

Relevant policies to be aware of:

Regent Policy 5.C.2(D): “Tenure resides with the university. The move of a faculty member to a new primary unit on any campus is subject to the approval of the faculty in the receiving primary unit, but does not require reconsideration of tenure by the Board of Regents. No faculty transfer can be mandated if it would result in the loss of tenure.”

Regent Policy 5.D.2(B): “A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”

Regent Policy 5.D.2(C): “Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.”

Regent Policy 5.D.3(A): “Primary units develop criteria that define the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for publications, grants for scholarly/creative work, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field(s). These primary unit criteria are reviewed for rigor, fairness, and consistency with regent requirements and are not effective until approved by the dean and provost. In those cases where the primary unit has requested and received Board of Regents approval of specific alternative or additional criteria, those criteria shall be applied in appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

(1) If new or revised primary unit criteria have been adopted during a faculty member’s tenure probationary period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure based on the new criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current primary unit criteria shall apply. See the corresponding Administrative Policy Statement.”

Regent Policy 5.D.5(A)(1): “The primary unit criteria shall be used at every level of the review process and the criteria shall be included in the candidate’s dossier.”

DRAFT APS 1022:

“PRIMARY UNIT CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. Primary units develop criteria that define the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for publications, grants for scholarly/creative work, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field(s).

B. Primary unit criteria are reviewed (as directed by the dean or provost) for rigor, fairness, and consistency with regent requirements and are not effective until approved by the dean and provost. In those cases where the primary unit has requested and received Board of Regents approval of specific alternative or additional standards, those standards shall be reflected in appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion criteria.

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

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

E. The primary unit criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement that warrants the designations "meritorious" and "excellent" performance in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as well as in other applicable evaluation areas. However, reducing the inherent complexity of faculty activities to a strict formula is discouraged.

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

G. If new or revised primary unit criteria have been adopted during a faculty member's tenure probationary period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure based on the new criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current primary unit criteria shall apply.

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

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

VII.C: For tenure and promotion cases, faculty and review committees at each level of review vote on the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit) of the candidate as "not meritorious," "meritorious," or "excellent." The faculty and review committees then vote on whether to recommend tenure, and/or promotion.

For cases involving reappointment at comprehensive review, faculty and review committees at each level of review vote on whether the candidate is either: 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure. A determination will be made for each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Based on this evaluation, the faculty and review committees will issue a recommendation regarding reappointment.

VII.C.1.b. Following the PUEC recommendation, a vote is held among faculty of the primary unit. The faculty vote will address the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service and will include a positive or negative recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

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

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

iii. All eligible faculty may vote at this stage; participation on the PUEC does not preclude participation in the vote.

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

VII.C.1.c. In units with a department structure, the chair will also issue a recommendation on reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. (If the chair is a member of the PUEC, a separate recommendation letter is not required.)

General Resources:

- Current UCCS RPT criteria: <https://www.uccs.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-documents>
- UCCS Policy 200-001: <https://www.uccs.edu/vcaf/sites/vcaf/files/inline-files/200-001.pdf>
- Regent Article V (current version): <https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies/regent-laws/article-5-faculty>
- Regent Article V (new): <https://www.cu.edu/doc/article-5-policy-5-finalpdf>
- Faculty Assembly Women’s Committee study: <https://www.uccs.edu/women/fcqs-bias-student-evaluation>
- Report of Faculty Assembly Teaching Evaluation Task Force (May 2019): <https://www.uccs.edu/facassembly/fcq-revision>
- Links to Regent, CU system, and UCCS policies: <https://www.uccs.edu/vcaf/policies>
- Draft CU System Administrative Policy Statements: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/under-review>

The following are all POSSIBLE topics to address as we bring our RPT policies and primary unit criteria into compliance with the changes in Regent Laws and Policies. Some of the things on this list are mandated and some have come up in discussions with various faculty committees and deans. We need to address many of these to be in compliance with the July 1, 2020 implementation of Regent Law 5. Some other topics might require longer discussion and could extend into the following year.

