

Policies for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure  
 Program on International Affairs  
 College of Arts and Sciences  
 University of Colorado, Boulder  
 2008

The Program on International Affairs (IAFS) explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes, and Procedures (SPP) document and is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty."

1. *Rules of the Regents.* Rules of the Regents, as given in the C.U. Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements that cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

The University requires a comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials (see the Faculty Handbook) and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Program and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

According to the Faculty Handbook, the reward of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate "excellence" in either teaching or research and "meritorious" achievement in the other category, plus meritorious service. Promotion to the rank of full professor requires, according to the Faculty Handbook, that a candidate have the terminal degree appropriate to their (sic) 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 program's circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving 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.

The purpose of the Program's evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the disciplines that are represented within the Program on International Affairs.

2. *Allocation of Effort.* Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the program is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service (pro-rated to reflect the proportion of a faculty member's appointment in the Program.). This allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord

with the Program's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.

3. *Evaluation of Teaching.* In the first year after being appointed to a tenure-track position, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain all written records pertaining to teaching. The portfolio will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching. The Program may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any criteria identified below.

a. Undergraduate teaching. Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. However, no single measure of effectiveness in the undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Program. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
3. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
4. examples of course outlines, syllabuses, examinations, and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
5. descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
6. written statements that may have come from the Director or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Program in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Program may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seems appropriate for a particular individual.

b. Graduate teaching. International Affairs does not currently have a graduate curriculum. In cases of joint appointment where this Program's partner academic unit engages in graduate training, the latter unit's teaching report will include an evaluation of this component of the candidate's teaching performance based on a variety of measures such as those mentioned for undergraduate teaching and those pertinent to the mentorship of graduate students. The International Affairs Committee will vote on the teaching accomplishments of a faculty member holding joint appointment with due consideration to his/her contribution to graduate teaching as appropriate to this person's appointment.

Faculty members can request that the Director arrange a peer evaluation that will assist them in making improvements in teaching prior to evaluation. Other mechanisms for consultation on teaching include the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program and the Presidential Teaching Scholars consultation program. Faculty members are not required to use these mechanisms of self-improvement but are encouraged to do so.

The question to be considered by the Program in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

#### *4. Evaluation of Research.*

In making joint appointments with other academic units on campus, the Program on International Affairs seeks to reappoint, promote and grant tenure to faculty members who demonstrate that they meet the standards for meritorious or excellent accomplishments in research in a particular academic discipline. The Program's International Affairs Committee will evaluate the research accomplishments of faculty members with joint appointments on the basis of an evaluation prepared by a sub-committee of the academic unit with which the faculty members have a joint appointment.

Research accomplishments which meet the standards of a relevant academic department are the basis for the Program's consideration of research. No single measure of research effectiveness will be the sole basis of judgment by the Program. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in research include:

1. statements of research philosophy or self-evaluation of research;
2. articles in refereed journals, book chapters, and/or a book-length manuscript which make original contributions to knowledge and are published (or accepted for publication) by reputable academic journals or reputable academic or commercial presses (excluding vanity presses). Published work should show evidence of originality and importance;
3. grant awards or other honors received on and off campus;
4. conference participation and invited lectures;
5. citations, reviews, and other forms of recognition of research work, including external letters of evaluation.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have made original scholarly contributions in the form of articles in refereed journals, or scholarly book(s) published by a reputable academic or commercial press (excluding vanity presses) since they began the tenure-track probationary period.

The questions to be considered by the Program in its evaluation of research are as follows: Does the faculty member meet the standards for reappointment, promotion or tenure in

the department with which he or she has a joint appointment? Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

*5. Evaluation of Service.* A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Program is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Program to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial and reviewing for professional journals or professional societies, or professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it.

Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion, reappointment, or tenure. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Program, or from external sources.

The question to be considered by the Program in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

## **MILESTONES FOR EVALUATION**

### *Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.*

Individuals who are hired as beginning assistant professors will have at least one evaluation for reappointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. The last reappointment prior to a tenure decision must be based upon comprehensive evaluation. A standard pattern would be for an assistant professor to receive a four-year appointment initially and, upon positive comprehensive review at the end of the first appointment, to receive a second appointment that would extend to the mandatory tenure decision.

