

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Leadership, Research, and Foundations
Department of Special Education

THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO COLORADO SPRINGS - UCCS
APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY APRIL 27, 2014

Authored by: College of Education Faculty

Approved by the Provost August 2, 2018



College of Education

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Special Education**

Departmental Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Revised April 2018, Appendix A added

Approved by Provost August 2, 2018

As a professional school, the College of Education (COE) assesses the influence of the teaching, scholarship, and service of its faculty on the profession and its constituents. Such influence will be validated by both practitioners and scholars within the field who translate research into practice. The following criteria were developed and adopted by COE faculty and are reviewed annually. Examples under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Faculty members are expected to achieve a balance among the categories of evidence with emphasis on teaching and scholarship. The common expectation at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) is 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service.

Various levels of review use these criteria as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record within the policies of the Regents of the University of Colorado. These criteria are implemented in all faculty evaluation processes such as annual evaluations, awarding of merit raises, decisions about reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

These criteria referred to as "Quality Indicators" for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review in the Department of Counseling and

Human Services, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations and the Department of Special Education in the College of Education at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Faculty members currently within the College of Education may choose to use these criteria or those under which they were hired.

Each department is committed to quality teaching, strong research and creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. These criteria have been developed according to the standards as outlined in the *Rules of the Regents*.

Teaching Quality Indicators

1. Student perceptions of the usefulness of course content. Examples of evidence include:
 - course evaluations
 - student letters
 - student surveys
 - follow-up studies of graduates
2. Influence of the course content/program on students' learning, Examples of evidence include:
 - student projects
 - pre- and post-tests
 - course evaluations
 - comprehensive examinations
 - course syllabi
 - student portfolios
 - student surveys
3. Influence of instructor's teaching practice on student learning. Examples of evidence include:
 - course evaluations
 - peer evaluations
 - student portfolios
 - student letters
 - practicum evaluations
 - follow-up studies
 - student surveys
4. Influence of the course/program content on students' practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - supervisor evaluations
 - students self-evaluations
 - course evaluations
 - video recordings
 - student portfolios
 - student initiation of new models
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site
 - employer surveys
5. Advising and/or mentoring relationships with students developed over time to improve professional practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - master's or doctoral thesis supervision
 - master's research project supervision
 - undergraduate research
 - independent studies
 - student letters
 - student portfolios

- supervision of internship experience
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site
6. Successful demonstration of efforts by the faculty member to assess and improve the quality of his/her teaching. Examples of evidence include:
- implementation of alternative assessment strategies
 - changes in teaching practice
 - course evaluations
 - peer observations
 - implementation of technological instructional strategies
 - course or program development or revision
7. Professional reputation in teaching with constituents at local, regional, state, or national levels who translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence include:
- external reviews
 - status on local, regional, state, and national committees
 - letters from colleagues
 - invited presentations or speeches
8. Successful collaboration with faculty colleagues that results in program success in meeting and exceeding state and national standards within the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence include:
- leadership and/or participation in the design, alignment, and improvement of program curriculum
 - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to the development. Design, alignment, and improvement of programs delivered online
 - leadership and/or participation in the development of folios for learned society recognition
 - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state and national accreditation
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site
9. Development as a teaching professional based on past performance and the development of a plan and focus for teaching. Examples of evidence include:
- continuously improving course evaluations
 - professional development plan
 - student letters
 - annual reviews
 - department chair letter
 - peer observations
10. The work of any faculty member serving in an administrative capacity, who works on curriculum reform, development, or accreditation or otherwise assists other faculty or

faculty groups with any items listed above, may count in the category of Teaching Quality Indicators

Scholarship Quality Indicators

1. Professional publications that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners or the profession and may be published or accepted for publication. This category of scholarship is considered to be more influential than those in category 2. Examples of evidence include:
 - articles in peer-reviewed journals
 - invited publications (peer-reviewed)
 - peer-reviewed books
 - peer-reviewed textbooks
 - peer-reviewed book chapters
 - peer-reviewed and/or invited presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice
 - peer-reviewed online publications
 - circulation rates of publications
 - citation rates for one's publications
 - other indicators of professional impact

2. Professional publications that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives which influence peers, practitioners, or other targeted audiences. These may be published, accepted for publication, or submitted for review. While important to the faculty member's record, this category is not considered to be as influential as those in category 1. Examples of evidence include:
 - books
 - online publications
 - book chapters
 - textbooks
 - articles in journals
 - articles in newsletters
 - curriculum materials
 - editorials
 - monographs
 - critical reviews

