

UCCS CAMPUS POLICY

Policy Title: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Policy Number: 200-001

Policy Functional Area: ACADEMIC

Effective:

July 19, 2011

Approved by:

Pam Shockley–Zalabak, Chancellor

Responsible Vice Chancellor:

Executive Vice Chancellor of Academics Affairs (EVCAA)

Office of Primary Responsibility:

EVCAA

Policy Primary Contact:

EVCAA, 719-225-3700

Supersedes:

May 20, 2003; August 16, 2004; February 13, 2006; March 3, 2008;
October 7, 2009

Last Reviewed/Updated:

October 7, 2009

Applies to:

Faculty

Reason for Policy: This policy specifies the procedures for reviewing and recommending applicants at the primary unit level, the first level review, and second level review.

I. INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the *Laws of the Regents* and *University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements*, the University of Colorado Colorado Springs has adopted campus policies and procedures designed to provide a thorough and fair review of all tenure-track and tenured faculty subject to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The policies and rules governing Promotion and Tenure matters at the University of Colorado are found in Administrative Policy Statement, “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion” (Revised 5/1/11); Regent Law 5.B.5, “Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria and Standards for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty” (Amended 8/21/08); and Regent Policy 5M, “Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion” (Revised 04/12/09).

B. Purpose:

This policy statement is intended to provide additional procedural guidance, consistent with the Regent Laws and CU policies, for the review process at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. This policy specifies the procedures for reviewing and recommending applicants at the primary unit level, the first level review, and second level review.

C. Procedures:

1. General Standards for Review

All candidates for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure will be reviewed in accordance with the general criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service specified in the CU administrative policy, "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion," and the specific criteria and standards defined in approved primary unit's "statement of criteria, standards, and evidence" developed in compliance with Regent Law 5.B.5, "Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria and Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty." As acknowledged in system policy, the regents have approved the option for UCCS primary unit criteria to recognize professional practice as an additional criterion for consideration for tenure and promotion, with the reminder that for tenure, faculty must be deemed meritorious in all applicable categories and excellent in either teaching or research as defined by the primary unit criteria.

Under University policy, each primary unit's standards for review must be formally adopted under the unit's governance procedures and approved by the Dean and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each statement must include:

- a. The standards prescribed by the Laws of the Regents as described in Regent Law 5.B.5, "Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty."
- b. A description of the procedures used by the unit when recommendations on personnel actions are developed.
- c. A description of the specific and other criteria that will be used to evaluate the candidate against the standards (i.e., the specific questions that will be asked about the candidate's performance), including the role, if any, that professional practice may play in evaluation.
- d. A description of the way in which the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) will operate, if adopted by the primary unit.
- e. A description of the kind of evidence the unit will consider relevant to the criteria questions.
- f. A statement that indicates judgments regarding both the sufficiency and quality of academic work will be based on peer review and judgment, i.e., the recommendation is ultimately determined by a vote of appropriate faculty in the unit. The definition of appropriate faculty is described by the By-Laws of the primary unit and the faculty handbook. The faculty shall weigh the evidence but the recommendation is determined by a vote, not by any automatic tabulation or totaling of the evidence collected in the process.

At the University of Colorado Colorado Springs these statements must address promotion to Professor as well as evaluation of pre-tenure faculty, ensuring that criteria, procedures, and evidence are used to evaluate the candidate against the standard for promotion established in University policy.

All primary units must maintain records of approval of the primary unit statement of criteria, standards, and evidence as well as written records of formal faculty decisions regarding how primary unit evaluation committees will be constructed. At the beginning of every academic year, each Dean shall provide a copy of each primary unit's approved statement of criteria, standards, and evidence to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (EVCAA) and the second-level review committee

(VCRC). Each primary unit must revalidate its statement of criteria, standards, and evidence and obtain approval of the Dean and EVCAA at least every seven years, coincident with academic program review.

2. Faculty Responsibility Statement

The Colorado Springs campus has approved the use of the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) in faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion. If, for example, the primary unit decides to adopt a standard distribution of responsibilities for all faculty, that must be made clear. Likewise, if the primary unit adopts a standard distribution of responsibilities for pre-tenure faculty, but allows differential FRSs to be employed post-tenure, the allowable parameters of difference and the interaction between an individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion to full professor must be made as clear as possible. Finally, if a primary unit decides to allow faculty at all levels to operate under differential FRSs, the allowable distributions across the areas of review at each level of seniority and the interaction between the individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion and tenure must be made as clear as possible. The FRS must be implemented in such a way that the regental standard of "demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research [scholarship] or creative work" is met.

