



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY STATEMENT

Policy Title: Standards, Processes and Procedures for ~~Comprehensive Review~~ Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

APS Number: 1022

APS Subject Area: ACADEMIC/RESEARCH

Brief Description: This policy outlines the standards, processes, and procedures for the ~~comprehensive review~~ reappointment, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review and promotion of tenure-track faculty members ~~and the promotion and post-tenure review of tenured faculty members.~~

Effective: July 1, ~~2014~~ 2020 (Pending)

Approved by: President Mark R. Kennedy (Pending)

Responsible University Officer: Vice President for Academic Affairs

Responsible Office: Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Policy Contact: Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Supersedes: July 1, ~~2011-2014~~ (Revised May 1, 2011)

Last Reviewed/Updated: ~~October 19, 2016~~ July 1, 2020 (Pending)

Applies to: ~~University-wide~~ Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty on All Campuses

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

I. INTRODUCTION

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

II. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The performance of a tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated according to the standards established in Regent Policy 5.D and this Administrative Policy Statement (APS).

43 B. As stated in Regent Policy 5.D, criteria for evaluating faculty performance shall be established by the
 44 primary unit.

45 C. Every primary unit (described below) and reviewing body or person making recommendations concerning
 46 comprehensive review/reappointment, tenure and promotion, or participating in the post-tenure review
 47 process, shall strictly follow and apply the procedures and standards described herein.¹ Failure to adhere to
 48 these procedures and standards may lead to the imposition of sanctions. Questions about proper processes
 49 and procedures should be directed to the dean, faculty affairs office, or provost.

50 A-D. In accordance with Regent Policy 5.C.2(H), tenured faculty shall be reviewed in a comprehensive
 51 manner every five years.

52 **III. TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD**

53 A. ~~Each tenure-track faculty member below the rank of associate professor and faculty members in the Law~~
 54 ~~School hired at the rank of associate professor shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner, as outlined in~~
 55 ~~the primary unit documents, at least once during the tenure probationary period (at the School of Medicine,~~
 56 ~~School of Pharmacy and the Colorado School of Public Health, at least once during the promotion~~
 57 ~~probationary period), apart from the review for promotion or the award of tenure. (Regent Laws Article~~
 58 ~~5.B.6.B.1). A recommendation on tenure shall be made after a probationary period of continuous full-time~~
 59 ~~or full-time equivalent service as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. (See exceptions in~~
 60 ~~Section III.E.) The probationary period shall not exceed seven years, unless an extension has been~~
 61 ~~approved by the dean and chancellor or the chancellor's designee. If an individual's professional~~
 62 ~~accomplishments warrant, the probationary period may be waived and tenure may be recommended upon~~
 63 ~~hire.~~

64 1. If a faculty member utilizes family medical leave or parental leave during the tenure probationary
 65 period, and the leave period is of sufficient length that the faculty member's performance cannot
 66 not be appropriately evaluated during that period, the faculty member shall be granted a one-year
 67 extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than
 68 six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the
 69 tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and is subject to approval by
 70 the dean and the chancellor.

71 1.2. A faculty member may apply for leave for reasons other than family medical leave or parental
 72 leave during their probationary period. If the faculty member requests leave, with or without an
 73 requested extension of the probationary period, with the leave request the request shall be reviewed
 74 by the chair and dean and the dean will issue a recommendation to the provost. The request and
 75 the extension of leave is subject to provost approval. by the provost The Provost shall decide
 76 whether the leave is granted and whether it affects the probationary period (except in the case of
 77 Parental Leave, see subsection 2). Any change to the probationary period because of leave will
 78 shall be in increments of one year.

79 2.3. A faculty member who utilizes parental leave during the tenure probationary period will be
 80 granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably
 81 elect, no later than six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time
 82 count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and must
 83 be approved by the dean and the chancellor. If a one-year extension to the probationary period is
 84 provided, a one-year extension also applies to all personnel actions (comprehensive review or
 85 tenure review) scheduled to occur after the leave period.