Possible PHASE 1 items (2019-2020 academic year discussion and action):

1. Excellence in Teaching and Research at the time of tenure (Primary Unit)
 - a. “A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall require evidence of impact beyond the institution.”

“A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”
 - b. The research requirement is largely already in place from our use of external letters.
 - c. We need to define in RPT criteria what is meant by the teaching requirement.
 - i. What is “demonstrated achievement” ?
 - ii. What does it mean to “further the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning”?
 1. Presentations at conferences and to colleagues?
 2. Unsolicited letters from students showing impact – or is this within “one’s immediate instructional setting”?
 3. Development of new academic programs?
 4. Outreach activities?
 - iii. How do we distinguish what elements of the scholarship of teaching and learning belong under research/scholarship and what belong under teaching?
 - iv. What is “one’s immediate instructional setting” ?
 1. Would data on our graduates show external impact beyond this?
 2. Anyone we impact who is not registered in a class we teach?
2. Interpretation of time toward tenure (College/Primary unit)
 - a. Different colleges have different interpretations. This is OK as long as it is intentional.
 - b. One interpretation is that a specific number of years of past record are credited toward a tenure review. For instance, two years of credit toward tenure means that the two years immediately prior to joining UCCS are counted toward tenure and the tenure clock is moved up two years.
 - c. Another interpretation is that two years of credit toward tenure is a determination based on the person’s record as a whole and we move up the tenure clock by two years in recognition of that entire record and consider it all in our reviews.
3. Are criteria clear and helpful? (Primary Unit)

- a. Do RPT criteria provide clear guidance to faculty and evaluators on the expectations at each stage – while still allowing flexibility to recognize the multiple paths that faculty may take toward tenure ?
4. Different instructional modes (Primary Unit)
 - a. Do our RPT criteria and policies appropriately protect faculty engaged in different modes of instruction such as in-class, on-line, and hybrid ?
5. FCQ changes (Primary Unit)
 - a. How should departments take into account the changes in the FCQ forms since faculty will have some FCQs in the older form and some in the new form?
 - b. How should primary units conduct comprehensive or tenure reviews under older criteria that require the use of questions that have been removed?
 - c. The faculty removed the overall instructor and course questions based on research that they tend to be biased. Should departments be allowed to put them back in?
 - d. How much weight should be given to FCQ questions since they are supposed to be only one of at least 3 means of evaluating teaching?
 - e. Resources:
 - i. Faculty Assembly Women’s Committee study:
<https://www.uccs.edu/women/fcqs-bias-student-evaluation>
 - ii. Report of Faculty Assembly Teaching Evaluation Task Force (May 2019):
<https://www.uccs.edu/facassembly/fcq-revision>
 - iii. APS 1099 Section IV (currently in draft form) describes the FCQ purpose and requirements.
6. How is grant activity recognized in RPT criteria at different stages of review? (Primary Unit)
 - a. Is submission of grants recognized and valued?
 - b. How does submission of grants differ from receiving a grant in recognition?
 - c. At TENURE decision: Regent Policy 5.D.2(C): “Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.”
7. How is teaching evaluated using multiple measures? (Primary Unit)
 - a. Most criteria provide lists of possible measures. Do these need greater definition?
 - i. For example, are there best practices on how to conduct a peer evaluation?
 - b. How are the multiple measures weighted in the teaching evaluation?
8. How is service work related to equity, diversity, and inclusion recognized ? (Primary Unit)
9. Previous wording of “In making ... recommendations, primary units ... shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on a comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion recommendation in that unit.” has been removed from APS 1022 and replaced with “The program requirements of the primary unit shall be considered only at the time of appointment and reappointment.” (Primary Unit, Campus)
10. Vote terminology: APS 1022 (draft) requires at tenure that the evaluators vote separately on teaching research, service (and any other areas) as “not meritorious”, “meritorious”, or “excellent”. For comprehensive (and initial) reviews the evaluators vote separately in each area as “on track for tenure”, “not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with

appropriate corrections” or “not on track for tenure”. The evaluators separately issue a recommendation regarding reappointment. (Primary Unit, Campus)