A tenure decision is required by the end of the seventh year. Faculty members are typically evaluated for tenure in the seventh year. The seven-year probationary period will include any years of credit toward tenure that are specified in writing at the time of hiring. In unusual cases, tenure can be awarded early. However, because it is customary for review committees to apply standards strictly and without discounted expectations based on shorter time in rank, it is inadvisable for faculty members to seek early promotion unless there are compelling reasons to do so.

Typically, promotion to associate professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure, although formally the two are separate decisions. Under unusual circumstances, individuals may be hired as associate professors without tenure (mainly because the University is reluctant to hire individuals without a probationary period prior to tenure), and

in this case the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of promotion to associate professor.

There is no mandatory point of decision for promotion to full professor. A customary waiting interval is approximately equal to the interval between the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, because significant incremental achievement is expected between ranks. In unusual cases, an individual can be considered for promotion to full professor after only a few years in rank as an associate professor, but this is not advisable on a routine basis because review committees can be expected to apply criteria strictly and not in such cases take into account shorter time in rank. Individuals who have doubts about the timing of promotion should seek advice from their Director, who may appoint an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the situation.

An individual can ask to be considered for promotion or tenure at any time, and the request will be considered by the Program unless it is contrary to the rules of the University. Individuals who believe that they are promotable or tenurable should not hesitate to ask their Director for an evaluation.

### *The Program's Review Process*

The program's judgments on reappointment, promotion and tenure are based on a comprehensive review. The recommendation of the Program is ultimately determined by a vote of the appropriate faculty following discussion of the evidence that was collected for the review.

The process of personnel review begins for the Program with the Director's appointment (with approval by a majority of the International Affairs Committee) of an ad hoc Personnel Committee, consisting of three faculty members, which performs two functions. First, if there is some doubt as to the likelihood of a favorable outcome, the Personnel Committee may advise the candidate to withhold the case until more time has elapsed, except in the case of mandatory tenure decision or mandatory comprehensive review. The committee may give this advice either initially, or after accumulating information indicating that the case needs to be stronger in order to be successful. The candidate is not bound to the advice of the Personnel Committee, however, and can proceed against it.

The second purpose of the Personnel Committee is to collect confidential information that the candidate cannot collect independently. It is also the responsibility of the Personnel Committee to obtain any information that it may require in order to make a complete presentation to the Program.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the bulk of the personnel file but can seek the help or advice of the Personnel Committee as appropriate. The Program staff will work with the candidate to assemble the personnel file and will review it for completeness. The file should meet the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the Campus as outlined on specification sheets that are available from the Dean's office. It is the candidate's responsibility, working with the Program staff and the Program Director, to see that the file is attractively

prepared, complete, and well-ordered, and that it has places for the insertion of confidential materials by the Personnel Committee.

In voting on the research accomplishments of faculty having joint appointments with other academic departments, the Personnel Committee shall rely upon a personnel file assembled by the department with which the candidate has a joint appointment. In its evaluation of research, the IAFS Program's Personnel Committee shall forward to the IA committee a verbatim copy of the report on research approved by the personnel sub-committee of the department with which the faculty member has a joint appointment.

In evaluating teaching and service the Personnel Committee will examine a portfolio reflecting the candidate's contribution to the IAFS Program, the department with which he/she has a joint appointment, the College, the University and the larger community.

Following the assembly of all materials, the Personnel Committee will have a final meeting at which it decides by vote its opinion on the case. The committee also will assign to its members responsibilities for presentation of the case to the Program. The committee will make the entire file available on a confidential basis to those faculty who will participate in the discussion two weeks prior to the Program's discussion of the case.

The meeting at which discussion of personnel cases by the Program takes place is announced in advance by the Program Director. The candidate for a particular decision will be absent during the discussion pertaining to his or her case. All other faculty members, whether or not eligible to vote, may attend. After the presentation by the Personnel Committee, there will be a discussion of the case by all faculty. When the Director is satisfied that discussion is complete, there will be a vote by secret ballot. The right to vote is limited to those faculty members who have professional status to which the candidate aspires, or a higher status. For example, only full professors would vote on the case of an associate professor being considered for promotion to full professor.

Voting shall be consistent with the By-Laws of the IAFS Program. Decisions shall be made by a simple majority of all votes cast, with a quorum consisting of a simple majority of all IAFS Faculty Committee members eligible to vote on that personnel case. Members absent from a meeting may submit written absentee ballots prior to the meeting, recording their four-part vote as described below. However, absentee ballots on personnel cases will only be accepted from faculty members who certify in writing that they have reviewed the complete dossier describing the case. Absent members who have submitted absentee ballots will count towards the quorum. The Director votes as a member of the Faculty Committee. Committee members who have voted in another unit on the personnel case at hand are encouraged to participate in the discussion, but are not eligible to vote with the IAFS Committee.