86 B. The tenure probationary period shall begin when the faculty member is first appointed to the rank of
 87 assistant professor or a higher rank. ~~However, a faculty member appointed to the rank of assistant professor~~
 88 ~~without a terminal degree may decide at the time of initial appointment whether the probationary period~~

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

~~will begin at the time of initial appointment or upon receipt of the terminal degree. Such a decision shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and the chancellor.~~

- 89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
- C. Typically, up to three years of full-time service in the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period.
 - D. Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the tenure probationary period apart from the review for award of tenure. The comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service.
 - 1. The comprehensive review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure.
 - 2. The review may include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by campus, ~~/school/college,~~ or ~~/library~~ policy.
 - 3. ~~Candidates 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. Candidates may also request additional feedback from the primary unit head in the second year of their appointment and any subsequent year prior to the tenure and/or promotion decision (except the academic year in which the comprehensive review is undertaken).~~
 - a. In this additional feedback process, the primary unit head shall examine evidence provided by the candidate of the candidate's teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit), and make suggestions for improvement in those areas in which the record of the candidate should be stronger in order to meet primary unit criteria.
 - b. Suggestions provided by the primary unit head are not intended to provide the level of specific formal feedback that is provided through the comprehensive review. The primary unit head may recommend advising sessions where that the candidate can work with senior faculty members and/or with a campus office of faculty development.
 - c. If the candidate elects these advising sessions, the candidate shall report this fact in the annual report of professional activity (e.g. FRPA), but the content of these consultations shall remain confidential unless the candidate elects otherwise.
 - 4. The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the comprehensive review, which is one of two outcomes:
 - a. the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or
 - b. the faculty member is informed that they will be given a one-year terminal appointment and the tenure-track appointment will not be continued.
 - E. In the Schools of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health, promotion and tenure are separate processes, but may occur concurrently.
 - 1. Unless waived by the faculty member and approved by the dean and chancellor, a decision regarding promotion to associate professor shall be made after a maximum probationary period of seven years of continuous full-time service at the rank of assistant professor (or its prorated equivalent). Normally, the promotion review of a faculty member will commence at the beginning of the seventh year of service.
 - 2. School of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health tenure-track faculty members in the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible for consideration for tenure. There ~~will be~~ no maximum time limit for the award of tenure; however, the faculty member who is turned down for tenure may not be reconsidered for three years.

137 IV. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR TENURE

- 138 A. As stated in Regent Policy 5.D, (Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with who have
 139 demonstrated, at a minimum, meritorious performance in each of the three areas of: teaching (or
 140 librarianship), research or scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service to the university and the
 141 faculty member's profession (to the university, profession, and/or public); and demonstrated excellence in
 142 either teaching (or librarianship), or researchscholarly/creative work.

143 Candidates at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) may also be evaluated on professional
 144 practice, in which case they must also demonstrate meritorious performance in that area. Faculty members
 145 in health science fields may be required by their respective schools or colleges to demonstrate meritorious
 146 performance in clinical activity/clinical care, public health practice, or other professional areas as
 147 appropriate. Librarians must demonstrate meritorious performance in librarianship and curators in
 148 curatorial activities. In addition, faculty members in the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy and the
 149 Colorado School of Public Health must meet the standards of the School that were approved by the Board
 150 of Regents. In the School of Medicine, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with national and
 151 international reputations for academic excellence who are among the best in their field of academic
 152 endeavor and who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship, as well as excellence in, and dedication to
 153 teaching (as further defined in the rules of the School of Medicine). Public Health may consider in its
 154 tenure recommendations public health practice/clinical activity and scholarly activity, as further defined by
 155 its bylaws. In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have
 156 demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching.
 157 Professional/administrative leadership and service and/or clinical activities should be weighed into any
 158 decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both
 159 teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.

160 Additionally:

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

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

- 169 2. In its tenure recommendations, the Colorado School of Public Health may consider public health
 170 practice/clinical activity and scholarship, as further defined in school policy.

- 171 3. In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have
 172 demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to,
 173 teaching (as further defined in the appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure policy of the
 174 School of Pharmacy).

- 175 4. Candidates at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs may also be evaluated on professional
 176 practice, in which case they shall also demonstrate at least meritorious performance in that area to
 177 be recommended for tenure. A faculty member cannot be tenured based on excellence in
 178 professional practice without excellence in researchscholarly/creative work or teaching.

- 179 B. A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of
 180 impact beyond the institution. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include
 181 multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national,
 182 and/or international level whichthat furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and
 183 learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting.

- 184 1. For the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy, which require excellence in both
 185 teaching and scholarship, at least one area, as specified in the primary unit criteria, must show
 186 evidence of impact beyond the institution.

187 C. Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance.
 188 Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.

