A. INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, CU Denver and CU Anschutz the University of Colorado Denver and University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus have adopted policies and procedures designed to provide a thorough and fair review of all tenure-track and tenured faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Reviews occur at various levels: primary unit—first-level review (primary unit; dean and dean’s advisory/review committee within the college/school/library); second-level review (Vice-vice Chancellor’s chancellor’s Advisory-advisory Committee-committee or VCAC, provost, and chancellor); and third-level review (president). The Board of Regents makes the final decision on tenure.

B. TABLE OF CONTENTS
C. POLICY STATEMENT

All evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty at all levels for comprehensive reappointment, review and for tenure, and promotion must be conducted in accordance with the University of Colorado’s APS #1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Comprehensive Review-Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review and Promotion—and this campus policy. Primary unit primary unit procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are subject to periodic review (at least every 3-5 years) by the Office of the Provost.

1. Primary Unit Criteria
   a. Each college or school and the library have primary unit criteria that are made available to all tenure track faculty at the time of the initial appointment and at the beginning of any year in which a tenure track faculty member is to be considered for comprehensive reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Primary unit criteria are subject to approval by the dean of the college or school in which the unit resides and the Provost.
   b. Should the primary unit revise its tenure criteria during the faculty member’s tenure probationary period, affected faculty members may, at that time, elect to be evaluated for reappointment or tenure based on either the basis of the criteria at time of hiring or the revised criteria. If the faculty member elects to be evaluated based on the revised criteria, is required to make a formal, written request to the dean if they wish to be evaluated under Primary Unit criteria in effect at the time of the tenure review—rather than the criteria in place when they entered the track, this choice must be acknowledged in writing and submitted to the dean. The dean is required to provide written response in writing of to the faculty member’s
request choice. The faculty member’s request and the dean’s approval both documents must be placed in the dossier.

(1) Faculty members on CU Anschutz Medical Campus who are evaluated for promotion to associate professor without a coincident evaluation of tenure (see C.2.b(4) below) may elect, in writing, to be evaluated for promotion based on the primary unit criteria at the time of appointment or the current primary unit criteria.

c. Primary unit criteria must be included in the candidate’s dossier to assist personnel-review committees in understanding the criteria and standards by which the candidate is being evaluated.

2. Schedule for Reviews

a. Appointment Length Probationary Period

a. Faculty on the tenure track typically undergo comprehensive review in their fourth year; faculty with successful comprehensive reviews undergo review for tenure in their seventh year. The time leading up to comprehensive review and tenure review is the probationary period.

Faculty members in the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy, and Colorado School of Public Health are often exceptions to this rule. At these schools, there is no time limit for tenure review (see section C.2.b).

(1) Prior Service Credit. Regent Law Article 5.B.4.D(3) APS 1022 states: “Typically, up to three years of full-time service in the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period.” Years of prior service credit must be negotiated at the time of hiring and must be included in the letter of offer. See the CU Denver University Administrative Policy Faculty Affairs website for further information.

(2) Faculty Members Hired without Terminal Degrees. As stated in Regent Law, Article 5.B.4.D(3): “A faculty member appointed to the rank of assistant professor without a terminal degree may decide at the time of the initial appointment whether the probationary period will begin at the time of the initial appointment or upon receipt of the terminal degree. Such a decision shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and the chancellor.”

(3)(2) Alterations to the Seven-Year Probationary Period.

(a) Approved Leave.

As provided by Regent Policy 5.D.1(A)(1): “A faculty member may apply for leave during the probationary period. The provost shall decide whether the leave is granted and whether it affects the probationary period (except in the case of Parental Leave). Any change to the probationary period will be in increments of one year.”
• As provided by Regent Policy 5.D.1(A)(2): “A faculty member who utilizes parental leave during the tenure probationary period will be granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and chancellor.”

(b) Tenure Upon Hire. If an individual’s professional accomplishments warrant, the tenure probationary period may be waived and tenure may be recommended upon hire. When this occurs, it must be documented in the letter of offer.

(c) Request for Early Consideration for Tenure. Tenure-track faculty members seeking early tenure are required to have undergone comprehensive review before they may apply for tenure consideration. As stated in APS 1022, all faculty members in a unit, no matter when they are considered for tenure, are held to the same standards. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

b. Requirements for Comprehensive Review

(1) Assistant professors are required to undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

(2) For associate professors on the tenure track, the hiring process may constitute the comprehensive review. When this occurs, it needs to be documented in the letter of offer.

e-b. Timing of Reviews

(1) Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.