11. APS 1022 (draft) requires that the faculty in a primary unit vote after receiving a recommendation from the PUEC. Some of our departments are small and this could involve a very small number of faculty (especially for full professor promotions) if we exclude those that serve on the DRC and VCRC. As such the vote would not have much anonymity. Primary units may specify that this step is not needed. It is probably simplest to specify that in the criteria. (Primary Unit)
12. APS 1022 (draft) requires that the department chair submit a separate evaluation letter unless the chair served on the PUEC. (Primary Unit)
13. Full professor promotion (Primary Unit / College)
 - a. Regents require a record which is excellent when taken as a whole. Some primary units require individual ratings of excellent in all three areas. This is acceptable, but not required. It may be worth discussing in primary units.
 - b. Should the discussion be at the college level for consistency or at the primary unit level to recognize disciplinary differences?
14. Separate procedures and criteria. (Primary Unit)
 - a. Criteria should focus on the requirements expected of the faculty.
 - b. Procedures of how reviews are conducted (committee membership, timing, etc.) should be in a separate document so that they can be changed without going through the entire RPT criteria change process.
15. Publications (primary unit)
 - a. With the expansion in pay-to-publish outlets, predatory journals, and other opportunities to publish work, how do we assess the quality and peer-review process of journals where faculty publish?
 - b. Useful resource: <https://thinkchecksubmit.org/>
16. RPT criteria format (Campus / Primary Unit)
 - a. Should our RPT criteria have a standard format to make it easier for reviewers above the Primary Unit Committee to find what they need? Current criteria tend to be in one of two forms outlined below:
 - i. Primary organization by review level with secondary organization by teaching, research and service.
 1. Initial Reappointment
 - a. Teaching criteria
 - b. Research criteria
 - c. Service criteria
 2. Comprehensive Review
 - d. Teaching criteria
 - e. Research criteria
 - f. Service criteria
 3. Etc.
 - ii. Primary organization by teaching, research and service with secondary organization by review level:

4. Teaching criteria
 - g. Initial review
 - h. Comprehensive review
 - i. Tenure and/or promotion
 - j. Full professor promotion
5. Research criteria
 - k. Initial review
 - l. Comprehensive review
 - m. Tenure and/or promotion
 - n. Full professor review
6. Etc.

Since the criteria are typically used by review level, structure i would seem to be more useful.

17. Criteria for instructors (Campus / College / Primary Unit)

- a. As we move to three levels of instructor rank faculty, should we incorporate more formal promotion criteria into our RPT criteria?
 - a. Do we add a third level above the current senior instructor or do we adjust the requirements for both promotional levels?
- b. As we make multi-year contracts more accessible to instructors, how might this connect in with the three levels of instructor rank faculty ?
 - a. Are multi-year contracts only available to certain levels?
 - b. Are they automatic of the highest level?

18. Tenure transfer (Campus / Primary Unit)

- a. Now that Article V recognizes tenure as granted by the University, how do we handle requests by faculty to transfer their tenure from one primary unit to another?
 - i. It appears that this could be as simple as a vote of the tenured faculty in the receiving unit or as complex as a full tenure review or anything in between.
 - ii. This does not need to be the same for all departments and could be described in the primary unit criteria. Campus policy could set a minimum requirement as a default if not addressed by the primary unit.

19. Letters at comprehensive review (Campus/College/Primary Unit)

- a. Regent Law does not require that we get outside letters at the comprehensive review.
- b. Arguments in favor of continuation:
 - i. Our department are still small and do not have the breadth of expertise needed to evaluate specialized research of our faculty.
 - ii. The feedback provided by the outside letters is useful to faculty in preparing for their tenure review.
 - iii. Associate Deans were mixed on this but more interested in continuing.
- c. Arguments against continuation:
 - i. It is difficult to find people to write these letters since it is an imposition on their time for just a reappointment review.