189 B-D. All faculty members within a unit, no matter when they are considered for tenure, are held to the
 190 same standards. The standards of performance that apply to faculty members on the seven year tenure
 191 clock apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. They must have a record of achievement in
 192 teaching, research or creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service that is equal to the record
 193 expected of a faculty member coming up in the seventh year. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot
 194 be applied to candidates for early tenure. Department chairs and mentors have a responsibility to counsel
 195 tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early promotion or tenure. An unsuccessful candidate
 196 for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

197 **V. PRIMARY UNIT CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION**

198 A. Each primary unit shall develop specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of
 199 candidates in the primary unit that are consistent with the standards herein. Primary units shall develop
 200 criteria that define the teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service
 201 expectations for faculty, such as expectations for publications, grants for scholarly/creative work, measures
 202 of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field(s).

203 B. These approved criteria, called the "primary unit criteria," shall be subject to periodic review and approval
 204 by the dean and provost. The primary unit shall review its criteria at least every seven years (or more
 205 frequently if directed by the dean or provost) for rigor, fairness, and consistency with regent requirements.
 206 Criteria and are effective when approved by the dean and provost. In those cases where the primary unit
 207 has requested and received Board of Regents approval of specific alternative or additional standards (e.g.
 208 professional practice, clinical activity), those standards shall be reflected in the primary unit criteria.

209 C. All primary unit criteria shall be in writing and shall be included in the candidate's dossier or made
 210 available electronically to individuals and committees involved in higher levels of the review process. They
 211 must be used by the primary unit and by all other bodies or persons as part of in their evaluation of the
 212 candidate.

213 D. Regent Law 5-B,C, Regent Policy 5-M,D, this administrative policy statement, and the primary unit criteria
 214 and procedures shall be made available by the head of the primary unit to each tenured and tenure-track
 215 faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment.

216 E. The primary unit criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement that warrants the
 217 designations "meritorious" and "excellent" performance in teaching (or librarianship), research or
 218 scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as well as in other activities relevant to their specific
 219 unit or other applicable evaluation areas. However, reducing the inherent complexity of faculty activities to a
 220 strict formula is discouraged.

221 F. ~~It will~~ The primary unit criteria shall also provide a description of the types of evidence that will be used to
 222 evaluate the candidate against the performance standards. Examples of criteria that might be considered in
 223 evaluating teaching, ~~research or~~ scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service are included in
 224 Appendix A.

225 G. If new or revised primary unit criteria have been adopted during a faculty member's tenure probationary
 226 period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for reappointment or tenure based on the new
 227 criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. The choice must be made before the next
 228 personnel action that follows implementation of the new criteria. When a faculty member is evaluated for
 229 promotion to full professor, the current primary unit criteria shall apply.

230 1. Faculty members on the Anschutz Medical Campus who are evaluated for promotion to associate
 231 professor without a coincident evaluation of tenure may choose to be evaluated for promotion
 232 based on the primary unit criteria at the time of appointment or the current primary unit criteria.

233 H. When joint or split appointments are made, the affected faculty member must be informed in writing, prior
 234 to the appointment, of: 1) the duties and expectations as agreed upon by all primary units involved; and 2)
 235 which primary unit will be responsible for such personnel recommendations as reappointment, tenure,
 236 reappointment, promotion, and salary.

I. ~~The~~ Tenure and promotion decisions are based on ~~summary summative~~ evaluations of a faculty member's cumulative performance according to primary unit criteria. These processes and criteria are separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation ~~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.~~² ~~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.~~

~~I.J.~~ The merit of the candidate is the only consideration in recommendations for awarding tenure. The program requirements of the primary unit shall be considered only at the time of appointment and reappointment.

~~J.~~ 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.

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

~~L.~~ 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.

~~K.~~ To be promoted to the rank of Professor (also referred to as "Full Professor"), an individual should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and:

~~1.~~ 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.

~~2.1.~~ A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; and

~~3.2.~~ A record of significant contribution to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and

~~4.3.~~ A record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.

VI. MENTORING

~~A.~~ A considerable amount of time and resources is invested in hiring tenure-track faculty; therefore, the university has a significant stake in their success. While it is the individual faculty member's responsibility to develop the teaching and research skills and a work plan that produces the quality and quantity of professional activity needed to warrant reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, the unit and the administration have certain obligations to mentor tenure-track faculty and to help them navigate the review processes. 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. In addition to published policies and

²-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.

guidelines, schools and colleges shall provide their faculty members reasonable opportunities for training and information sessions on the tenure and promotion process.

