Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review

The Primary Unit

The Department of Bioengineering serves as the primary unit for faculty. Voting members of the primary unit are tenured faculty in Bioengineering. Until the Department has three voting members, the Chair shall add tenured faculty (within the CU system) from related disciplines who have the expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record (such as faculty with joint or affiliate appointments in Bioengineering) to create a primary unit of at least 3 members. In these situations, the primary unit may have a different composition for each tenure-track faculty member because of the different specializations of the tenure-track faculty.

In considering promotions to full professor, the voting members of the primary unit shall be full professors. If the primary unit lacks three full professors in Bioengineering, the Chair shall add tenured full professors (within the CU system) from closely related disciplines who have the expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record (such as faculty with joint or affiliate appointments in Bioengineering) to create a primary unit of at least 3 members.

Even after the Department achieves the threshold of three tenured (for tenure decisions) or three full professors (for promotion to full), the Chair may augment a primary unit by adding faculty from other units (within the CU system) with particular expertise in the candidate’s field. Faculty added to a candidate’s primary unit normally remain on the primary unit for its deliberations on tenure and promotion.

The primary unit is charged with evaluating the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the criteria provided in this document (see Criteria section).

The primary unit has the authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure. Recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are made by the department by a majority vote. The primary unit shall vote separately on the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the terms “not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent.”

Criteria for Reappointment (Comprehensive Review)

All candidates for tenure must undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review. This is normally undertaken in the fourth year of appointment. The faculty member undergoing review (i.e., the
candidate), assisted by the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair, will develop a dossier with materials reflecting his/her record in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The reappointment evaluation measures whether the candidate is on a reasonable trajectory to receive tenure. The section entitled Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor provides detailed explanations of expectations.

As part of the reappointment evaluation, the chair or his/her designee will solicit at least 3 letters from external evaluators concerning the candidate’s research/scholarship. The primary unit may solicit names of external evaluators from the candidate consistent with university policy.

To be reappointed, the candidate must receive a meritorious evaluation in all three areas and must be on track to develop a record of excellence in either teaching or research. The evaluation should indicate what the candidate’s areas of strength are and also what areas of weakness exist. Special attention should be given to advising the candidate on remedies. For example, a faculty mentor might be provided for a faculty member with problems teaching large classes. Or a senior faculty member might advise the candidate on the best way to focus and accelerate research and publication. Candidates with weaknesses in certain areas should be counseled by the chair and colleagues on how to get on track for tenure. A candidate who demonstrates major weaknesses and who exhibits little or no promise of improvement or accomplishment and who is quite evidently not on a trajectory to achieve tenure should be recommended for termination (non-renewal).

Candidates should be advised to focus their efforts on achieving a record of excellence in either teaching or research. (Being highly meritorious in both will not result in a positive recommendation for tenure; there must be a record of excellence in one.)

Candidates are responsible for their own careers and records, but the department has an obligation to provide advice and mentoring where needed.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in research, teaching and service. Tenure-track faculty will undergo review for tenure and promotion no later than their seventh year of appointment. Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may request a deferral in his/her tenure evaluation for certain conditions (maternity leave, etc.) Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may also request early evaluation of tenure.

A pre-tenure faculty member (the candidate) seeking tenure must present his/her record in the form of a dossier. It is the responsibility of the department chair or a faculty member chosen by the department chair to help the candidate develop the dossier. The candidate should refer
to the University’s “Standards Processes and Procedures” document for a guide to the steps involved in the evaluation process.

Regent policy states that the program requirements of the department shall be considered at the time of appointment and reappointment; the merit of the candidate shall be the primary consideration in recommendations for the award of tenure.