(2) The comprehensive reappointment review for reappointment is typically conducted in the fourth year of the initial four-year appointment. If the comprehensive reappointment review is unsatisfactory, the fifth year is the terminal year.

(3) Regent rules regarding typically, candidates are reviewed for tenure provide for review in the seventh year. If tenure is approved, it is effective the award of tenure at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is the terminal year.

(3)(4) Tenure-track faculty members in the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy, and Colorado School of Public Health may be reviewed for promotion without a review for tenure. Candidates are normally reviewed for promotion during the seventh year of service. There is no time limit for the review of tenure.

d-c. Failure to Submit a Dossier
A faculty member failing to submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time or submitting a dossier missing required material is deemed not to have applied for reappointment or tenure.

e. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure

Tenure track faculty members seeking early tenure are required to have undergone comprehensive review as specified in C.2.b (above) before they may apply for tenure consideration. The standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure schedule apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

f. d. Deadlines

(1) Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the Office of faculty affairs the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by January 15th. For mid-year appointments, consult with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Office.

(2) Deans who wish to submit dossiers after the due date (see preceding paragraph) must submit a written request for a delay to the office of faculty affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

3. Standards for Review

a. Tenure

(1) Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive review as specified in C.2.b (above), before applying for tenure consideration.

(2) Tenure may be awarded only for demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/scholarly/creative work.

(2)(3) Additional requirements for faculty members in the School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, or School of Pharmacy, include:

(a) Per Regent Policy 5.D.2(A)(1), “In the School of Medicine, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with national and international reputations for academic excellence who are among the best in their field of academic endeavor and who have demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching. Professional/administrative leadership and service and/or clinical activities should be weighed into any decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.”
Per Regent Policy 5.D.2(A)(2), “In its tenure recommendations, the Colorado School of Public Health may consider public health practice/clinical activity and scholarship.”

Per Regent Policy 5.D.2(A3), “In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence, and dedication to, teaching.”

As required by 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.”

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

b. Promotion

(1) Associate Professor: With the exceptions noted in C.2.c.(4), 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. Promotion to associate professor requires considerable successful teaching experience and accomplishment in research/scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; occasionally, experienced individuals are hired as tenure-track associate professors.

(2) Professor: Promotion to professor requires: (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and (c) 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/creative work and leadership and service.

4. Limitations on Reviewer Participation

a. Confidentiality

Discussion at all levels of the personnel process is confidential. Individual reviewers may not have any communication with the candidate or with anyone else about the review process, the details of deliberations, or the outcomes of meetings or votes. Although it may seem counterintuitive not to
share positive outcomes, even information relayed with good intention
damages the integrity of the process.

b. Conflict of Interest

A member of the primary unit, the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee, or
the campus-level VCAC should recuse themselves from the
deliberations when he/she believes that there is a conflict of interest with
the candidate.

A conflict of interest exists when an individual’s prior relationship with a
candidate for promotion or tenure, whether positive or negative, would
adversely impact his/her ability to participate objectively in meetings or
deliberations related to a recommendation regarding promotion or tenure.
Professional disagreements or conflicts that are a natural extension of academic
discourse or organizational processes are not considered conflicts of interest
that would preclude an individual from participating in a promotion or tenure
decision.

A candidate for promotion or tenure may object to the participation of a
colleague in the review process only if a conflict of interest has been
documented previously via an official complaint made to the appropriate
administrative office. A written request to prevent an individual from
participating in the review process should be made by the candidate to the
office of faculty affairs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, by
September 1 of the review year. If the Associate Vice Chancellor agrees to the
candidate’s request, he/she exclude the colleague in question will be excluded
from the personnel review and inform the appropriate parties will be informed.

A faculty member may speak to and vote at only one level on a case
undergoing review and may not be present during or contribute to or
influence in any way discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of
the process. A faculty member may serve as a member of a primary unit
review committee and participate in a faculty vote at the primary unit level
(see C.6.c below); however, no individual may vote in more than one stage
of the review process. For example, a faculty member who votes on a case in
their primary unit may not participate in discussions or vote on the case
when it is reviewed by the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee or the
VCAC.