1. Primary units shall ensure that reasonable mentoring opportunities are available for faculty members during their probationary period. However, in some cases, it may make more sense for the campus's faculty development office or a school or college to take responsibility for providing mentoring opportunities. Together, the dean and faculty of each school/college shall determine whether to have unit based mentoring or campus/school/college based mentoring.

2. Department chairs/unit heads have the responsibility to assist any faculty member who requests a mentor during their probationary period to locate an appropriate mentor on the campus. In some units, it may be helpful to identify an external mentor from another CU campus or from outside the university. External assistance, however, cannot be assured. If the mentoring program is formal, the frequency and general subjects of the mentoring sessions should be documented.

3. Faculty members who serve as mentors should be able to count mentoring activities in the annual merit evaluation process.

B. During the probationary period, candidates are expected to proactively seek and take advantage of available mentoring and advising programs.

C. Faculty members who believe they are not getting adequate mentoring are responsible for bringing their situation to the attention of the unit head. If they are not satisfied with the mentoring opportunities the unit head provides, they should bring this concern to the attention of the dean or the provost's office.

VII. REVIEW PROCESS

A. The Primary Unit. The primary unit is composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning ~~comprehensive review~~reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In schools and colleges with departmental organizations, each department will usually constitute a primary unit. In a school or college without such organization, all tenured and tenure-track faculty members have the responsibility for developing the terms of the working structure whereby the primary unit is defined. The primary unit may be a division, or may be the school or college as a whole. In some instances, the primary unit may involve faculty from cognate departments or institutes.

B. The Candidate Dossier. Each candidate for ~~comprehensive review~~reappointment, tenure or promotion, assisted by the head of the primary unit making the recommendation, shall prepare a comprehensive dossier for evaluation. Faculty members should include copies of their published materials, as well as supporting data and electronic communications documenting their professional activities. The School of Medicine has different standards for the dossier and campuses may have requirements in addition to those listed below. The primary unit or the dean should provide templates or models of good dossiers to guide candidates in dossier preparation. The dossier submitted by the candidate shall include the following materials:

1. A current curriculum vitae.
2. Evidence concerning the teaching ability of the candidate, including results of learner evaluations. (See the administrative policy statement "Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation" for examples of the types of evaluative material that ~~can~~may be used.) Each candidate should submit an organized teacher's portfolio that highlights accomplishments in teaching (for example, development of new instructional materials or methods, educational scholarship, receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a teacher, course syllabi; and normed student feedback, e.g. Faculty Course Questionnaires, which are required when available). This section may also include evaluations by the candidate's students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate's teaching in classroom, laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.

3. Documents supporting the candidate's research, scholarly ~~or~~/creative work, or other activities relevant to their specific unit/clinical activity and professional practice. This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications,

- 331 ~~unsolicited~~ letters, and other evidence of success. A self-evaluative statement or narrative
 332 summary should be provided.
- 333 4. Documents supporting the candidate’s leadership and service to the university, profession and
 334 community. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- 335 5. Any other information the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation
 336 during the ~~comprehensive review, tenure review, or promotion~~ review process.
- 337 6. Documents to be added by the primary unit following receipt of the dossier from the candidate
 338 include:
- 339 a. A copy of the primary unit criteria;
- 340 b. Previous reappointment, tenure and/or promotion (~~RTP~~) letters if required by the campus,
 341 primary unit, school/college or library; and/or
- 342 c. Evaluation letters received from external reviewers.
- 343 i. The primary unit requests written evaluations ~~in writing~~ by scholars-experts from
 344 outside the university ~~and from various locations~~ who are qualified to judge the
 345 candidate, using a solicitation letter following the college-approved format.
- 346 ii. Such outside evaluations are mandatory in cases of recommendations for tenure
 347 and promotion. Comprehensive reviews may also include external evaluations, as
 348 determined by the campus/school/college/library policy.
- 349 iii. Selection of external evaluators shall be undertaken by the primary unit; the
 350 candidate shall be given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or
 351 indicate specific scholars whom the candidate feels should be excluded from
 352 consideration. Primary unit ~~bylaws-review procedures will~~ shall describe the
 353 process used in the primary unit for the selection of external evaluators. Care must
 354 be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations may constitute a conflict of
 355 interest, such as a dissertation director.
- 356 ~~– If a candidate for tenure is a new hire, and at the time the letter of offer was~~
 357 ~~issued, the individual held a tenured position at another institution, the~~
 358 ~~letter(s) of recommendation for hire may be used in the tenure evaluation~~
 359 ~~process in place of the external evaluation letters typically required. If~~
 360 ~~necessary, additional letters may be requested in the tenure evaluation~~
 361 ~~process.~~
- 362 ~~iv.~~ A minimum of three external letters shall be added to the file; however, campuses,
 363 schools/colleges/libraries may require ~~a greater number of~~ more than three letters.
 364 All letters that are received must be included in the candidate’s promotion or
 365 tenure dossier.
- 366 ~~These External~~ letters solicited by the primary unit must be treated as confidential;
 367 they shall not be shared with the candidate.
- 368 ~~v.~~ The primary unit may offer external evaluators a modest stipend for their work.
- 369 ~~vii.~~ Primary unit letters should include summaries of key comments by evaluators,
 370 with all identifiers removed to preserve confidentiality.