- ii. The letters seldom provide clear guidance since they attempt to project where the faculty member could be by the time of tenure. Most of our criteria are broad enough that this may not identify problems.
 - d. Other observations:
 - i. The use of letters could be made optional in campus policy, but could be required at the college or primary unit level.
 - a. This could be confusing for committees trying to assess candidates with different materials in their dossiers, but dossiers already vary widely.
 - b. Current faculty would still need letters under the older criteria unless they chose to use the new criteria.
20. Multi-unit hires (Campus/Primary Unit)
- a. How do we handle RPT review for faculty who have appointments in multiple primary units?
 - b. Should this be specified in policy? (Current practice is to write an MOU at the time of hire that spells out how to do the reviews.)
21. Administrative service (Campus / Primary Unit)
- a. We need to be clear about how administrative service is included in RPT.
 - b. If the person is given a separate annual review for the administrative work, should that documentation be included in RPT reviews?
22. Approval of RPT criteria (campus/college/primary unit)
- a. Should we encourage primary units to have a peer review of their criteria before submitting them into the approval process?
 - i. Internal (UCCS) or external (comparable unit)?
 - ii. Have a VCRC member from the college review the criteria?
23. Hiring with tenure (Campus)
- a. When we hire someone with tenure, we currently run them through a fairly complete tenure review process. We are constrained by Regent Law, but we may want to allow some accommodations in our policy (probably in campus policy).
 - b. APS 1022 allows the use of recommendation letters from the hiring process in place of external evaluation letters.
 - c. CU system policy: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1018>
24. Hiring academic administrators (deans, etc.) (Campus)
- a. When hiring academic administrators with tenure, our criteria are not always particularly appropriate if they have recently served mainly in administration. Do we need some campus guidance on how to apply criteria in these cases?
 - b. For example, deans are usually hired as full professors with tenure. The tenure criteria typically discuss progress since the last review. Should we be looking more at the record as a whole being excellent?

Possible Phase II items (2020-2021 discussion and possible implementation)

25. Initial review (Campus)

- a. Our initial (2nd year) reappointment review is not required in Regent Law. It is unique to our campus within the CU system. Should it continue and, if so, in what form?
- b. Arguments in favor of continuation:
 - i. This review provides important professional development for faculty in the RPT process and helps prepare them for successful comprehensive review.
 - ii. Faculty get familiar with our RPT process by actually working through the process of dossier preparation and receiving committee feedback.
 - iii. We have the ability to get rid of a poor hire early.
 - iv. Associate deans generally feel the review is useful.
- c. Arguments against continuation:
 - i. We have matured as a campus to the point that this is no longer necessary.
 - ii. We hire good people and do not need to review them after their first year.
 - iii. The investment of time and effort by faculty review committees is significant and it is hard to recruit faculty to serve.
 - iv. Faculty anxiety over this review.
 - v. We never get rid of anyone at this review.
- d. Other observations:
 - i. If we get rid of this initial review, would we move the comprehensive review up from year 4 to year 3? (Boulder review is 4th year)
 - ii. If we get rid of this initial review, we would need to change the initial contract length.
 - iii. Is there a middle ground, where some type of formal feedback is provided to the faculty member within the college, but not as detailed as a reappointment review?
 - iv. Could we keep the review but simplify it further?

26. Tighten comprehensive review (Primary unit)

- a. It is very unusual for our campus to fail to renew a contract at the comprehensive review. Should this review be strengthened to encourage non-renewal in cases where a person is not making satisfactory progress?
- b. Arguments for tightening:
 - i. This review can be used to remove non-productive faculty and replace them with new faculty who have better potential to succeed.
- c. Arguments against tightening:
 - i. Even if we renew the contract, underperforming faculty get the message and leave voluntarily before going up for tenure.
 - ii. Very few cases would clearly be unable to gain tenure. We want to err on the side of supporting our faculty.