For tenured faculty, the professional plan required for post-tenure review and the FRS (if required by the primary unit criteria) should be a single document that meets all the requirements of the primary unit criteria and the post-tenure review process. For all faculty to whom it applies, the FRS should be coordinated with any differentiated workload recognized in the annual merit evaluation process, but the distributions are not required to be identical. An FRS should be put in place for all faculty for whom it is required within 45 days of employment (or following tenure) and should be reviewed and potentially revised each year during the annual merit evaluation process, but may be revised at any time as needed. New (initial or revised) FRS documents must be approved by the department chair and dean, in addition to the agreement of the faculty member. Each college will develop processes for insuring that all FRS agreements required are in place and meet the requirements enumerated in this policy and the approved primary unit criteria that govern each FRS.

Those departments adopting professional practice as a category for evaluation must be especially clear about what activities fall under not only professional practice, but teaching, research/scholarship/creative work and service as well. Some activities previously considered under one of the existing categories may now be deemed more appropriate for consideration as professional practice. The regents' policy makes clear that all tenured faculty must have demonstrated significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship, and that excellence must be demonstrated in one or the other, but departments have discretion in defining the scope of each and in defining meritorious and excellent performance in each. Departments need to keep in mind that the evaluative weight and the actual workload associated with each category may differ, and that excellence is a function of quality as well as quantity.

3. Faculty Rights and Privileges

An applicant for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion has specific rights and privileges in the review process. These are described in the *Faculty Handbook*, Part III.

4. Schedule for Reviews

Appointment Length. Tenure-track appointments are normally for an initial three-year period, followed by two 2-year re-appointments as an Assistant Professor.

Exceptions to this pattern of appointments could include:

- a. **Starting without the terminal degree.** In cases in which an individual is hired before his or her dissertation is complete, the initial appointment will be as an Instructor, with change to Assistant Professor rank when the doctorate is granted. Time in the Instructor rank is not applicable as credit towards tenure; the tenure clock begins only with appointment to the assistant professor rank.
- b. **Arriving with prior academic experience.** Up to three years credit may be granted toward the probationary period for academic experience at another institution. The amount of credit and the time line for re-appointment, tenure, and promotion reviews must appear in the letter of offer and is subject to approval by the EVCAA. In other circumstances, such as employment of a faculty member who has already achieved tenure at another institution, modified schedules for tenure reviews must be documented in conjunction with original letters of offer. In addition, under special circumstances, a faculty member may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure based on academic experience and accomplishments at other institutions. Finally, the hiring unit may propose, and the campus may approve, letters of offer that include tenure.
- c. **Mid-year appointments.** An individual's tenure clock begins at the time of the initial appointment. However, when the first academic year in the appointment consists of one semester or less, the tenure clock will start at the beginning of the next academic year.

5. Timing of Reviews

Reviews normally take place in the next-to-last year of the current appointment, except for tenure reviews, which occur in the final year of the appointment.

For those faculty on the normal 3-2-2 (or 3-2-2-1) schedule, the first review is conducted at the beginning of the second year and the comprehensive reappointment review is conducted in the fourth year of the initial appointment. If the reappointment or comprehensive review is unsatisfactory, the third or fifth year is the terminal year.

Tenure rules provide for review in the seventh year and, if tenure is approved, the award of tenure at the beginning of the eighth year. For applicants denied tenure, the eighth year is the nonrenewable one-year terminal appointment.

6. Failure to Submit a Dossier

A faculty member who declines or fails to submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time is deemed not to have applied for reappointment or tenure. In this situation, the faculty member's appointment terminates at the end of the existing contract. *There is no terminal year beyond the end of the existing contract.*

7. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty members must have been appointed on the tenure-track at UCCS for at least three years and have undergone comprehensive review before they may apply for tenure

consideration. The comprehensive review and consideration for tenure may not occur in the same academic year; but at the request of the candidate and with the approval of the primary unit and Dean, the comprehensive review may be conducted earlier than originally scheduled. A primary unit evaluation committee or Dean may require that a faculty member wait until the seventh year to apply for tenure. Exceptions to this three-year requirement may be made for individuals who already have been granted tenure at another institution and for whom specific alternative provisions are detailed in the Letter of Appointment.

D. Deadlines

Dossiers and related materials for applicants under review are due in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs no later than the first of February. College and school deadlines must be sufficiently early in the fall semester to meet this deadline.

E. Specific Standards for Review

1. Tenure

Tenure may be awarded only for demonstrated meritorious performance in each of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if included in the primary unit's criteria), and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research/scholarship/creative work.