3. Competency in grant procurement for research or programs that translate research or improve service through dissemination of innovative practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - individual or first author grant proposals funded
 - individual or first author grant proposals submitted
 - participation on grant-writing teams

4. Regional, state, national, or international prominence as a professional researcher or educator. Examples of evidence include:
 - editorship of a professional journal
 - service as a referee for articles or papers in conference proceedings
 - service as a referee for journals that have substantial influence on the constituents of the faculty member's field
 - creative work that translates research into practice such as media presentations, workshops, or staff development
 - collaborative work with practitioners in the field to translate research into practice, such as curriculum development (including curriculum implementation), or efforts to link local practice with national or state trends or standards in education
 - presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives
 - development and implementation of curricula and/or programs reflecting innovative practice and current research

5. Professional reputation with constituents at local, state, national, or international levels which translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence include:
 - reviews of research, papers, presentations, articles, and/or books from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
 - letters of commendation from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
 - elected offices in professional organizations that support the translation of research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's field

6. The work of any faculty member serving in an administrative capacity, who works on grant development for the College or otherwise assists faculty or faculty groups with any items listed above, may be considered in the category of Scholarship Quality Indicators.

Leadership and Service Quality Indicators

1. Professional leadership and service to the college. Examples of evidence include:
 - college committee leadership
 - college committee membership
 - college search committee chair or member
 - college committee member or chair for faculty evaluation
 - service as department chair, program coordinator, director, or associate dean

2. Professional leadership and service to the university campus. Examples of evidence include:
 - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
 - participation in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee

- campus committee or task force leadership
 - campus committee or task force membership
 - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position
3. Professional leadership and service to the university system. Examples of evidence include:
- leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
 - participation in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
 - university committee or task force leadership
 - university committee or task force membership
 - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position
4. Professional community, regional, or national leadership and service. Examples of evidence include:
- professional service related to the University or College of Education mission, such as board membership, community service projects, and presentations
 - professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership, task force membership
 - professional practice related to the University or College of Education mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
5. Professional leadership and service to community, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Examples of evidence include:
- professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership, task force membership, or conference committees
 - professional practice related to the University or College of Education mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
 - professional service and leadership in the governance of community, regional, national and/or international professional organizations
6. Generally leadership roles in service activities are considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.

The items listed here as the *College of Education's Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Quality Indicators* are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required.

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Special Education**

Committee Structure for Promotion and Tenure

Primary Committee

The following committee should consist of at least four members recommended by the Department Chair and approved by the Dean annually for faculty reviews. Department Chairs should consider input from the candidate regarding the composition of members of the Primary Committee:

- Department Chair (or designee) chairs the committee
- One tenured faculty member from the department
- One tenured faculty member from another COE department
- One tenured faculty member from another college recommended by the candidate

The Dean has final approval of the composition of the Primary Committee.

Dean's Review Committee

The following committee should consist of at least four members* appointed by the Dean annually for faculty reviews. The Dean should consider input from the faculty regarding the composition of members of the Dean's Review Committee:

- Three tenured faculty from COE not on the Primary Committee or on the VCAA Committee
- One faculty member appointed by the Dean as Chair of the committee
- A member from another college will be appointed by the Dean

VCAA Committee

Full Professor, recommended by Dean with input from the faculty and approved by the Provost for a three-year term.

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Special Education**

Standards for Successful Reviews

Reappointment Review

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration. Beyond the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs), candidates are required to present documentation of at least two means of teaching evaluation from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarship

Candidates are expected to present evidence of research/creative work potential and progress toward publication. This might include copies of drafts or work in progress or submitted for publication and evidence of performances and readings. Candidates should develop a Faculty Professional Plan that will lead toward tenure.

Leadership and Service

The candidates are expected to begin a process of identifying appropriate service contributions. Each candidate must have met his or her departmental service obligations. The candidate should be beginning service contributions within the college, the university, and/or the community.

Criteria for Reappointment

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

Comprehensive Review

At the comprehensive review level, candidates should not be given rating of *meritorious* or *excellent*. Ratings should reflect that adequate progress is being made toward future ratings of *meritorious* or *excellence*. Ratings should indicate that the candidate is *making progress toward meritorious* or *making progress toward excellence*. These ratings indicate that if current levels of productivity continue, the candidate is likely on track for *meritorious* or *excellent* ratings at the time of their next review.