For tenure cases, votes will be recorded on a four-part ballot consisting of:

1. Research

On the ballot, voting members will record their evaluations of research as excellent, meritorious, or less than meritorious.

## 2. Teaching

On the ballot, voting members will record their evaluations of teaching as excellent, meritorious, or less than meritorious.

## 3. Service

On the ballot, voting members will record their evaluations of service as at least meritorious or not meritorious.

## 4. Tenure decision

A positive vote on tenure requires that the candidate be found at least meritorious in all three categories and excellent in either teaching or research, or both.

Following the Program's vote, the Personnel Committee will write a detailed letter of evaluation giving its own view of the case and reporting its vote. The letter will be addressed to the Program Director, and signed by all members of the Personnel Committee and will be added to the personnel file. In a letter addressed to the Dean, the Director reports the Program's vote and summarizes the faculty discussion.

In cases of joint appointments, after the International Affairs Committee and the relevant academic departments have voted, the Director of the Program on International Affairs and the Chair of the relevant department will write separate reports on their deliberations. The Program director and the Chair of the relevant department will also write a joint cover letter. These documents will be included in one notebook which will be forwarded to the Dean of Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee. The report from the personnel subcommittees of both International Affairs and the relevant academic departments will be similarly included.

If there is a disagreement between the Program on International Affairs and the relevant academic department about the reappointment, promotion or tenure, the Director of International Affairs and the Chair of the relevant department will explain the nature of their disagreement in their summaries of the discussion leading to the votes of their units.

In the event that the two units disagree about reappointment, tenure or promotion, if and when a reappointment or tenure case is approved, the individual moves into a vacant half line in the supporting unit and vacates a half line in the rejecting unit. The rejecting unit may, subject to the approval of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, use the vacated half line for other purposes. If the supporting unit does not have an immediate vacant half line to accommodate the individual, the Dean of Arts and Sciences will bridge it until one opens up.

### *Review above the Level of the Program.*

Following the program vote, the candidate's file is sent from the Program to the Dean. The Dean refers the case to a standing College committee (Dean's Personnel Committee) which discusses the case and votes on it. The Dean then writes a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter gives the Dean's personal evaluation of the case and a recommendation for action, as well as reporting the vote and, if appropriate, the opinions of the

Dean's Personnel Committee. The Dean is not bound to agree with the Dean's Personnel Committee, with the Program, or with the Director.

Beyond the Dean's office, the personnel file passes to the offices of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor's office receives files on all personnel decisions from all colleges on the Campus. The Vice Chancellor relies heavily on the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC), which considers all cases for comprehensive reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The VCAC discusses each case in detail and votes on the disposition of the case. The vote is considered a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The Vice Chancellor's decision is relayed to the Chancellor. Beyond the Vice Chancellor's level, review occurs by the Chancellor and, in cases of tenure decisions, the President and the Regents. However, review above the Vice Chancellor's level at present is typically pro forma. Difficult cases may be scrutinized by all levels but the typical case is not usually examined closely at higher levels.

A negative decision by any level of review can be overruled by a positive decision at a higher level. For example, a negative decision by the Program could be overruled by the Dean or by the Vice Chancellor. Similarly, a positive decision at any level can be overruled by a negative decision at a higher level. When any decision is overruled, the case is sent back to the lower level with advice from the upper level and a request for clarification, reconsideration, or additional information. The case is then reconsidered by the lower level and forwarded again to the upper level for review. The rights of appeal for rejected candidates are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Return of cases from an upper level to a lower level cannot always be taken as a sign of weakness in the case. Sometimes, review committees find critical pieces of information missing from the file and ask for additional information, even though they fully expect to approve the case. Individuals under review should not be unduly concerned by a request for additional information, unless the request is accompanied by a negative vote from a review committee.

The candidate is directly advised through the Director of all review decisions at the Dean's office. In addition, the candidate will receive a copy of the letter that passes from the Dean to the Vice Chancellor and from the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee to the Dean and Vice Chancellor.

Personnel cases are prepared in the fall semester of the year before they take effect. The order of preparation is typically by increasing rank: comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor. Under the current scheduling system, the comprehensive reappointment cases will leave the Program in October and the full professor cases may leave the Program as late as January in the year of the proposed personnel action.