Tenure-track faculty members must have been appointed on the tenure-track at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs for at least three years and have undergone comprehensive review before they may apply for tenure consideration. Initial appointment as an Associate Professor or Professor without tenure will substitute for the comprehensive review only if a positive recommendation results from a review of the candidate's credentials by the Committees and Officers involved in the normal promotion and tenure review process. The candidate's dossier must include the relevant documentation in the initial letter of appointment in the latter cases.

2. Early Tenure

While the same overall standards for tenure and promotion apply in cases of early consideration for tenure, department chairs and colleagues have a responsibility to advise tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early tenure and should not encourage any colleague to stand for early tenure unless they are positive the record is unequivocally tenureable. In any case, review for early tenure does not prejudice the review on the normal schedule.

3. Promotion

Associate Professor: At UCCS, the review for promotion to Associate Professor occurs at the same time as the tenure review. There is no consideration for promotion to Associate Professor separate from consideration for tenure unless warranted by special circumstances. When these special circumstances exist, the candidate will be evaluated based on the criteria for appointment of Associate Professors that are defined in University policy.

Professor: Under University policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in

teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, professional practice (if applicable) and service.

F. Dossiers

1. Document Folder

The Document Folder is a thin binder prepared by the candidate's college. The Document Folder is not available to the candidate. It contains a Table of Contents of the entire dossier, the UCDF-7 form which contains all required signatures, the Primary Unit Criteria, the candidate's Executive Summary, all previous RTP and personnel action letters for the applicant (and any special circumstances included in the initial offer of appointment), a list of all external evaluators, an explanation of how evaluators were chosen, and an explanation if the total number of evaluators fails to meet minimum requirements. The Document Folder also contains the primary unit evaluation committee's assessment, vote, and recommendation (if vote not unanimous, explanation and minority report); the department chair's evaluation (if applicable); the Dean's Review Committee review evaluation, vote, and recommendation (and, if vote is not unanimous, an explanation or minority report); and the Dean's evaluation and recommendation. FCQ summaries also should be part of the document folder. However, evidence of the FCQ's reliability and validity for a particular candidate should be taken into account.

2. Content of Dossier

Dossiers are prepared by the candidate and organized in binders divided into specific sections, with each section containing the necessary relevant information. Omitted sections or sections without documentation are detrimental to the applicant. Dossiers are limited to the Document Folder plus three, three-ring binders. The first binder (Document Folder) contains all essential information including the candidate's Executive Summary, current vita, and the Primary Unit Criteria. Supporting documentation, such as actual FCQ's, must be submitted in separate binders. Sample dossiers may be available for review in the Deans' offices.

a. Each dossier contains the following material ***in the order listed below***:

- i. Applicant's executive summary statement
- ii. Applicant's current vita
- iii. Current and previous Faculty Responsibility Statements (or standard responsibility distribution statement as provided by primary unit criteria)
- iv. Teaching or Librarianship
 - Applicant's statement
 - Evaluative data (peer review, student letters, other)
 - Supporting material in a separate binder
 - FCQ's (including student comments) in a separate binder
- v. Research/Scholarship or Creative Work
 - Applicant's statement
 - Evaluative data (summary of publications, grants, awards, etc.)

- Supporting material in a separate binder
- vi. Professional Practice (if included in the primary unit's criteria and is part of a faculty member's FRS)
 - Applicant's statement
 - Evaluative data (summary of activities and evaluations)
 - Supporting material in a separate binder
 -
 - vii. Service
 - Applicant's statement
 - Supporting material in a separate binder
- b. Supporting material. Applicants are entitled to submit to the primary unit evaluation committee any relevant material or information that may be helpful in evaluating the applicant for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Dossiers should be accompanied by supporting materials such as books, monographs, refereed journal articles, photographs of works of art, etc.
 - c. Adding material during the process. A candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information he or she believes will be helpful in evaluating her or his case at the first, second and third review stages. If significant material is added to the dossier or information that could have changed the outcome of the primary unit evaluation committee or subsequent levels of review is provided at any stage in the review process beyond the primary unit level, the case must be reconsidered by all levels of review. The determination of whether the material could have changed the outcome of the review at each level will be made by each chair responsible for making recommendations, in consultation with the other members of the appropriate review committee. This determination shall be in writing. Any reconsideration must be completed by the specified submission deadline to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
 - d. Revision of dossier. Revision of dossier material under the candidate's control at initial submission is not allowed.
 - e. Return of dossiers. Dossiers and supporting documentation, except external letters, are returned to the applicant at the completion of the RPT process.

