Advisory Committee on
Tenure-Related Processes
Timeline

May 2005

- Study Director appointed

June 2005

- Scope of work finalized
- RFP for working group written and released
- RFP process begins

September 2005

- RFP process completed
- Consultants (External Working Group) contracted
- Working Groups and Study Director hold initial meetings
- Internal and External Working Groups begin separate studies
- Campus Resource Groups assemble documents for review

February 2006

- Internal and External Working Groups deliver draft reports to Study Director
- Drafting Group convenes to reconcile draft reports

March 2006

- Study Director’s report issued to ACTRP and released publicly
- Public comment

April 2006

- ACTRP presents its findings and recommendations to the Board of Regents, the Faculty Council and the administration, including the ’s Report.
Structure
RFP Process
External Working Group

- Structure and process determined
- Scope of work described
- Methodology open
- Bids opened on August 4
- Screening process and interviews
- Selection in September
Selection Process
Internal Working Group

- 9 faculty from comprehensive campuses: UCB, UCCS, UCDHSC-Downtown
- 4 faculty from Health Sciences
- 2 graduate students (1 A&S; 1 Prof.)
- 2 system administrators
- Faculty nominees contacted in June
- Convening and charge in August
- Work begins in September
Study Director

Howell M. Estes, III

- Retired General, U.S. Air Force
- Commander in Chief, North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Space Command
- Commander, Air Force Space Command
- Experienced manager of complex, large-scale organizations with significant personnel systems and processes
- Credentials and integrity to instill public and university confidence
Committee Members

R L Widman, Faculty, UCB

Jonathan Kurche, Student, UCDHSC

John Huggins, Community Member

Mark Heckler, Administrator, UCDHSC

Regent Bosley, Faculty, UCDHSC

Regent Lucero, Faculty, UCDHSC

Regent Schwartz, Faculty, UCDHSC

Richard Bakemeier, Faculty, UCDHSC

Robert Damrauer, Faculty, UCDHSC

Jennene Nelson, Faculty, UCCS
Accomplishments to Date

- Committee appointed and chair elected
- Study Director identified
- Structure and process determined
- RFP developed for External Working Group
- Internal Working Group identified
- Campus Resource Groups determined
- Scope of Work described
- Communications plan drafted
Advisory Committee on Tenure-Related Processes

Update for the University of Colorado Board of Regents
August 3, 2005
Scope of Work

- Comprehension and Accessibility
- Mission Alignment
- Comparison across Campuses
- Rigor
- Coherence across Processes
- Compliance
Scope of Work

- Communication
- Responsibility and Authority
- Effectiveness
- Benchmarks and Best Practices
- Continuous Improvement
Deliverables

- Identify and Document Processes
- Evaluate Policies and Practices
- Examine Policies and Practices at Other Institutions
- Recommend Changes
Timeline

August – September
- Selection of External Working Group
- Charge to and Process for Internal Working Group
- Preparation of Campus Resource Groups

October – January
- Study Period
- February
- March
- Drafted
- Public Comment and ACTRP Recommendations

April
- ACTRP Recommendations Submitted
Communications Plan

- All Committee meetings are public
- Opportunity for public comment at each meeting
- Study Director Meetings
  - Key Legislators
  - Editorial Boards
- Regular access to journalists
- Campus briefings and open forums
- Website: http://www.cusys.edu/tenurereview/
Excerpt from RFP for Consulting Services to Review All Tenure-Related Processes
June 20, 2005

SECTION II. STATEMENT OF WORK

The ACTRP has developed a preliminary statement of the areas of inquiry for this study as well as a tentative list of deliverables and a timeline. As explained above, the ACTRP expects this study to be an iterative process, with the scope and details of the inquiry being subject to change as the study progresses. In addition, because this study appears to be path-breaking in its nature and extent, there are no templates available for defining the expected course and duration of the study. Therefore, this RFP will ask respondents to propose a methodology and possible work plan for study (e.g., should the study include confidential random audits, focus groups, quantitative analysis, quantitative assessments, personal interviews, etc.)