5. Candidate Responsibilities

a. Dossier

The candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is responsible for a
clear, accurate, and detailed presentation of the record. The primary unit head
shall advise the candidate on compiling the dossier. Reviewers at all levels will
review and judge the record of accomplishments in teaching,
research/scholarly/creative work and leadership and service only as represented
in the dossier.
b. Additional materials

The candidate may add materials to the dossier after the review process has begun. Most often those materials confirm a recent addition to the candidate’s record: confirmation of an article accepted, a grant awarded, a book contract signed, etc. Materials added during a higher level of the review process shall also be provided to all other bodies who already reviewed the candidate, who may take them into account and/or respond.

6. Primary Unit Responsibilities

a. Department Chair/Primary Unit Head

The department chair/primary unit head is responsible for: (a) fully advising candidates of the areas of performance that will be examined, the standards of performance that must be met, and the primary unit criteria used in making decisions about performance; (b) ensuring that dossiers are reviewed and submitted to the college, school, or library dean’s director’s office in a timely fashion; and (c) re-reviewing cases, if required. The department chair/primary unit head is also responsible for overseeing the process by which external reviewers are selected.

b. Dossier

The primary unit head is responsible for including the primary unit criteria, the previous VCAC and personnel action letters, subcommittee reports, and letters of evaluation from external reviewers.

c. Primary Unit Summary Review, Vote and Recommendation (Step 1 of the First-Level Review)

(1) For the purpose of assisting the primary unit in making recommendations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, each primary unit will elect or appoint (having previously voted on the method to be followed) from among its members an evaluation committee for each candidate being considered during an academic year. The committee may consist of both tenured and non-tenured members, but usually consists of tenured faculty members. In a small primary unit, all members of the unit may constitute the evaluation committee.

(2) The primary unit evaluation committee (PUEC) provides conducts a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, using the primary unit’s written criteria. The primary unit committee’s role is to evaluate, not to advocate for the candidates. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. While program requirements of the primary unit may be considered at the time of reappointment, only the merit of the candidate may be considered in recommending the award of tenure. At the completion of the evaluation process, the committee will issue a recommendation.
Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on tenure. The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual votes. A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes should be explained and a minority report may be submitted. A statement such as “we do/do not recommend tenure” is not sufficient. The recommendations shall record the primary unit’s evaluation of and votes on the candidate’s teaching (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), research/scholarship or creative work (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) and leadership and service (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) as well as the overall recommendation and vote.

Following the committee recommendation, and consistent with its primary unit bylaws, the faculty of the primary unit must vote on the action under consideration, prepare a summary of the evaluation including a statement describing the procedures followed, and make a recommendation for action including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation and the results of any vote taken, and include this information in the dossier.

Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on tenure. The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual votes. A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes should be explained and a minority report may be submitted. A statement such as “we do/do not recommend tenure” is not sufficient. The recommendations shall record the primary unit’s evaluation of and votes on the candidate’s teaching (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), research/scholarship or creative work (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) and leadership and service (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) as well as the overall recommendation and vote.

The PUEC must forward its recommendation and the results of the faculty vote. The PUEC prepares a document with the following information: 1) a summary of the evaluation, including a statement describing the procedures followed; 2) a recommendation for action, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements; 3) the results of any vote taken. This document must be included in the dossier.

For assistant professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one recommendation (with the exception noted in C.2. be(4)).

The department chair/head of the primary unit promptly informs the candidate orally of the primary unit’s recommendation and provides the candidate with a copy of the primary unit recommendation letter and the chair’s letter (if applicable) at the time the letters are inserted in the candidate’s dossier.
Form UCD-7. This form is completed and signed by the department chair/primary unit head and placed in the appropriate section of the candidate’s dossier.

7. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers

a. Responsibility of the External Reviewers

External reviewers are asked to evaluate the research/scholarly/creative work record and to measure that record against that of others in the field at the same career stage. Reviewers are asked to evaluate both the quality and quantity of the research/scholarly/creative work.

b. Affiliation and Location of External Reviewers

External reviewers should be faculty members at institutions outside the University of Colorado system, preferably at “peer” or higher-ranked institutions.

c. Rank of External Reviewers

(1) External reviewers for comprehensive (reappointment) review and promotion/tenure review should be tenured associate professors or professors.

(2) For promotion to professor, the external reviewers should be tenured professors.

(3) Exceptions may be made when external reviewers have specialized expertise.

(4) External reviewers must provide a biographical sketch or short vita to be included in the dossier.

d. Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers

(1) The candidate supplies a list of potential external reviewers to the primary unit from which one or two reviewers should be chosen (see section 7.g below).

(2) Persons recommended by the candidate to write evaluation letters must not be relatives or close personal friends. Also, professional colleagues who may be biased (for or against) the candidate, or not able to give a fair, honest assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments, should not be asked to serve as external reviewers.