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a rating of *making progress toward meritorious*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress toward a rating of *meritorious* at the time of tenure in teaching as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. In cases in which this standard is not met, the candidate must provide an explanation for the failure and an appropriate remedial plan. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *making progress toward excellence*, candidates with stronger teaching records may additionally show that they are making reasonable progress toward *excellence* at the time of tenure in terms of effective teaching as indicated by FCQs and multiple examples of other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarship

For a rating of *making progress toward meritorious*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress toward merit in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities, compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarship Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels, such that the candidate appears to be making reasonable progress toward a rating of *meritorious* at the time of tenure.

For a rating of *making progress toward excellence*, candidates must demonstrate that they are presenting a balance of scholarly activities that indicates a greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels as delineated in the College of Education's Scholarly Quality Indicators.

Leadership and Service

For a rating of *making progress toward meritorious*, candidates are expected to have begun initial efforts in appropriate types and levels of leadership and service contribution as listed in the College of Education's Service Quality Indicators. Candidates must have met their growing commitment and obligations to department, college, university, community, or profession.

A rating of *making progress toward excellence* requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession.

Criteria for Comprehensive Review

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward comprehensive review. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a *meritorious* rating, candidates must demonstrate teaching performance as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) judged to meet or exceed the average range for the University and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must additionally demonstrate above-average performance in teaching, other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarship

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate merit in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarship Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate will present a balance of scholarly activities indicated in the rating of *meritorious* with greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

Leadership and Service

For a *meritorious* rating, in addition to meeting their primary obligations to department, university, and/or community leadership and service, candidates should also have contributed leadership and service to the profession as listed in the College of Education's Service Quality Indicators.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession. In evaluating leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Guidelines for Committee Consideration

Candidates must demonstrate *meritorious* performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and leadership and service, and demonstrated *excellence* in either teaching or scholarship.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward promotion. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

Promotion to Full Professor

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a *meritorious* rating, candidates must demonstrate continued growth in teaching as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) judged to meet or exceed the university average range and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must additionally demonstrate continuing above-average performance in teaching and other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarship

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate continuing productivity in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarship Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate will continue to present a balance of scholarly activities indicated in the rating of *meritorious* with greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

Leadership and Service

For a rating of *meritorious*, candidates must provide evidence of continued contributions in the areas of professional, university, or public service as delineated in the College of Education's Faculty Leadership and Service Quality Indicators.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of contributions will be considered.

Guidelines for Committee Consideration of the Record as a Whole

The College of Education views faculty member's record as a whole as *excellent* and as having "substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching

and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service” when they have received at least one rating of *excellent* in any one of the three categories listed above (*Teaching, Scholarship, or Leadership and Service*) and ratings of at least *meritorious* in all categories. Consideration and weighting of ratings in all categories should be given, in terms of productivity for any official responsibilities such as differentiated workloads, administrative positions, and faculty governance offices held since the time of the award of tenure (*if applicable*).

Post-Tenure Review

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward post-tenure. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate’s case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate’s record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate’s expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

Standards and processes for post-tenure review of faculty are governed by Article V of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-016.

Processes for Post-Tenure Review

1. As the Primary Unit, the College of Education faculty will be responsible for the primary review of all faculty at post-tenure review.
2. The Dean of the College of Education will inform each faculty who is required to have a post-tenure review of the review procedures and timeline for review.
3. The Dean of the College of Education will be empowered by the faculty to select a committee that is appropriate to perform the post-tenure review of all candidates who are to be reviewed in a given year. Reviewed faculty will be consulted on potential committee members. Post-tenure review committees will consist of tenured faculty. If there are many faculty undergoing post-tenure review in a given year, multiple committees may be constituted. A post-tenure review committee will have at least three members. The committee will have the majority of its members from the College of Education; however, members from other academic units may be selected when their area of expertise allows for sound judgment of the candidate’s record or when an insufficient number of tenured faculty are present in the College of Education. Post-tenure review

members cannot review faculty who have provided a post-tenure review for the committee member in the same year.