Preliminary Areas of Inquiry

The following are suggested Areas of Inquiry that will guide the efforts of both the External (consultant) and Internal Working Groups. However, given that the process is expected to be iterative in nature, prospective consultants should expect that the scope of the inquiry may evolve as the project develops and information is gathered.

I. General areas of inquiry applicable to all tenure-related processes include the following:

A. Are the University’s laws, policies, and procedures on (1) hiring tenure track faculty, (2) reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and (3) post-tenure review understandable and easily accessible?

B. What are the major differences in tenure-related processes among the schools and campuses? The Medical School has several important variations in its tenure-related processes, which may raise distinct questions. The consultant will most likely need to revise or reframe specific questions for the Medical School case (and perhaps other cases).

C. Are these policies and procedures followed at the primary unit and upper levels through the president’s office?

D. Are the specific parties responsible for the tenure-related criteria and processes for the various primary units, schools, and campuses identified clearly? How are these criteria and processes reviewed and
approved? By whom and how frequently are reviews conducted and approvals made?

E. Are these policies and procedures effective in the recruitment, selection, retention and tenure of highly qualified faculty who align with institutional missions and who offer long term strategic value to the primary unit, the school/college, and the university, including the value of diversity?

F. Should changes be made in these policies and procedures to improve their effectiveness in (1) the hiring of tenure-track faculty, (2) the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure track candidates, and (3) post-tenure review?

G. Are candidates informed in a timely fashion about the progress of their reviews through these procedures?

H. What benchmarks and best practices are available from other institutions against which our tenure practices could be measured?

I. Are there processes in place to identify deficiencies in tenure-related processes?

II. Areas of inquiry related to specific tenure-related processes include the following:

A. Search and Hiring Processes.

1. Are the current application, search, recruitment, and hiring processes for tenure-track faculty effective in identifying, attracting, and hiring viable and productive tenure-track candidates who meet identified primary unit needs, including the need for diversity?

B. Faculty Development and Retention.

1. What policies and practices are in place for mentoring tenure-track faculty? Are they implemented?

2. Are tenure-track candidates adequately informed of the primary unit criteria for reaching decisions about a candidate’s performance? Are the primary unit criteria effective in guiding
reappointment and tenure decisions which benefit the university? How do these criteria compare to those at other universities?

3. Do the faculty development and mentoring processes result in the retention of promising candidates who meet the missions and strategic needs of the primary unit, the college/school, and the institution, including the need for diversity?

4. To what extent is the reappointment review effective in the mentoring process?

5. Are post-tenure reviews and professional plans effective means for faculty development and evaluation?
C. Annual Evaluation.

1. How rigorous is the annual evaluation process in each of the categories being evaluated?

2. How effective is the current process for annual review in preparing candidates for comprehensive review?

3. Are there appropriate linkages between the outcome of the annual review of a candidate and the comprehensive and tenure reviews? To what extent should tenure review consider the accumulation of annual reviews in its process?

4. Is the annual evaluation process after tenure effective in identifying and addressing performance issues?

D. Reappointment and Comprehensive Review.

1. How rigorous and effective is the evaluation process at comprehensive review?

2. Are the reappointment and comprehensive review processes designed to move forward those candidates who meet primary unit needs and are qualified for tenure?

3. To what extent do the institutions use the comprehensive review as an opportunity to evaluate the candidate’s long-term strategic value to the primary unit and to what extent do they evaluate if they are consistent with the goals and objectives of the school/college and the institution?

4. To what extent do other institutions use the comprehensive review as an opportunity to evaluate the candidate’s professional conduct as part of the reappointment process?

E. Tenure Review.

1. How rigorous and effective is the evaluation process at tenure review?
2. Is the tenure review process designed to result in the tenure of candidates who are likely to make significant and continuing contributions?

3. To what extent and how do other institutions use the tenure review as an opportunity to evaluate the candidate's professional conduct?