C. Levels of Review.³ The case for reappointment, tenure and promotion of a tenure-track faculty member

³ ~~School of Medicine 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/medicalschooll/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, Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines provide such information. At the School of Medicine, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Colorado School of Public Health,~~

and promotion of a tenured faculty member is evaluated at multiple levels. The expertise of the primary unit is balanced by the broader perspective introduced at other levels of review. At each level of the review process, the candidate should be informed of the outcome as expeditiously as possible. The primary unit criteria shall be used at every level of the review process and the criteria shall be included in the candidate's dossier.

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

For cases involving reappointment at comprehensive review, faculty and review committees at each level of review vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure. A determination shall be made for each of the areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit). Based on this evaluation, the faculty and review committees shall issue a recommendation regarding reappointment.

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

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

a. The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) is the group within the primary unit responsible for initially reviewing the qualifications of a candidate for comprehensive review/reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In a small primary unit, all members of the unit may constitute such a committee and additional members may be added from other units. The PUEC issues a recommendation that includes:

i. 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.

ii. The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee's recommendation includes:

iii.i. A description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/and-creative work, research, teaching, clinical activity, professional practice, and leadership or service to the university, profession, and/or public or the community, and other activities relevant to specific units, as required by primary unit criteria;

ii. Salient points of external reviewers' analyses, with care taken to maintain confidentiality

iv-iii. A statement describing the procedures followed, perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, and the committee vote, and actions taken by the unit making the recommendation, including the reasons for the recommendation and

review procedures differ in many respects from those described in this APS. Faculty members should consult their school's tenure and promotion policies.

419 any dissenting statements from the recommendation (this statement must include
 420 the results of any vote taken);

421 v. Salient points of the external reviewers' analyses, with care taken to maintain
 422 confidentiality;

423 b. Following the PUEC recommendation, a vote is held by the faculty of the primary unit.
 424 The faculty vote shall address the candidate's performance in teaching (or librarianship),
 425 scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit
 426 criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit) and shall include a positive or
 427 negative recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

428 i. Only members of the primary unit holding tenure may vote on decisions relating to
 429 reappointment or tenure.

430 ii. Only members of the primary unit with the rank of full professor may vote on
 431 decisions to promote a faculty member to the rank of full professor or hire a
 432 faculty member at the rank of full professor.

433 iii. PUEC members may participate in these votes.

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

437 a. If required by the individual school, college or library, the findings of the comprehensive
 438 review.

439 c. In units with a department structure, the chair shall also issue a recommendation on
 440 reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. (If the chair is a member of the PUEC, a
 441 separate recommendation letter is not required.)

442 d. The PUEC recommendation, results of the faculty vote, and chair recommendation are
 443 forwarded to tThe Dean's Advisory or Review Committee (DRC). The DRC aids in the
 444 evaluation of recommendations forwarded by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee will
 445 review the dossier and all prior action on the case, conduct a vote, and issue a
 446 recommendation to the dean.

447 i. The DRC is typically composed of full professors in the candidate's
 448 school/college. Members of the committee who are faculty within the candidate's
 449 primary unit are ineligible to vote.

450 ii. When necessary due to the size or structure of the school/college, the DRC may
 451 Where it is not possible for the review committee to consist of faculty members
 452 other than those in the primary unit, the dean will form a review committee that
 453 will include faculty from other schools or colleges.