Primary unit evaluators, assisted by external reviewers, provide an evaluation of the candidate in all three Regent-mandated categories—teaching, research/scholarship and service. External evaluators normally focus primarily on the research/scholarship record of the candidate though they may also comment on the teaching and service record, if they have knowledge of these activities. Six letters from external evaluators are required; these evaluators are selected by the primary unit. The candidate may recommend a list of external evaluators from which one or two possible evaluators are chosen. The candidate may also recommend certain fields or sub-fields from which evaluators should be chosen in order to provide a comprehensive evaluation in the multi-disciplinary world of bioengineering. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility to determine the external evaluators.

The possible ratings are excellent, meritorious and not meritorious. To achieve tenure, a candidate must be evaluated by the primary unit committee (by majority vote) and by subsequent levels of evaluation (college and campus) to be at least meritorious in all areas and excellent in either teaching or research. A record is kept of the primary unit’s votes in each of the three areas and reported to the Dean and the Dean’s Advisory Committee.

Each candidate will have a somewhat different profile of achievements and strengths. Any candidate recommended by the primary unit for tenure should add overall strength to the Department and help it maintain excellence in teaching, research/scholarship and service.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Any tenured associate professor may apply for promotion to full professor. Normally, the interval between achieving tenured associate professor status and applying for full professor status is about seven years, but a candidate with a record he/she feels meets the standards for full professor may apply at any time after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. The candidate puts together a dossier, advised by the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair. The primary unit solicits 6 letters from external evaluators on the candidate’s qualifications to be promoted to full professor. The candidate may nominate a list from which one or two external evaluators are chosen. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility in selecting the external evaluators.
The University’s policy “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion” sets the standard for full professor as having: “(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 can be shown to 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, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”

Full professors are expected to continue to be highly productive members of the department and to take leadership roles as appropriate.

Full professors have an overall record of excellence that shows evidence of substantial and continued growth in accomplishments. To achieve a record of overall excellence, the candidate’s record in at least two of the three categories should be evaluated as Excellent. Continued service to the department, particularly as mentors to junior colleagues, college, university, community or profession is also an important component of the evaluation for full professor.

Criteria for Successful Post-Tenure Review

University policy requires that every tenured faculty member undergo post-tenure review every five years. A post-tenure review committee will be constituted by the chair, consisting of tenured faculty within the department. The chair may select tenured faculty from outside the department (within the University of Colorado system) to serve on this committee as well. The post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member’s professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member’s record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance report, including FCOs, peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member’s five-year professional plan.

One feature of the University’s post-tenure review process is the identification of problems that may arise in a tenured faculty member’s record BEFORE the mandated post-tenure review. In any case in which the annual merit evaluation produces a “below expectation” rating (still in effect after any appeal of such a rating), the faculty member so rated must work with the chair to develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) that includes specific goals, timelines and benchmarks to measure progress. The PIA can be for one or two years. If the faculty
member achieves a “meeting expectations” at the annual evaluation following the PIA, the process is complete and the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle.

If at the end of the PIA, the annual evaluation is still “below expectations,” the faculty member must participate in an Extensive Review, assisted by an ad hoc committee in the Department that helps to identify areas of weakness and potential remedies. The resulting Development Plan sets benchmarks and timelines (similar to the PIA process). If the resulting annual review is “meeting expectations” or better, the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle. If at the end of the Development Process, the faculty member’s work is still “below expectations,” the faculty member will normally have his/her tenure revoked and his/her employment terminated (for professional incompetence and/or dereliction of duty) by the Board of Regents. In certain circumstances, other sanctions may be imposed. If they believe it to be warranted, the department chair and committee may provide recommendations for alternate sanctions to the dean. The Board makes the final determination.

Faculty Recruitment

Faculty members recruited into the department will be appointed at the level appropriate to their position. Faculty hires entering the department without tenure at their prior institution and who ask for a tenured-appointment within the department will have to undergo the normal tenure evaluation process prior to joining the department as a tenured member. For faculty without tenure who wish to be considered for tenure after joining the department, the letter of offer must clearly indicate the time by which the faculty member must apply for tenure.

