University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

TO: Regent Governance Committee

FROM: Michael Lightner, Vice President Academic Affairs

DATE: September 16, 2026 (Updated October 8, 2026)

RE: Recommended Changes to Regent Policy 5.D

Background

In April 2025, the Board of Regents approved updates to **Regent Policy 5.D: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty** as part of its Five-Year Review Plan. Since then, the campus provosts have requested several updates in Section 5.D.1 on the tenure probationary period to modernize terminology and reflect current practice in greater detail. Note that review of Policy 5.D. is limited to the proposed updates, and this is not a full review. See recommended changes below.

Stakeholders who are participating in the review of the proposed changes to Policy 5.D include:

- Campus Provosts and their teams
- University Counsel
- Faculty Shared Governance
- CU System Office of Academic Affairs

Recommendations

1) Removal of “tenure clock” language in favor of the more modern, precise “probationary period.”

2) Reordering and minor revision of existing content in Section 5.D.1(A) as follows:

   - Subsection (1) in proposed draft is the same as subsection (3) in current policy. Text was simply moved up for improved overall flow of the section.
   - The first sentence in subsection (2) in proposed draft is the same as the first sentence in subsection (4) in current policy. Text was simply moved up for improved overall flow of the section.
   - The second sentence in subsection (2) is deleted in proposed draft in favor of greater detail provided in the language of (2)(a) and (2)(b) in the proposed draft, which reflects campus practice.
   - Subsection (3) in proposed draft is the same as subsection (1) in current policy.
   - The first sentence of subsection (2)(a) is deleted in proposed draft in favor of clarified language regarding delayed timing of personnel actions like comprehensive review when there is a leave. Note that (a) in proposed draft is in existing policy as subsection (2). The new sentence is conceptually the same but stated more clearly and reflects campus practice.

3) Updated language in Section 5.D.1(A) and Section 5.D.1(A)(3), subsections (b) and (c) reflect campus practices and support clarity at primary unit/department level. 5.D.1(A)(3)(c) language was further updated after comment from faculty. (updated 10/8/26)

4) Edits to create paragraphs in 5.D.1(B), subsections (1)(a), (2)(a), and (3)(a) are added to support consistency in formatting. (updated 10/8/26)

5) Minor updates to wording in Section 5.D.1(B) for consistency and to reflect campus practice. (updated 10/8/26)

6) Minor edits in Section 5.D.1(E) are proposed for clarity in response to feedback. (updated 10/8/26)

Fiscal Review

A. Do you think a fiscal review is needed for these proposed changes? **No.**

1. If no, please explain. **These are minor updates that update terminology and align with current campus practices.**

2. If yes, please share with the Office of the Vice President for Budget & Finance for review.

   a. Date fiscal review completed: **N/A**
   b. Person completing fiscal review: **N/A**
   c. Would these changes create a fiscal or resource impact?

      [X] NO
      [ ] YES

      If yes, what resources will be required to implement and sustain these policy changes? **N/A**