3. Applicant's Responsibility

Applicants for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are responsible for ensuring that the teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service sections of their dossiers are complete, accurate, and properly organized, and that they present the strongest possible case. While the applicant may provide additional significant material about his or her entire career, the material should focus on activities since the date of the last appointment, reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

The applicant provides the following information in the dossier:

- a. Current Vita. The vita must be current to the date of submission. Faculty who were hired before AY 2003-04 may keep the curriculum vitae format they currently have or they may rewrite their curriculum vitae to conform with the format options for new faculty as follows. New Faculty (employed on or after AY 2003-04) have the option of: (a) presenting a curriculum vitae conforming to the format presented in Appendix A (a sample vita is presented in Appendix B) or (b) presenting a curriculum vitae in a format agreed upon by the candidate and his/her primary

review unit. The candidate and her/his unit should agree that this format best represents the performance of the candidate and that format will be used throughout the candidate's promotion and tenure procedures. This recommendation applies only to comprehensive reviews and reviews for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

- b. Executive Summary. This is a two-to-three-page summary statement of the candidate's entire record, dossier, and plans for the future, including responses to any suggestions and/or recommendations made in prior RPT reviews. Candidate is expected to address teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service areas.
- c. Teaching or Librarianship. Material related to teaching includes a statement of teaching philosophy and changes in teaching methods over the years, the history of courses taught, the number of students in classes, work with students outside the classroom, methods used to review teaching, grading practices, a summary of the student evaluations, and a response to the evaluation data. Multiple means of evaluating teaching should be included for the review period, and FCQs should be included as one method of evaluating teaching in formal courses. Actual FCQ's for at least the most recent three (3) years must be provided in a separate binder. If a selection of actual FCQ's is provided, the means of selection must be described. Library faculty include materials related to the practice of librarianship and work with students in that context.
- d. Scholarship and Creative Work. Material related to research/scholarship/creative work includes a statement describing the focus of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative work to date, anticipated future directions, and information related to publications, performances, galleries, grants, and related research, scholarly and other creative activity. The Primary Unit Committee should ascertain the extent of the candidate's contribution when there are co-authors. For each refereed publication, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide an indication of the peer review process and selectivity level. In the statement, the candidate may provide justification for the selection of journals or publication outlet.
- e. Service. Material related to service includes all significant professional service to the University, city, state, region, nation, and to professional associations.
- f. Professional Practice (if included in the primary unit's criteria and is part of a faculty member's FRS). Material related to professional practice includes a description of professional practice activities and development, as well as any evaluations of the effectiveness of practice.

4. Reviewer Responsibilities

A faculty member may speak to and vote only at one level on a case undergoing review and may not be present during discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of the process. For example, a faculty member serving on a review committee at any other level beyond the primary unit evaluation committee, who votes on a case in his/her primary unit, may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to the discussion, and must abstain from voting on the case when it is considered by the review committee beyond the primary unit. If the faculty member does not participate in the primary unit discussion and vote on the case, the faculty member may participate in the discussion and vote on the case at one subsequent level. **All participants in evaluation committees are responsible for maintaining strict confidentiality regarding the content of committee deliberations and external reviewers' identities.**

a. Primary Unit's Responsibility

- i. Department chair and primary unit evaluation committee chair. Every candidate must have a primary unit evaluation committee consisting of at least five members of the candidate's department or related departments if the department is too small. Units may specify a smaller number of members of the Primary Unit Committee in their approved unit criteria, but in no case can this committee have fewer than three members. The chair of the primary department is responsible for providing candidates with a copy of the primary unit's "statement of criteria, standards, and evidence" during the first semester of appointment.

The chair of the primary unit evaluation committee is responsible for ensuring that dossiers are reviewed and submitted to the college, school or library Dean's office in a timely fashion, and for re-reviewing cases, if required.

Schools and colleges may adopt governance procedures that provide for an independent (of the primary unit evaluation committee) evaluation letter of the candidate's record by the department chair. In these cases, the letter by the primary unit evaluation committee chair and the department chair will be forwarded to the Dean's Review Committee and the Dean.