454 iii. The dean shall determine whether the committee will be is elected or appointed.

455 e. Should either the review committee DRC or the dean disagree with the recommendation of
 456 the primary unit (based on the faculty vote), the dean shall communicate in writing the
 457 nature of this disagreement with the head of the primary unit.

458 i. The primary unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its
 459 reconsidered judgment, including the results of any additional votes, to the dean
 460 for consideration and that of the review committee. The dean may then ask the
 461 DRC to reconsider its original recommendation and cast a new vote.

462 ii. The recommendation of the dean, the results of the all votes of the primary unit
 463 and the review committee DRC, and the comprehensive candidate dossier on the
 464 candidate shall be forwarded together to the provost.

465 iii. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the review
 466 committee DRC, and/or the dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each

467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515

party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context.

2. The Second-Level Review is at the campus level; it includes review by the vice chancellor for academic affairs² advisory committee (VCAC), the ~~vice chancellor for academic affairs, hereafter referred to as the~~ provost,²² 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.
 - a. ~~The provost on each campus shall have an advisory committee of faculty members (VCAC) to assist her/him in the review of recommendations submitted by the dean. The provost shall determine whether the committee will be is elected or appointed, and the committee will participate fully with the provost in the review of the recommendation from the first level.~~
 - b. ~~Following its review, the VCAC shall conduct a vote and issue a recommendation to the provost. Members of the VCAC who are faculty within the candidate's department are ineligible to vote.~~
 - c. ~~If Should the VCAC or provost disagrees with the recommendation from the first level review of the dean or primary unit faculty, he/ she the provost shall transmit to the dean of the school or college the nature of the disagreement.~~
 - i. ~~If the VCAC disagrees with the recommendation of the primary unit faculty or the primary unit faculty and the dean, the case shall be returned to the faculty for reconsideration, and then, in turn, the case shall go back to the dean for reconsideration.~~
 - ii. ~~If the VCAC agrees with the primary unit faculty recommendation, but disagrees with the dean's recommendation, the case shall be returned to the dean for reconsideration.~~
 - iii. ~~The dean and the review committee shall then reconsider their recommendation and return their reconsidered judgment(s), including the results of any additional votes, shall be forwarded to the provost.~~
 - iv. ~~At her/his discretion needed, 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 he/she 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.~~
 - v. ~~After receiving the reconsidered judgment from the dean, the provost may ask the VCAC to review its original recommendation and cast a new vote.~~
 - d. ~~If the provost finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, he/she the provost may return the case to the primary unit and other levels of the campus review to repeat the process. The provost may, at his/her 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.~~
 - b. ~~—~~
 - e. ~~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.~~

- e. The provost shall make a recommendation regarding tenure to the chancellor.
- f. For cases involving reappointment decisions, the program requirements of the primary unit may be considered by the chair, dean, provost or chancellor when issuing a recommendation.
- g. A candidate for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure shall be informed in writing of the final determination of the chancellor in writing as expeditiously as possible.
 - i. All positive recommendations for tenure shall be forwarded to the president.
 - ii. Decisions not to recommend tenure are not forwarded to the president. A decision by the chancellor to deny tenure may be appealed according to the terms of Section VIII of this APS.
 - iii. Non-reappointment is not subject to administrative appeal. See Section VIII of this APS for faculty grievance rights.
 - iv. Denial of promotion is not subject to administrative appeal unless it coincides with a denial of tenure or results in a terminal appointment (an "up or out" decision). An "up or out" decision as may apply to faculty members at some schools and colleges at the Anschutz Medical Campus. See Section VIII of this APS for faculty grievance rights.

3. The Third-Level Review is at the presidential level; it refers to either (1) the review by the president of a positive recommendation for tenure or (2) an appeal of a negative decision for comprehensive review or tenure or promotion. (Promotion may only be appealed only in accordance with Section VII.C.2(dg)(iv.) 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

a. 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 recommendations rests with the chancellors.

a-b. An appeal of a negative decision for tenure shall follow the procedures specified in section VIII.A.

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

D. Candidates Prerogatives

1. At any stage in the review process, a candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information that he/she/they believes will be helpful in evaluating his/her/their comprehensive review, promotion and/or tenure at the first, second, and third level review stages case. 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.