The following matrix provides examples of activities that would be considered meritorious or excellent in the areas of evaluation. This list is intended to reflect some of the example of work or achievements by faculty and is not intended to be comprehensive.
Promotion Criteria Matrix

The following is intended to present examples of various levels of accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. It is not exclusionary, but is intended to assist faculty, department chairs and promotion committees in matching candidates’ accomplishments to the promotion criteria. Moreover, areas frequently overlap in practice, although they are presented as distinct entities here.

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, it is expected that the candidate will satisfy some of the typical criteria for excellence. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, it is expected that the candidate will achieve excellence through more criteria.

**Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Active participation in teaching activities of the department, including two or more of the following: presenting a series of lectures covering one or more topics; coordinating a course, acting as primary instructor in a course, advising students, mentoring students and/or fellows, seminar or journal club organizer, small group or laboratory teacher, continuing education activities.</td>
<td>1. Regularly assumes greater than average share of teaching duties - e.g., course director, fellowship director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meritorious peer reviews of class meetings and other teacher-student venues</td>
<td>2. Consistently receives outstanding teaching evaluations or teaching awards, recognition as an outstanding role model for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum advising and participation in curriculum review or revision for the program</td>
<td>3. Acquiring (PI) teaching or curriculum development grants (e.g. T32, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meritorious teaching evaluations from students and peers.</td>
<td>4. Trains students/fellows who pursue outstanding academic careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development or redevelopment of teaching materials for students, continuing education courses and/or other faculty training.</td>
<td>5. Develops innovative teaching methods such as educational software, videotapes, packaged courses or workshops, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meritorious standardized student evaluations (FCQs) from every course. This measure is required by the Board of Regents. Normally, there are no FCQ for independent study and thesis advisory.</td>
<td>6. Successfully runs regional continuing education courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Consistent participation in national educational activities - e.g., programs sponsored by professional organizations, re-certification, workshops and symposia, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Provides educational leadership by writing syllabi, textbooks or assuming an administrative role (e.g., Assistant Dean Research, Academic Planning, Student Services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Publications on teaching in peer-reviewed journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
roles. However, letters from students in independent study or whose thesis was advised by the candidate or interviews with such students by a member of the primary unit can assist in evaluations.

7. Solicited and unsolicited opinions of students and recent graduates, if available

8. Invitations to present Grand Rounds/seminars here and at other institutions; invitations to present courses outside of primary department.

9. Invitations to be a visiting professor at another institution.

10. Peer-reviewed conference presentations on teaching methods or curricular innovations.

*Less than meritorious* evaluations are based on a record that does not rise to the level of merit describe above. Consistently poor teaching evaluations, little effort to improve teaching, a pattern of student complaints deemed legitimate, and uninspired or ineffective mentoring are indications of a less-than-meritorious record.
Research

**Meritorious**

1. Sustained research focus, building a coherent body of research findings/innovation.
2. Authorship of papers in high quality peer-reviewed journals.
3. Co-investigator on grants.
4. A sustained role in the management of a research program with external funding.
5. Entrepreneurial activities such as licenses, contracts with venture capitalists or other developers of research finding to achieve practical application.
6. Presentations at national meetings; invited research seminars.

**Excellent**

1. A consistent level of peer-reviewed and/or other funding for research over a sustained period of time.
2. Served as a primary mentor to graduate students who successfully completed or are on the path to successfully complete their Ph.D.
3. Provide consistent research support for at least 2 graduate students per year.
4. Demonstrated evidence of originality as an investigator.
5. Principal investigator status on peer-reviewed grants.
7. An ongoing, peer-reviewed publication record with senior author publications.
8. A national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference, invitations to present at national/international meetings, visiting professorships, service on study sections, organizing national meetings, serving as a national consultant, or on editorial boards of journals, etc.