- ii. The chair of the primary unit evaluation committee provides the following materials in the dossier:
- a) Primary Unit Criteria. The criteria used by the primary unit evaluation committee in evaluating the applicant's record must be provided by the primary unit. These must be the approved criteria previously adopted by the primary unit faculty and approved by the EVCAA. (Note: It also is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that all faculty are provided copies of the primary unit criteria.)
 - b) Faculty Responsibility Statement. The primary unit is responsible for providing the current and past Faculty Responsibility Statements for the candidate. If the department's primary unit criteria specify standard responsibility distributions for faculty at the particular level of review, the primary unit should provide a clear statement of the standard distribution.
 - c) Previous RPT and Personnel Action Letters. If the applicant has previously undergone RPT review, copies of the following must be included: (1) previous primary unit evaluation committee evaluations, votes, and recommendations (to include areas to be strengthened as identified during previous reviews); (2) previous chair of the department evaluation, if applicable, (3) previous first level review evaluations, votes, and recommendations; (4) previous Dean's evaluations and recommendations; (5) previous Executive Vice Chancellor's letters. (Note: The Dean and/or Department Chair is responsible for giving copies of these letters to the primary unit evaluation committee.)
 - d) Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers. The primary unit evaluation committee Chair or the Dean, not the applicant, must solicit external letters of evaluation. Several more evaluators than the minimum required should be contacted to determine their willingness to serve, because some evaluators agree to assist but never do. Whenever possible, the evaluators should represent a variety of institutions and geographic areas. Institutional diversity is ordinarily given priority over geographic diversification. Explanations should be provided in the primary

review letter in situations where institutional and/or geographic diversification is not possible. All letters received in response to requests for external evaluations must be included in the dossier. The letters to the external reviewers should include a request from the reviewers for their vita so that the various RPT committee members may assess the external reviewer's expertise in evaluating the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly specify his or her relationship to the external reviewers (e.g., co-author, etc.).

External reviewers are expected to give an "arm's length objective" review. The solicitation of co-authors, mentors, and former colleagues must not constitute a majority of the solicitation letters. Care must be taken to exclude any reviewers whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest.

Although procedures vary among colleges, schools, and the library, the applicant may suggest potential external evaluators, as well as specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations may be prejudiced against the candidate. Persons recommended by the applicant to write evaluation letters must not be relatives or current or former students. Before the primary unit evaluation committee sends letters requesting the external evaluations, the Dean of the college, school, or library must approve the list of evaluators. The primary unit evaluation committee must include in the applicant's dossier a copy of the letter requesting evaluation letters. Consult the Dean's office for the format for letters to external evaluators for comprehensive review. It is suggested that with the candidate's materials, the external reviewers be sent an institutional description, primary unit criteria, any applicable FRS, and a clarification of whether this is a comprehensive or a tenure review.

For a comprehensive review, at least three external letters will be in each dossier. At least four external evaluation letters will be included in each dossier under evaluation for promotion or tenure.

The names and institutional affiliations of external reviewers and their letters of evaluation are confidential, must not be divulged or provided to the applicant and are retained in the Human Resources Office. The applicant is not to know which individuals or which institutions have furnished evaluation letters. A summary, redacted to preserve the anonymity of the reviewers, of the content of evaluation letters must be made available to the applicant. This summary may be provided within the primary unit letter. The primary unit evaluation committee letter and all subsequent letters should not supply any information that would serve to identify those individuals who have written external letters evaluating the candidate.

iii. Primary Unit Evaluation Committee Summary, Vote, and Recommendation

- a) Each primary unit will constitute an evaluation committee following its own internal written procedures, or in compliance with College or University guidelines in the absence of written primary unit procedures. The primary unit evaluation committee provides a thorough and careful evaluation of the applicant in the four areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if included in the primary unit's criteria), and service. The primary unit evaluation committee's role is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the applicant. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the applicant's strengths and weaknesses in relation

to the established standards and criteria, especially with regard to the interaction between the candidate's Faculty Responsibility Statement (if applicable) and the criteria and standards in the primary unit. Negative comments or votes must be explained. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend reappointment" is not sufficient. The primary unit evaluation committee's letter must explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation. The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee letter must specifically address how the applicant's record of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service meets the primary unit standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in University policy, keeping in mind that the faculty on subsequent level committees are further removed from the candidate's area of specialization. The letter also should provide the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee's assessment of the prestige and impact of the individual's research/scholarship/creative work products and publication outlets. Under the Administrative Policy Statement, "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion," revised 5/1/11, primary units shall "also take into account other factors that have a material bearing" on the recommendation of that unit. "The program requirements of the unit shall be considered at the time of appointment and reappointment. The merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for the award of tenure." For the purposes of this campus policy, this means that members of the primary unit may rely on their own direct knowledge of the candidate's actions, over and above those documented in the dossier, only when those actions affect whether or not the candidate meets the primary unit criteria for teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service. Primary units may wish to consult university counsel in determining whether particular actions have such a material bearing. It also means that primary units may take the degree to which the candidate's expertise and contributions meet the unit's specific needs into account when making recommendations regarding reappointment, but not in making recommendations regarding tenure.