(3) The candidate may also indicate specific reviewers to exclude from consideration because their evaluations might be prejudiced.

e. Confidentiality

(1) The names and institutional affiliations of external reviewers and their letters of evaluation are confidential and must not be divulged to or provided to the candidate.
(2) The external evaluators’ letters and their vitae are retained only by the Human Resources Office and copies must not be retained in the department, division, or dean’s office.

f. **Nature of the Requirements for External Letters**

(1) External Letters for the Comprehensive Review. At least three external reviewers are required, with at most one selected from the candidate’s list, and at least two selected outside the candidate’s list.

(2) External Letters for Promotion and Tenure. At least six external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two selected from the candidate’s list.

g. **Solicitation of External Letters**

(1) The primary unit or the dean must solicit external letters of evaluation. Primary unit bylaws should describe the process used in selecting external reviewers. The primary unit may offer external reviewers a modest stipend for their work.

(2) The department chair, division coordinator, associate dean, or dean/director of the college, school, or library must approve the letters requesting external evaluation before the primary unit sends them out.

(3) The external evaluators should be informed that their names, institutional affiliations, and letters are confidential and every effort will be made to insure they remain confidential.

(4) All letters received must be included in the candidate’s dossier.

h. **Documentation of External Evaluations**

In the confidential external letters section of the candidate’s dossier, the primary unit provides:

(1) a copy of the approved letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters;

(2) full and complete documentation concerning:

(a) the selection of external reviewers;

(b) each evaluator’s biographical sketch or short vita;

(c) whether the candidate or the primary unit recommended the evaluator;

(d) the relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit.

8. **Dean’s Responsibility**

a. **First-Level Dean’s Review Committee, Summary, Vote, and Recommendation (Step 2 of the First-Level Review)**

(1) The Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee, as defined in the bylaws of the college, school, or library, reviews the candidate’s dossier, votes on the proposed action, and forwards to the dean an evaluation and a
recommendation for action. The first-level review is a thorough assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.

(2) When a member of the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee has a conflict of interest, the member may not be present during any discussions of the case, and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion. The member must be recused from voting and must not be present during voting on the case where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. (See section C.4.b for the definition of conflict of interest.)

(3) The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote. A statement such as “we do do not recommend tenure” is not sufficient. A unanimous vote is not required. The recommendation shall record the Dean’s Review Committee evaluation of, and votes on, the candidate’s teaching (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), research/scholarship or scholarly/creative work (not meritorious, meritorious or excellent) and leadership and service (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), as well as the overall recommendation and vote.

(4) The dean’s office will provide the candidate with a copy of the review committee’s recommendation at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate’s dossier.

b. Dean’s Recommendation

(1) The dean prepares an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement.

(2) If the first-level Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee and/or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the dean must discuss and communicate in writing the nature of the disagreement with the chair of the primary unit. The primary unit reconsiders its original recommendation and reports the reconsidered judgment, in writing, to the dean and the review committee. If the reconsideration process will lead to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the dean should notify the Associate Vice Chancellor’s Office in writing and provide a probable time for submission.

(3) Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee, and/or the dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation.
The dean must promptly inform the chair of the primary unit orally of the dean’s recommendation. The chair of the primary unit must promptly inform the candidate orally of the dean’s recommendation. The dean provides the candidate with a copy of the dean’s letter to the provost at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate’s dossier.

The dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, completes and signs Form UCD-7 and forwards the complete dossier to the Provost’s Office by January 15.

9. Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) (Step 1 of the Second-Level Review)

The Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs has an advisory committee of faculty to assist in the review of recommendations; the provost determines whether the committee will be elected or appointed. (See APS 1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review). Every effort should be made to ensure that the VCAC is as diverse as the constituency it represents.

a. Membership

(1) Faculty of the colleges, schools, and library elect or nominate representatives to the VCAC. Each of the colleges, schools, and the library has one representative, except for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, which has three representatives, who must be from different departments.

(2) Faculty members of the VCAC must be tenured and hold the rank of associate professor or professor. Associate professors may participate in considering and voting on applications for promotion to professor.

(3) Faculty members may not serve on both the first level review committee (the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee) and the VCAC.

(4) Faculty members who serve on the VCAC may not be considered for promotion to professor while they are on the committee.

(5) Associate deans and department chairs are not eligible to serve on the VCAC.