Less than meritorious evaluations result from a record that is seriously lacking in some of the areas described above. Failure to obtain grant support (even as a collaborator), research without focus, and lack of publications are obvious signs of a less-than-meritorious work
Service

Meritorious
1. Willingness to perform department services (serving on committees, being faculty advisor to student clubs/organizations, etc.).
2. Serving on departmental committees.
3. Involvement in professional societies, especially serving as an officer or committee chair.
4. Outreach to the community (lectures, guest presentation, coaching pre-college students, serving on boards and committees, etc.).
5. Engaging in college-wide or university-wide service, including faculty governance.
6. Participating in grant and paper reviews.

Excellent
1. Externally documented exceptional leadership in a professional society.
2. Assumption of a substantive leadership role at the regional or national level - i.e., chairing committees, or accepting positions as officer of local or statewide professional organizations.
3. Editorial role in a journal.
4. High impact outreach to the community as evidenced by external review, independent media sources, etc.
5. Chairing NIH study sections or grant review sections.

Less than meritorious evaluations of service derive from the candidate’s unwillingness to undertake a reasonable level of service to the department, the college and campus, the profession, or the larger community. Refusing to serve or consistently failing to attend or participate in departmental, college or campus service is an indication of less-than-meritorious service. A pattern of disruptive and unprofessional behavior in service activities is also deemed less than meritorious.
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This document outlines the expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These evaluation benchmarks are not meant to be exclusionary; rather, the intent is to help faculty, the department chair, and review committees identify the expectations for faculty members. The criteria and standards in the document apply to tenure-track and tenured faculty with a workload assignment of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service (40-40-20), and should be applied for annual evaluations, reappointments, tenure cases, promotions, and post-tenure reviews.

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, a faculty member must have a record that is evaluated as excellent in either teaching or research and at least meritorious in the other two categories. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the faculty member must have a record that is evaluated as excellent overall since obtaining tenure. Faculty undergoing evaluation for tenure or promotion are responsible for preparing their dossier in accordance with the University and College policies.
1. Teaching

The standard teaching load for 40-40-20 tenured faculty is five courses per year subject to Department needs and Chair approval. The teaching load for faculty with a different workload assignment should refer to Research Incentive Guidelines for the Department of Civil Engineering and other related policies. Excellence in teaching is primarily evaluated by classroom teaching, student mentoring, and engagement in engineering education.

For consideration of excellence in teaching, faculty should exhibit some of the examples of excellence listed below.

**Meritorious**

1. Receives good course evaluations from Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs), faculty peer review, or other means of class assessment
2. Advises undergraduate and graduate students
3. Participates in curriculum development and improvement to existing courses
4. Attends and participates in college, department, center, or program educational initiatives and activities
5. Applies innovations in teaching, such as teaching with technology, teaching beyond classroom lectures, linking teaching to research or case studies
6. Takes teaching effectiveness training/workshops, etc.

**Excellent**

1. Receives excellent teaching evaluations from FCQs, faculty peer review, or other means of class assessment
2. Performs exemplary advising of undergraduate and graduate students by documenting achievements of advisees in their academic or professional careers
3. Develops new or completely revised courses that contribute to the department’s mission
4. Leads college, department, center, or program educational initiatives and activities
5. Develops innovation in teaching, such as teaching with technology (software, video clips, teaching packages, etc.), teaching beyond classroom lectures (industrial partnership, engineering projects, etc.)
6. Gives presentations of teaching/advising at local/regional/national meetings, seminars, and/or workshops
7. Receives teaching awards or documented recognition from peers or students for excellence in teaching
8. Publishes on teaching/advising in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, or textbooks
9. Receives external grants in support of educational programs
10. Holds Professional Engineer (PE) license
11. Serves as faculty advisor for student organization(s) (ASCE, ITE, Chi Epsilon, etc.)
2. Research

Excellence in research is primarily evaluated by quality publications in peer-reviewed archival journals and by a consistent level of competitive external research funding. Such activities are integrally related, as research funding is necessary to support students for research productivity, and quality publications are crucial to obtain research funding.

For consideration of excellence in research, faculty should exhibit some of the examples of excellence listed below.