- b) Following the approved procedures of the primary unit, the primary unit evaluation committee must vote on the action under consideration, prepare a summary of the evaluation by the primary unit evaluation committee and a recommendation for action, and include this information in the dossier. For Assistant Professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one decision. For Associate Professors without tenure, the issue of tenure is one action requiring one decision.
- c) The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual vote (e.g., six of eight faculty members were present and voted 4-2 in favor of promotion and tenure). A unanimous vote is not required, but a majority of the committee is required for a positive recommendation. Split votes must be addressed, with the inclusion of an explanation of the reasons for the minority votes. Those voting in the minority may write a separate report that describes their evaluation of the candidate's dossier and the points of disagreement with the committee majority.
- d) Primary units vary in their written procedures on the role of the primary unit evaluation committee within the department. Nothing in this document shall be construed as preventing a department from determining its own internal processes, consistent with the laws of the Regents and applicable administrative policy. Any formal votes conducted among faculty who did not participate in the primary unit evaluation committee's deliberations also shall be reported in the primary unit's

recommendation letter.

- e) The chair of the primary unit evaluation committee promptly informs the applicant orally of the primary unit evaluation committee's recommendation. The chair of the primary unit evaluation committee provides the applicant with a copy of the primary unit's recommendation letter after the next level of review has been completed. There must be no identification of the external reviewers in this or any other communication with the candidate.

iv. Department Chair Summary and Recommendation (when required by Departmental or College governance)

The department chair provides a separate evaluation only when required in the primary unit's approved "statement of criteria, standards, and evidence." When it is required, the department chair provides a thorough, careful, and independent evaluation of the applicant in the four areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service. The department chair's role also is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the applicant. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the applicant's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the established standards and criteria. Negative recommendations must be explained. A statement such as "I do/do not recommend reappointment" is not sufficient. The department chair's letter must explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation. The department chair's letter must specifically address how the applicant's record of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and service meets the primary unit standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in University policy, keeping in mind that the faculty on subsequent level committees are further removed from the candidate's area of specialization. The department chair promptly informs the applicant orally of the department chair's recommendation. The department chair provides the applicant with a copy of the recommendation letter after the next level of review has been completed.

b. Dean's Responsibility. The Dean of the college, school, or library provides the following information:

- i. Dean's Level Review Summary, Vote, and Recommendation (also known as First Level Review). The appropriate body, as defined in the bylaws of the college, school, or library, reviews the applicant's dossier, votes on the proposed action, and forwards to the Dean a review summary and a recommendation for action. The first level review is a thorough assessment of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the primary unit standards and criteria and the criteria and standards defined in University policy. The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote (e.g., all three members were present and voted unanimously in favor of promotion and tenure). A unanimous vote is not required. Split votes must be addressed, with the inclusion of an explanation of the reasons for the minority votes. Those voting in the minority may write a separate report. The chair of the Dean's level review committee promptly informs the applicant orally of the Dean's level review committee recommendation. A copy of the review committee's letter is provided to the applicant after the dean's review has been completed.
- ii. Dean's Role, Responsibilities, and Recommendation. The Dean prepares a recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews (primary unit evaluation committee, department

chair [if applicable], and Dean's Review Committee) and points out areas of concern or disagreement.

If the Dean's Review Committee and/or the Dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit evaluation committee and/or the recommendation of the department chair (if applicable), the Dean discusses the nature of the disagreement with the chair of the primary unit evaluation committee and the department chair. The primary unit evaluation committee then reconsiders its original recommendation and reports the reconsidered judgment to the Dean and the Dean's Review Committee in writing.

Where differences of opinion exist among the primary unit evaluation committee, the department chair (if applicable), the Dean's Review Committee, and/or Dean, a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and rationales for the recommendations must be included in the Dean's letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

The Dean promptly informs the chair of the primary unit evaluation committee and the department chair orally of the Dean's recommendation. The chair of the primary unit evaluation committee promptly informs the applicant orally of the Dean's recommendation. The Dean provides the applicant with a copy of the Dean's letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor at the time the letter is inserted in the document folder.

- iii. UCDF-7 Form. This form is completed and signed by the appropriate administrators at each level and placed in the dossier.
- iv. Final Review. The Dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, completes and signs the document folder checklist, and forwards the document folder to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs office by the first of February.