4. The chair of the post-tenure review committee is responsible for conducting the review, writing the report, and providing feedback to the reviewed faculty member. A copy of the written performance evaluation will be made available in a timely manner to the candidate.
5. The following materials, submitted in one binder, will be examined by the post-tenure review committee:
 - annual performance evaluations for the previous 5 years
 - current curriculum vita
 - professional plan(s) from the current post-tenure review cycle
 - a new, updated professional plan
 - a copy of any differentiated workload agreements for the five-year period as appropriate.
 - FCQ summary sheets
 - additional materials selected by the faculty member which are appropriate evidence for demonstrating meeting the departmental criteria
6. The post-tenure review committee will review submitted materials and provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The committee will provide an evaluation of the faculty as *outstanding*, *excellent*, *exceeding expectations*, *meeting expectations* or *below expectations*. The report will summarize the committee's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous professional plan(s); meeting the department's standards; conclusions about the faculty member's productivity and contributions to the university in teaching, research/scholarship, and service; and will remark on the feasibility of the new professional plan for allowing the faculty member to meet the departmental standards at the next review. All committee members will be given an opportunity to see the report summarizing their deliberations and decision prior to submission to the reviewed faculty member and the department chair.
7. If the reviewed faculty member disagrees with the post-tenure review committee's rating, the faculty member will file a grievance with the department chair. The faculty member will explain in writing the areas of disagreement. The department chair will constitute a faculty committee with three tenured College of Education faculty members to review the grievance. The committee will review the grievance and the candidate's materials. If the committee agrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was not conducted properly, the committee will conduct a new review and will write a new evaluation letter. If the committee disagrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was conducted properly, the evaluation from the original committee will be submitted to the department chair.

8. A copy of the report will be given to the department chair, who will review the materials and will approve the new professional plan. The chair will submit the post-tenure review report to the dean. If the department chair or the post-tenure review committee does not approve of the new professional plan, the faculty member will be asked to revise the plan before submission to the dean. Typically, the department chair would not write an additional letter for the post-tenure review.
9. In the event that the Dean disagrees with the decision of the post-tenure review committee, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the department chair. The chair will then call a meeting of the post-tenure review committee to reconsider the decision. The chair will write a letter summarizing the results of the faculty's reconsideration.
10. Following Regents' policy, there are three types of post-tenure review:
 - A **regular five-year review** occurs if the candidate has received annual review ratings of *meeting expectations* or better since the last post-tenure review (or since receiving tenure if this is their first post-tenure review).
 - A **triggered review** occurs when a faculty member receives two annual summary reviews of *below expectations* within a five-year period or when a primary unit committee has given a *below expectations* rating at a regular five-year post-tenure review.
 - An **extensive review** occurs when a faculty member has received two *below expectations* ratings within the previous five years or when a faculty member who has undertaken a Performance Improvement Agreement did not achieve an evaluation of *meeting expectations* or better by the end of the agreement.
11. If the faculty member is found to be *below expectations* on a post-tenure review, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. The faculty member and the department chair will work together with input from the post-tenure review committee to develop a Performance Improvement Agreement following procedures outlined in the post-tenure review policies (Regents, UCCS, and the College of Education).
12. If a triggered review follows two *below expectations* rating, attempts will be made to include the same members on the post-tenure review committee who made the initial rating and who will evaluate whether the faculty member has meet the conditions of the Performance Improvement Agreement.
13. A department post-tenure review committee will complete a triggered review or an extensive review following procedures outlined in system and campus policies and consistent with the procedures for doing a regular review.

14. If criteria are revised, faculty will be evaluated under the criteria in place when they submitted their most recent professional plan. A faculty member may elect to be evaluated under new criteria.
15. Administrative Policy statements.¹

¹ Any processes not directly addressed will use the campus and university processes and guidelines as outlined in the appropriate Regents Laws and Policies, and CU.

Appendix A
College of Education
Procedures for Reappointment Promotion and Tenure

The following will guide the process by which dossiers are created and reviewed, and the general deadlines for each step in the review process. Note that deadlines will be adjusted as necessary each year to correspond with calendar dates and the final due date established by the Provost's office.

RPT Dates and Procedures

For those requiring external review (applicable to comprehensive review, tenure/associate professor, and full professor)

September 5: Candidates provide to the dean's office a list of at least 12 possible external reviewers using the Provost Office "External Reviewer List" template. Dean's office contacts external reviewers to solicit participation.

September 14: Candidates deposit external dossiers into OneDrive

September 18: Dean's office sends external dossiers to reviewers via a secure file sharing platform such as [Filelocker](#)^[SK1]

October 6: Receive letters from reviewers. Dean's office loads external letters into Digital Measures.