**Meritiorius**

1. Develops and sustains clear research thrust(s)
2. Maintains active publishing record in peer-reviewed journals
3. Actively engages in proposal writing to external funding sources
4. Develops patents, software, or reports
5. Gives contributed presentations of research findings at national/international meetings, seminars, and/or workshops
6. Serves as a mentor to graduate students who successfully complete or are on the path to successfully complete their M.S. or Ph.D.

**Excellent**

1. Gains national and/or international research reputation within sustained research thrusts
2. Maintains a distinguished level of active publishing in peer-reviewed journals
3. Demonstrates sustained success in obtaining external funding as the principal or co-principal investigator that includes significant student support
4. Develops patents, software, or reports that contribute to advances in practice of discipline
5. Gives peer-reviewed conference paper presentations and/or invited presentations of research findings at national/international meetings, seminars, and/or workshops
6. Serves as a mentor to graduate students who successfully complete or are on the path to successfully complete their M.S. or Ph.D. and are presenting advised research at conferences, writing peer-reviewed papers, and/or writing grant proposals
3. Service

Faculty are expected to provide service to the department, college, and university. Faculty are also expected to serve both professional societies and the broader community. All tenure-track and tenured faculty must maintain a level of service that is commensurate with their workload assignment.

**Meritorious**
1. Serves on department, college, or university committee(s)
2. Participates in professional societies
3. Participates in grant and paper reviews
4. Reaches out to the community (continuing education, guest lectures, advising K-12 students, serving on boards and committees, etc.)

**Excellent**
1. Chairs department, college, or university committee(s)
2. Takes a leadership role in professional societies
3. Serves as editor for journal(s) or regularly published society newsletters, etc.
4. Documents high-impact outreach activities to the community
5. Chairs conference sessions and/or actively participates in conference planning activities or other professional society activities
6. Formally mentors junior faculty
7. Develops service contracts with industrial partners
These criteria and standards have been approved by the Civil Engineering Faculty:

Kevin L. Rens, Chair
Civil Engineering Department

2/7/2012
Date

These criteria and standards have been accepted and approved by:

Marc S. Ingber, Dean
College of Engineering and Applied Science

2/8/2012
Date

Roderick Nairn, Provost
University of Colorado Denver

4/13/2012
Date
Criteria and Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review

Approved by CSE Faculty on May 3, 2011; Revised and Approved by Unanimous Vote during the Faculty Meeting of 9/19/2011,

Incorporated comments from Academic Affairs and Approved by Unanimous Vote during the Faculty Meeting of 10/24/11

The Primary Unit:

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering serves as the primary unit for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews of its faculty. Voting members of the primary unit are full-time tenured faculty in the department. In cases where the department does not have a minimum of three members at the appropriate rank to serve on the CSE primary unit, the department chair, in consultation with the members of the primary unit, shall add tenured faculty with appropriate rank (within the CU system) with particular expertise in the candidate’s field to evaluate the candidate’s record in order to create a one-time primary unit. In considering promotions to full professor, the voting members of the primary unit shall be full professors. The primary unit is charged with evaluating the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the criteria provided in this document.

The primary unit has the authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review. Recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are made by the primary unit by a majority vote. The primary unit shall vote separately on the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the terms “not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent.”

Roles and Responsibilities in Preparing the Dossier and External Evaluators:

Faculty undergoing evaluation for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are responsible for preparing their dossier in accordance with the University and College policies. The department chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair may provide guidance and mentorship in this process. Candidates should refer to the University’s “Standards Processes and Procedures” document for a guide to the steps involved in the evaluation process.

As part of the reappointment, tenure and promotion evaluation, the chair or his/her designee will solicit a number of letters from external evaluators concerning the candidate’s teaching, research, and service consistent with the Department’s Criteria and Standards and the University’s established procedures. The primary unit will also solicit names of external evaluators from the candidate for a subset of external letters to be solicited.