G. The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (2nd Level Review)

1. Membership

The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC) consists of one representative from the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering, and Nursing, three representatives from the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (one from each of the arts and humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences). In addition, the library and the School of Public Affairs will have an ad hoc representative on the Committee in years when they have a candidate under review.

Members of the Committee will be recommended following governance processes in the respective schools, colleges, and the library, with final selection and appointment by the EVCAA.

Whenever possible, all members of the VCRC will be tenured Full Professors. When a unit is unable to nominate a Full Professor for the VCRC, the unit may be represented by a tenured Associate Professor, who will not participate in discussion or voting on cases involving promotion to professor.

Faculty members may not serve on both the Dean's Review Committee and the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee.

2. VCRC Role and Responsibilities, and Recommendation

The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee assists with the campus level review of applicants for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The Committee is advisory to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Committee selects its Chair through majority vote.

The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all dossiers and making recommendations for all tenure-track applicants for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and all tenured applicants for promotion. The committee makes individual and collective judgments. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in the Laws of the Regents and in the Faculty Handbook. Committee deliberations, votes, and recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor are confidential.

Members of the VCRC must not be advocates for any applicant for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Applicants for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion and their advocates must not discuss the applicant's case with members of the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee, and vice versa.

The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee conducts a full review of all applicants and makes recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor on the following personnel actions:

- Comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor and associate professor without tenure prior to the award of tenure
- Promotion to associate professor and professor
- Award of tenure

The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee convenes early in the fall semester to establish its calendar of meetings. All VCRC recommendations must be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs prior to the middle of March.

Prior to all Vice Chancellor's Review Committee meetings at which applicant dossiers are considered, the Chair assigns specific dossiers to each committee member. Although all committee members review and evaluate all dossiers, the members with specific dossier assignments present those cases to the committee. The presenter is always from a department or area different from that of the applicant. After deliberation, the committee votes on each applicant and prepares a confidential recommendation to the Executive Vice Chancellor. The vote and members present are noted. In the case of a non-unanimous decision, a minority opinion may be included.

H. Role of the office of the executive vice chancellor for academic affairs

The Office of the EVCAA is responsible for administering the RPT process, including receiving and securing dossiers, establishing the RPT calendar, scheduling committee meetings, and recording the votes and recommendations of the committee for each case considered.

I. Decisions by the executive vice chancellor

The VCRC's confidential recommendations are forwarded to the EVCAA, who reviews the dossiers and recommendations and makes a decision on each case. If the EVCAA disagrees either with the recommendation of the VCRC or that of the Dean, the nature of the disagreement is transmitted either to the VCRC or to the Dean, as warranted. The dean and the review committee shall then reconsider their recommendation and return their reconsidered judgment(s) to the provost. The decision made by the

EVCAA constitutes the final stage of the second level of review and is forwarded to the Chancellor for the final recommendation.

If the Executive Vice Chancellor finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, he or she may return the case to the primary unit to repeat the process. The Executive Vice Chancellor may, at her or his discretion, appoint a responsible party to oversee the process to ensure procedural integrity and fairness to the candidate. If it is determined that the repetition of the process will carry forward into the next academic year, the Executive Vice Chancellor 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.

If the Chancellor disagrees with the Executive Vice Chancellor's decision, the Chancellor's decision is final.

Negative decisions on tenure and/or promotion are not forwarded to the President's Office. A summary report of the decisions on cases considered for promotion and tenure is provided to President's Office. Except in cases of appeals to the President by the candidate, this process constitutes the third level of review.

J. Decisions by the Chancellor

The Chancellor's decision in RPT cases is the final and presiding one. If the recommendations of the VCRC and the Executive Vice Chancellor are different, the Chancellor will meet with the Executive Vice Chancellor and the VCRC to hear distinguishing points of view. In cases where the Chancellor disagrees with the Dean, VCRC, or Executive Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor shall provide written justification for his/her decision.

K. Post-decision processes

The Executive Vice Chancellor prepares a letter apprising each applicant of the decision, noting strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. All negative decisions are communicated to the Dean and the VCRC. Notice of the decision normally will be provided to each applicant by the end of the academic year. If a candidate so requests, the Executive Vice Chancellor shall advise her or him of the reasons that contributed to a negative recommendation.

