

Two items are mandated in the new Regent Laws:

1. Excellence in Teaching and Research at the time of tenure (Primary Unit)
 - a. Article V wording: "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.
2. Separate annual merit review criteria (Primary Unit)
 - a. Regent policy now specifies that departments must have separate criteria for RPT processes and for annual merit 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. The things on this list are not mandated, but all have come up in discussions. We might consider addressing some subset of these next year to be in compliance with the July 1, 2020 implementation of Regent Law 5. Some of the bigger topics might require longer discussion and could extend into the following year.

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

3. 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.
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. 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
 - a. Teaching criteria
 - b. Research criteria

- c. Service criteria
 - 3. Etc.
 - ii. Primary organization by teaching, research and service with secondary organization by review level:
 - 1. Teaching criteria
 - a. Initial review
 - b. Comprehensive review
 - c. Tenure and/or promotion
 - d. Full professor promotion
 - 2. Research criteria
 - a. Initial review
 - b. Comprehensive review
 - c. Tenure and/or promotion
 - d. Full professor review
 - 3. Etc.
6. 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?
 - b. As we make multi-year contracts more accessible to instructors, how might this connect in with the three levels of instructor rank faculty ?
7. 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 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.
8. 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. The faculty removed the overall instructor and course questions based on research that they tend to be biased. Should departments be allowed to use put them back in?
 - c. 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.
9. 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?
10. 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).
11. 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?
12. 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?
13. 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.

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

14. 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. The investment of time and effort by faculty review committees is significant and it is hard to recruit faculty to serve.
 - iii. 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?
 - 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?
15. 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 removed from campus policy, but could be required at the college or primary unit level.
 - 1. This could be confusing for committees trying to assess candidates with different materials in their dossiers.

16. 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.