For all candidates

August 31: Department chairs provide recommendations of individuals willing to serve on Primary Unit Committees (PRC) to the Dean. Department chairs must confirm with recommended PRC members that they are willing to serve. Upon approval, names are forwarded to Institutional Research by the dean's office for creation of Digital Measures accounts.

September 5: Digital Measures accounts available for candidates

September 11: Dean appoints members of the Dean's Review Committee (DRC). The dean's office forwards names to Institutional Research for creation of Digital Measures accounts.

September 15: Digital Measures accounts available for committee members, including PRCs and DRC

October 13: Dossiers complete by candidates and ready for PRC review

November 10: PRC completes work and sends letters to the DRC

November 13: DRC begins review

December 15: DRC completes work and sends letters to the Dean

February 1: Dean completes reviews and submits all documents to Provost

Full Dossier—all candidates

The review process will be fully contained within Digital Measures, including the creation of the full dossiers by candidates, reviews by PRC and DRC, and the inclusion of letters by all committees, the Dean, and external reviewers.

Dossier contents must be organized into three separate PDF documents: (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarship, and (3) Service. Each PDF document should include bookmarked sections to allow for ease of navigation for reviewers.

External Dossier (applicable to comprehensive review, tenure/associate professor, and full professor)

Candidates who must create dossiers for external review will assemble the documents listed below into a single bookmarked PDF file for submission to the Dean's office.

Dossier Contents for External Review

- UCCS and COE institutional profile
- College of Education *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines*
- CV
- FCQ summary data^[SK2]
- Generally three examples of scholarly work
- A self-statement may also be included in order to contextualize the candidate's work and to draw connections for the reviewer

Completed dossiers will be submitted to the Dean's office via folders on OneDrive. The Dean's office will extend the necessary email invitation to the candidates to facilitate folder access. Only the Dean, the Dean's RPT administrator, and the candidates will have access to these folders. The Dean's office will load the dossiers into a secure file sharing platform such as Filelocker^[SK3] and distribute to external reviewers.

Candidate Responsibilities

All Candidates

- Provide to the department chair a recommendation of an individual who is external to the College of Education to serve on PRC: by August 31
- Complete full dossier on Digital Measures: by October 13

Candidates for Comprehensive Review, Tenure/Associate Professor, and Full Professor

- Provide to the Dean's office a list of at least 12 possible external reviewers using the Provost's Office "External Reviewer List" template: by September 5
- Deposit external dossiers into OneDrive: September 14

Department Chair Responsibilities

- Provide and discuss with all new faculty the System, Campus, and College criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure: by end of first month of first semester of service
- Provide recommendations of individuals willing to serve on Primary Unit Committees (PRC) to Dean's office: by August 31
- Chair the department PRC, or name a designee

PRC Responsibilities

- Review full dossiers
- Write and load committee letters into Digital Measures: by November 10

DRC Responsibilities

- Review full dossiers
- Write and load committee letters into Digital Measures: by December 15

Dean’s Office Responsibilities

- Create folders in OneDrive to receive dossiers for external review: by August 31
- Facilitate distribution of UCCS and COE institutional descriptions [SK4] to candidates with external reviews: by August 31
- Coordinate with Institutional Research for the creation of candidate Digital Measures Accounts for RPT: by September 5
- Coordinate with Institutional Research for the creation of committee Digital Measures Accounts for RPT: by September 15
- Contact external reviewers to solicit participation: by September 18
- Send external dossiers to reviewers [SK5] via a secure file sharing platform such as Filelocker [SK6]: on September 18
- Receive letters from three external reviewers and load letters into Digital Measures: by October 6
- Dean reviews full dossiers
- Dean writes and loads letters into Digital Measures: by February 1
- Dean’s Office will provide electronic and/or printed copies (candidate’s choice) of the letters from the PRC, DRC, Dean, and VCRC at the completion of the process.

Levels of Review

	Initial Reappointment	Comprehensive Review	Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Full Professor	Post-tenure Review
External Review		X (min. 3)	X (min. 4)	X (min. 4)	
Primary Review Committee	X	X	X	X	X
Dean’s Review Committee	X	X	X	X	X
Dean	X	X	X	X	X
VCAA Committee		X	X	X	
Provost	X	X	X	X	X
Chancellor	X	X	X	X	
President			X		
Regents			X		