2. Each With the exception of letters provided by external evaluators, each faculty member candidate shall have access to all performance evaluation evaluative documents in their/his/her own files. These documents shall include statements prepared by primary unit evaluation committees, by department or division the primary unit chairs, or by administrative officers, but shall not include Evaluation letters of recommendation solicited from outside the primary unit university, which are to be treated as confidential and not shared with the candidate. 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. Any letters provided by students must be de-identified before sharing with the candidate.

565 3. If a candidate so requests, in a confidential conversation, the provost or ~~her/his~~ the provost's
 566 representative designee shall advise the candidate of the reasons that contributed to a
 567 recommendation not to grant tenure or ~~promote~~ promotion.

568 3.4. At any point in the process prior to the decision by the chancellor, a candidate may withdraw the
 569 case from consideration.

570 ~~VIII.—After the final decision, a candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure shall be entitled to file a grievance~~
 571 ~~with the Faculty Senate's Privilege and Tenure Committee within the allowable time frame (see Regent Policy~~
 572 ~~5-H) if the candidate believes that the procedures described herein have not been observed at any stage of the~~
 573 ~~recommending or review process. While procedural errors per se may entitle the candidate to proper~~
 574 ~~reconsideration as herein provided, such errors may not be used as the justification for personnel~~
 575 ~~recommendations not otherwise justified on the basis of performance. Nor shall the Privilege and Tenure~~
 576 ~~Committee substitute its judgment about an individual's merit for that of other committees and administrators.~~
 577 ~~The committee shall promptly report any procedural deficiencies to the provost of the campus where the faculty~~
 578 ~~member works.~~

579 ~~IX.—~~

580 ~~X.—A candidate who is denied tenure will have a terminal year before his/her appointment ends.~~

581 ~~IX.~~ VIII. APPEAL AND GRIEVANCE RIGHTS

582 A. Administrative Appeal of Decisions Regarding Tenure

583 1. In the case of a negative decision on tenure by the chancellor, the faculty member, within ten
 584 working days of receipt of written notice of denial for tenure from the chancellor, may request
 585 review by the president. The president may review, at the initiation of a faculty member, a
 586 negative decision of the campus chancellor regarding tenure. Within 10 business days of receipt of
 587 notification, a candidate denied tenure by the chancellor may request a third-level review by the
 588 president. This request for review shall be made only on the grounds that the review contained
 589 either (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (2)
 590 substantive errors (such as a biased summary of student comments) of sufficient magnitude that
 591 they may have affected the outcome, or (3) prima facie evidence of discrimination, or some
 592 combination of these grounds. The only grounds for a presidential review are: (1) procedural
 593 errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (2) factual errors of
 594 sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; or (3) the material violation of the
 595 Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy; or (4) some combination of these grounds.

596 2. The president reviews the request and determines whether there are grounds for a third-level
 597 review. The president may determine there are no grounds for appeal and uphold the chancellor's
 598 decision. In this circumstance, the case is closed.

599 3. If there are grounds, the president shall convene a system-wide advisory committee of tenured
 600 faculty members chosen in consultation with faculty council to review the case. The advisory
 601 committee shall be provided with a complete dossier on each candidate referred to it by the
 602 president. After completing its review, the advisory committee will make its recommendation to
 603 the president. After considering the advisory committee's recommendation, and if he/she disagrees
 604 with a recommendation for tenure submitted by the chancellor, the president shall transmit to him
 605 or her the nature of the disagreement. The chancellor shall then reconsider her/his
 606 recommendation and return her/his reconsidered judgment to the president. The president shall
 607 make her/his final determination whether to deny tenure or to recommend tenure to the Board of
 608 Regents only upon completion of this process. If the president determines there are grounds for an
 609 appeal:

610 a. The president may remand the case to the campus to rectify errors and require the
 611 chancellor to then revise or reaffirm the original recommendation.

612 b. The president may overrule the campus decision and recommend tenure to the Board of
 613 Regents.

614 c. The president may convene a faculty advisory committee to review the case. The

committee may issue a recommendation on tenure or recommend action to rectify errors. If the committee makes a recommendation on tenure, it shall base its recommendation on the dossier available to the chancellor at the time the chancellor issued a decision. Ultimately, the president shall either make the final decision to uphold the chancellor's decision to deny tenure or shall recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

B. Grievance Rights

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

~~XII. The committee shall promptly report any procedural deficiencies to the campus provost.~~

~~III.~~ IX. POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Post-tenure review (PTR) is a summative evaluation over a five-year review period. 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 to the university community, the Board of Regents, and the public.