4. To what extent do other institutions evaluate the candidate's long-term strategic value to the primary unit to see if this is consistent with the goals and objectives of the school/college and the institution?

F. Post-tenure Review

1. How rigorous and effective is the evaluation process at time of post-tenure review?

2. Are the current locus and levels of review appropriate and sufficient?

3. Does the post-tenure process result in the timely identification of performance deficiencies and lead to appropriate action for addressing those deficiencies?

4. To what extent and how do other institutions use the post-tenure review as an opportunity to evaluate the candidate's professional conduct?

5. To what extent do other institutions evaluate the candidate's long-term strategic value to the primary unit to see if this is consistent with the goals and objectives of the school/college and the institution?

G. Dismissal for Cause

1. Is the existing dismissal for cause process timely and effective in dismissing tenured faculty members?

Tentative Deliverables

The consultant shall provide a draft report to the Study Director that summarizes its study of the above areas of inquiry (as such may be amended by the ACTRP
and the Study Director during the course of the inquiry). The report shall address these four principal topics:

I. Identify and document the University’s tenure-related policies.
   A. What are the University’s main tenure-related policies?
   B. Are they understandable and accessible?
   C. How are the policies established and applied at individual school levels? How is such implementation monitored? How is the implementation reviewed or overseen?
   D. How do they vary across campuses and units of the University?

II. Evaluate these tenure-related policies and their implementation in practice.
   A. Are these policies effective at achieving their stated purpose(s)?
   B. Is there consistent compliance with these policies?
   C. What do the results of a confidential random audit of the implementation of the University’s tenure-related processes indicate?

III. Examine tenure-related policies and practices at other institutions.
   A. What examples at other institutions would allow for the University to compare and evaluate the relative effectiveness of its tenure-related processes and practices?
   B. What best practices can be identified at other institutions that may be applicable to the University?

IV. Recommend changes.
   A. What changes are recommended to the University’s tenure-related processes?

In addition, some members of the consultant team will be required to participate in the Drafting Group (see Section I above) that will reconcile the draft reports and recommendations of the Internal and External (consulting) Working Groups into the Study Director’s Report.

Considerations Regarding Subsequent Additions to the Scope of Work

The University reserves the right to include in the scope of services any services required to successfully support or complete the study. Accordingly, specific project services, deliverables, cost, work plans and the like for subsequent or
additional services will be negotiated and agreed to between the University and the awarded vendor before any subsequent work is begun. Any additions to the scope of work that occur prior to the submission of the final ACTRP report shall have the approval of the ACTRP. Any additions to the scope of work that occur after the submission of the final ACTRP report shall not require the approval of the ACTRP.

Ownership of Intellectual Property Rights

The University considers this consulting engagement to be "work for hire" and therefore the University will own all intellectual property rights created as a result of this engagement.

Preliminary Timeline

May 2005 Study Director appointed

June 2005 Scope of work finalized
RFP for working group written and released
RFP process begins
Campus Resource Groups assemble documents for review

August 2005 RFP process completed
Consultants (External Working Group) contracted
Working Groups and Study Director hold initial meetings
Internal and External Working Groups begin separate studies

January 2006 Internal and External Working Groups deliver draft reports to Study Director

February 2006 Study Director's report issued to ACTRP and released

March 2006 ACTRP holds public and stakeholders' review meetings to gather comments
ACTRP presents its findings and recommendations to
the Board of Regents, the Faculty Council and the administration, including the un-amended Study Director's Report.

**Contract Term**

The initial term of this contract is anticipated to be for a period commencing upon award (approximately September 1, 2005) and ending upon receipt of all deliverables. If the University requires additional services after that time, the contract may be extended for up to as long a time as necessary to complete the additional services. However, in no case will the term of the contract exceed five years. The University reserves the right to cancel this contract at any time upon written notice given thirty (30) days in advance. The University will give written documentation to the contractor as to the reason for cancellation. Authorized services performed for the University will be paid for through the cancellation date.