(6) Members of the VCAC must not be advocates for any candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

(7) Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must not discuss the candidate’s case with the chair or members of the VCAC.

(8) When a member of the VCAC has a conflict of interest with a candidate, the committee member may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to, or influence the discussion, and must be recused.
(9) When faculty members agree to serve on the VCAC, they are required to attend all committee meetings except under unusual circumstances.

b. Role and Responsibilities

(1) The VCAC assists with the campus level review of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and is advisory to the provost. It is responsible for reviewing and evaluating dossiers and making recommendations for all tenure-track candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and all tenured candidates for promotion to professor. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in Regent laws and policies and administrative policy statements and is governed by its specific bylaws.

(a) Faculty from the CU Anschutz Medical Campus recommended for promotion without dissenting votes from the first-level review are not subject to the VCAC review.

(2) All members of the VCAC, including the chair, review, vote on, and make recommendations on the following VCAC actions:

(a) comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor prior to eligibility for tenure;

(b) promotion to associate professor and professor;

(c) award of tenure; and

(d) appointments of new faculty members if they are requesting tenure and/or promotion at the time of the hiring. Committee deliberations and votes are confidential: The committee provides written recommendations to the provost.

After confidential deliberation and vote, the committee prepares a written recommendation to the provost. The chair of the VCAC is charged with drafting the recommendation to the provost. If the vote is not unanimous, the judgments of the minority are summarized and included in the written recommendation.

10. Provost’s Recommendation

a. The provost reviews each case and makes a recommendation to the chancellor.

b. If the provost disagrees with the recommendation from the first-level review, the provost transmits to the dean the nature of the disagreement. The Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee and the dean reconsider their original
recommendations and report their reconsidered judgment to the provost who then makes a final recommendation to the chancellor.

c. The provost communicates directly with the dean about all negative decisions.

d. The provost sends each candidate a copy of the VCAC’s recommendation, which specifies strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. The provost informs the candidate of the recommendation in writing by before the end of the academic year.

11. Decision by the Chancellor

a. The chancellor reviews the tenure recommendations of the provost and makes a final decision about which candidates are forwarded to the President and Board of Regents for consideration for tenure. The chancellor does not forward negative decisions on tenure to the President’s Office.

b. The chancellor makes the final decision on reappointments and promotions. These decisions do not require approval by the Board of Regents.

c. If the chief academic officer (chancellor or their designee, such as the provost) finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, the case will be returned to the primary unit to repeat the process. The chief academic officer may 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 chief academic officer may extend the contract of the candidate for one year. The re-evaluation process shall focus on the record as it existed at the time of the first review.

12. Administrative Appeal/Grievance Procedures

a. In the case of a negative decision on reappointment or within 10 business days of receipt of notification, a candidate denied tenure by the chancellor, the candidate—within ten working days of receipt of written notice of the negative recommendation—may request review by the president. This review will be granted. The only grounds for presidential review are: that the process had (i) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (ii) substantive-factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they have affected the outcome; or (iii) evidence of discrimination, violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy; or some combination of these grounds, (See APS 1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review).

b. The president may determine there are no grounds for appeal and uphold the chancellor’s decision. In this circumstance, the case is closed.

c. If the president determines there are grounds for appeal:
(1) The president may remand the case to the campus to rectify errors and require the chancellor to then revise or reaffirm the original recommendation.

(2) The president may overrule the campus decision and recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

(3) The president may convene a faculty advisory committee to review the case. The committee may issue a recommendation on tenure or recommend action to rectify errors. If the committee makes a recommendation on tenure, it shall base its recommendation on the dossier available to the chancellor at the time the chancellor issued a decision. Ultimately, the president shall either make the final decision to uphold the chancellor’s decision to deny tenure or shall recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

13. Grievance Procedures

   a. Following a negative decision, the candidate may choose to file a grievance with the university’s Privilege and Tenure Committee. There is an allowable time frame for such a grievance. See Regent Policy 5-H. If a candidate is denied reappointment, promotion, or tenure and believes that there have been serious procedural or factual errors in the case, or the denial occurred through the material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy, the candidate may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate grievance committee in accordance with Regent Policy 5.G.

   b. A grievance may not be filed until all available administrative appeals have been exhausted.

   c. While procedural errors per se may entitle the candidate to proper reconsideration, such errors may not be used as the justification for personnel recommendations not otherwise justified on the basis of performance.

   d. The faculty governance grievance committee cannot substitute its judgement about an individual’s merit for that of other committees and administrators.
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