In the case of a negative decision, the faculty member, within ten days of receipt of written notice of denial for tenure from the Executive Vice Chancellor, may request review by the president. The president may review at the initiation of the faculty member a negative decision regarding reappointment or promotion. This request for review shall be made only on the grounds that the review contained either (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (2) substantive errors (such as a biased summary of student comments) of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, or (3) *prima facie* evidence of discrimination, or some combination of these grounds.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Evaluation Committee

B. First Level Review

- C. Primary Unit
- D. Review Committee
- E. Second Level Review
- F. Tenure
- G. Third Level Review

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

- A. Administrative Policy Statements (APS) and Other Policies
- B. Procedures
- C. Forms (attached)
 - 1. Vita Format
 - 2. UCDF-7
- D. Guidelines
- E. Other Resources (i.e. training, secondary contact information)
- F. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

V. HISTORY

Initial policy approval	May 20, 2003
Revised	August 16, 2004
Revised	February 13, 2006
Revised	March 3, 2008
Revised	October 7, 2009

VITA FORMAT

1. **Name**
2. **Education** (list all degrees, years at each institution, and post-doc training)
3. **Professional Experience** (list all titles, institutions, dates)
4. **Refereed Publications, Galleries, Performances, etc.** (in reverse chronological order) (Note: The words “in press” are strictly confined to those where the author has received a letter from the journal editor indicating that the paper has been accepted for publication or that the paper has been accepted for publication with revisions. If the author has received a letter from the editor that the author may wish to revise and resubmit the article for consideration, the situation does not constitute using the words “in press.” In the latter situation, the author should indicate “publication submitted.”)
 - a. Categories will depend on discipline. Galleries and performances included in this section should be in reverse chronological order and should only be those where peer review or screening was involved.
 - b. In press and defined publications should be listed. Authors names or order of authors should be listed as they appear in publication including volume number, issue number (if appropriate), and page numbers.
5. **Non-Refereed Publications, Galleries, Performances, etc.**
Reverse chronology including meeting abstracts, proceedings, etc., technical reports, popular articles, or other galleries and performances.
6. **Publications/Creative Works Submitted**
Indicate whether papers are under review, being revised, and under second review. Cite journal, and submission date. Indicate scheduled galleries and performances.
7. **Books and Book Chapters**
8. **Published Reviews (books, articles, plays, other creative works)**
9. **Presentations at Meetings and Seminars Presented**
List in reverse chronological order with authors, and name of organization.
10. **Grants and Scholarship**
 - a. List the amount, date, agency, title of grant, and the role of author.
 - b. List proposals submitted; indicate status (denied, under review, pending).
 - c. Other indicators (both internal and external) of the quality of your scholarly and creative work; citations of papers; reviews of your works; purchases of your works by museums, reviewer of other people’s scholarly works, etc.
11. **Courses Taught**
Indicate title of course, level of course (graduate or undergraduate) (number of times taught is optional).
12. **Recognitions**
13. **Professional Organizations**
14. **Service**
Department, college/school/library, and University committees and activities, including faculty governance. State and national government agencies. Accreditation and program review site visits. Committees of professional societies or associations; session chair at professional meetings. Consulting.

University of Colorado Colorado Springs
Summary of Recommendation & Notification of
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Faculty Records
Dean's Office
Department
Faculty

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) Rank/Title
College or School Department Tenured (year)

Highest Degree Awarded Year Awarded Institution

(For tenure-track faculty): List years of service credit towards tenure, including those at other institutions counted by agreement in letter of offer:

- 1. Years at the University of Colorado on the Tenure Track:
2. Years at the University of Colorado NOT on the Tenure Track:
3. Elsewhere on Tenure Track Institution: Years: Title/Rank:

Reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations should be documented by supporting statements from the primary unit and the Dean.

A. Recommendation/Approval for REAPPOINTMENT (Tenure-Track)

(Subject to final approval by the Chancellor)

Initial Reappointment Review
Comprehensive Reappointment Review

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION: EFFECTIVE DATE:

Reappt. Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Reappt. Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

PROVOST'S RECOMMENDATION:

Reappt. Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

CHANCELLOR'S APPROVAL:

Reappt. Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

B. Recommendation for PROMOTION
(Promotions subject to final approval by the Chancellor)

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION: EFFECTIVE DATE:

Promotion: Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Promotion: Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

PROVOST'S RECOMMENDATION:

Promotion: Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

CHANCELLOR'S APPROVAL:

Promotion: Recommended for (Title/Rank) Signature Date
Not recommend

C. Recommendation for TENURE
(All tenure recommendations subject to final approval by the Regents)

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION:

EFFECTIVE DATE: _____

Tenure: Recommended _____
Not recommended _____

Signature _____ Date _____

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Tenure: Recommended _____
Not recommended _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Tenure: Recommended _____
Not recommended _____

Signature _____ Date _____

CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

Tenure: Recommended _____
Not recommended _____

Signature _____ Date _____