B. Each campus ~~has developed~~ shall have procedures for appropriate peer evaluation during PTR and for appeals of the PTR evaluation. ~~College or department level PTR procedures must~~ Primary units shall have written guidelines that conform to the campus procedures and this administrative policy statement.

1. A primary unit's PTR guidelines must ~~shall~~ describe the criteria that will be used to evaluate faculty and ~~must~~ shall indicate what level of performance is required for a faculty member to be considered "meeting expectations" in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit). They shall ~~also~~ consider ~~also~~ differentiated workloads. The primary unit PTR guidelines and criteria must be approved by the dean of the school/college/library and provost.

~~1.2.~~ The PTR evaluation shall be conducted by appropriate faculty peers within the campus, either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. This committee shall be called the post-tenure review committee. Other units may be consulted as appropriate.

~~1.3.~~ Consistent with campus or primary unit policy, As part of the PTR process, the faculty member under review shall ~~may~~ prepare and submit to the PTR committee a ~~P~~ professional P ~~plan. If a plan is submitted, t~~ he committee shall consider the plan in its evaluation. See Appendix B for more information on the P ~~professional P~~ plan.

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

~~C.~~ 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). 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)~~

~~D.~~ The PTR committee shall provide an ~~overall~~ evaluation of the faculty member's performance as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, ~~or~~ below expectations, ~~or fails to meet expectations~~ in ~~each of the areas of~~ teaching ~~(or librarianship)~~, ~~research/scholarly/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service~~ ~~(and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit)~~, and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation.

~~D-E.~~ Faculty members who receive a summative evaluation of "below expectations" in any of the ~~three evaluated areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, or leadership and service~~, must agree to a performance improvement agreement (~~See APS on Performance Ratings for Faculty for more information on the performance improvement agreement and extensive review~~).

~~E-F.~~ 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 to over the past five 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 the committee's~~ report will be given to the faculty member by the department chair or dean, depending on whether the PTR is undertaken by the primary unit or school/college. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The reports will be forwarded to the dean, who will provide a summary report and copies of the individual reports to the provost on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the school/college. Annually, the provosts will provide a summary report on post-tenure review to the System Office of Academic Affairs, who will forward the campus summary reports to the president and the Board of Regents. ~~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).~~

~~F-G.~~ 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/neglect~~ of duty, ~~which may include reduction in salary, reassignment of duties, unpaid suspension, and/or~~ dismissal for cause.

B. 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~~

716 other faculty members. The criteria for librarians will include activities in the teaching and/or practice of
717 librarianship. Primary unit criteria, as described above, articulate the requirements for tenure and promotion.
718

719 ~~XIV.X.~~ **RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FORMS, GUIDELINES, AND OTHER RESOURCES**

720 ~~A.~~ **Administrative Policy Statements (APS) and Other Policies**

- 721 • ~~Regent Policy 5.M5.D~~
- 722 • ~~Regent Policy 5.C~~
- 723 • ~~University APS: Justification for Appointment with Tenure Outside Hire with Tenure~~
- 724 • ~~University APS: Faculty Development/Mentoring~~
- 725 • ~~University APS 1009: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation~~
- 726 • ~~University APS 5008: Performance Ratings for Faculty~~
- 727
- 728
- 729

730 ~~XV.XI.~~ **HISTORY**

- 731 • Original policy effective July 1, 2007; Content previously stated in Appendix A of the Laws of the
732 Regents (Appendix A rescinded January 2009)
- 733 • Revised January 1, 2011
- 734 • Non-substantive revision on May 1, 2011
- 735 • The term “service” was replaced with the term “leadership and service” to reflect a change in Regent
736 laws and policies, effective April 30, 2014.
- 737 • Revised July 1, 2014
- 738 • ~~Non-substantive revision on October 19, 2016~~
- 739 • Revised July 1, 2020 (Pending)
- 740
- 741

742 ~~XII.~~ **KEY WORDS**

743 ~~—~~ Evaluation
744
745

APPROVED 03-18-20 BUT NOT YET EFFECTIVE

746 **APPENDIX A: Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation**

747 **A. Teaching**

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

762 **B. ~~Research~~Scholarly/Creative Work**

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

773 **C. Leadership and Service**

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

778 **APPENDIX B: The Professional Plan**

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

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

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