Faculty Professional Activities:

In evaluating a faculty member’s professional activity, the faculty member’s achievement is evaluated in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The following provides expectations of each of research, teaching and service activities that would be considered meritorious or excellent in the areas of evaluation.
A. Research: The record of the candidate’s research will be based on the quality of research publications, their impact in the field, and external funding. A candidate’s ability to conduct independent research is also a factor and may be evidenced by joint research publications with graduate students, sole and senior authorship, principle investigator on external funding, and others as provided by the candidate.

**Meritorious:** To achieve a rating of meritorious in research, faculty should be active in proposal writing to external funding sources and maintain an active publishing record in appropriate journals with some evidence of primary authorship (with the exception of students). Faculty should demonstrate that he/she has developed (or is developing) clear research thrusts. Participation in national conferences and patents are also considered contributions towards research activity.

**Excellent:** To achieve a rating of excellent in research, faculty should have demonstrated success as a PI and/or a Co-PI with a leading role in obtaining external funding that includes student support. Faculty should demonstrate sustained effort to obtain funding from competitive external funding sources. Faculty should actively advise students’ research. Faculty should also maintain an active publishing record in appropriate upper-tier journals with some evidence of primary authorship (with the exception of students). Participation in national conferences and patents are contributions to research activities as well. Faculty should demonstrate evidence of significant impact of their research in the field.

B. Teaching: Teaching responsibility for faculty involves classroom instruction, individual student supervision and mentoring, curriculum and laboratory developments, educational research and initiatives in the department and the college. The nominal teaching load for 40-40-20 faculty is four courses per academic year unless special arrangements are made with the department.

**Meritorious:** To achieve a rating of meritorious in teaching, faculty should receive good course evaluations where evaluations should include FCQ’s, faculty peer review, and/or other means of assessment. Faculty should mentor student projects and/or theses.

**Excellent:** To achieve a rating of excellent in teaching, faculty must receive good to excellent course evaluations where evaluations should be a combination of FCQ’s, faculty peer review, and other means of assessment. Faculty should mentor student projects and/or theses. Faculty should be involved in some of the following activities related to teaching: curriculum and laboratory development, mentoring graduate teaching assistants with teaching responsibilities, textbook publishing, co-authoring papers with educational content with students, and working on college and departmental educational initiatives. Excellence in teaching should also include external funding for education activities or equipment and publications in upper tier peer reviewed engineering education journals and conferences. Excellence in teaching must be supported by appropriate external review documenting the excellence in teaching.

C. Service: Faculty service is required for the maintenance and improvement of the CSE Programs. Departmental service responsibilities include, but are not limited to, advising students, program assessments, active memberships in departmental committees, and performing various evaluations of faculty performance. Faculty service may also include performing College
and University tasks and service to professional and scholarly societies. Faculty are expected to attend College and Departmental meetings. All tenured or tenure-track faculty must maintain a level of service that is commensurate with their workload requirements.

**Meritorious:** To achieve a rating of meritorious in service, faculty are expected to maintain a service load commensurate with the 20% workload requirement. For the small CSE department, service at the departmental level will help the maintenance and improvement of its programs.

**Excellent:** To achieve a rating of excellent in service, faculty are expected to meet the requirements to be meritorious and have performed service that has significant impact as determined by faculty peers.

**Criteria for Reappointment (also called the comprehensive review)**

All candidates for tenure must undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review. This is normally undertaken in the fourth year of appointment. The reappointment evaluation measures whether the candidate is on a reasonable trajectory to receive tenure.

To be reappointed, the candidate must receive a meritorious evaluation in all three areas and must be on track to develop a record of excellence in either teaching or research. The evaluation should indicate what the candidate’s areas of strength are and also what areas of weakness exist. Candidates should be advised to focus their efforts on achieving a record of excellence in either teaching or research. (Being highly meritorious in both will not result in a positive recommendation for tenure; there must be a record of excellence in one.)

**Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in research, teaching and service. Tenure-track faculty will undergo review for tenure and promotion no later than their seventh year of their appointment. Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may request a deferral in his/her tenure evaluation for certain conditions (maternity leave, etc.) Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may also request early evaluation of tenure. Regent policy states that the program requirements of the department shall be considered at the time of appointment and reappointment.

Primary unit evaluators, assisted by external reviewers, provide an evaluation of the candidate in all three Regent-mandated categories—teaching, research, and service.

To achieve tenure, a candidate must be evaluated by the primary unit committee (by majority vote) and by subsequent levels of evaluation (college and campus) to be at least meritorious in two areas and excellent in either teaching or research.

Each candidate will have a somewhat different profile of achievements and strengths. Any candidate recommended by the primary unit for tenure should add overall strength to the Department and help it maintain excellence in teaching, research and service.
Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Any tenured associate professor may apply for promotion to full professor. Normally, the interval between achieving tenured associate professor status and applying for full professor status is about seven years, but a candidate with a record he/she feels meets the standards for full professor may apply at any time after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. The University’s policy “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion” sets the standard for full professor as having: “(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 can be shown to 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, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”

Full professors are expected to continue to be highly productive members of the department and to take leadership roles as appropriate.

Full professors have an overall record of excellence that shows evidence of substantial and continued growth in accomplishments. To achieve a record of overall excellence, the candidate should not rely on the extra strength in one of the categories to compensate for the weakness in the other. A continued record of service including whether they have taken leadership roles is an important component of the evaluation for promotion to full professor.

Criteria for Successful Post-Tenure Review

University policy requires that every tenured faculty member undergo post-tenure review every five years. A post-tenure review committee will be constituted by the chair, consisting of tenured faculty within the department. For reviewing the full professor’s record, the committee must consist of full professors. In accordance to the University’s Post-tenure Review Policy and Procedures, the post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member’s professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member’s record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance reports, including FCQs, peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member’s five-year professional plan.

Faculty recruitment

Faculty members recruited into the department will be appointed at the level appropriate to their position. Faculty hires entering the department without tenure at their prior institution will not be awarded tenure at the time of their hire. For faculty without tenure who wish to be considered for tenure after joining the department, the letter of offer must clearly indicate the time by which the faculty member must apply for tenure.
Department of Electrical Engineering

Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review Process and Procedures

September 22, 2011

The Primary Unit

The Department of Electrical Engineering (EE) serves as the primary unit for the EE faculty reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review evaluations. The totality of the primary unit committee consists of all full-time tenured faculty in Electrical Engineering at UC Denver. In the cases of promotion to full Professor and post-tenure review of full professors, the primary unit committee consists of all the full-time tenured full professors in EE. In all cases, the primary unit evaluation committee of a tenure-track faculty must have at least three members.

In cases where the need may arise, the department chair, in consultation with the members of the EE primary unit committee, shall add to the committee guest members that are tenured faculty outside of the EE department but within the University of Colorado Denver (UCD) system, to secure a committee membership of at least three. In the cases of promotion to full professor or post-tenure review of full professors, the guest committee members must be tenured full professors. Thus, the composition of primary unit committees may sometimes vary across different evaluated faculty.

The primary unit committee is charged with the task of evaluating the teaching, research and service record of the evaluated faculty (named the candidate), using the criteria provided in this document (see Criteria section).

The primary unit committee has the authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure. When a recommendation is unanimously reached, it will be stated in a report signed by all the members of the committee. When there is a disagreement among the members of the committee regarding the recommendation, both the majority and the minority views must be included in the submitted recommendation report, signed by all the committee members. The primary unit committee shall vote separately on the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the terms “not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent.”

Criteria for Reappointment (also called the comprehensive review)

All candidates for tenure must undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review. This is normally undertaken in the fourth year of appointment. The faculty member undergoing review (i.e., the candidate), assisted by the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair, will develop a dossier with materials reflecting his/her record in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The reappointment evaluation measures whether the candidate is on a reasonable trajectory to receive tenure. The section entitled Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor provides detailed explanations of expectations.

For reappointment evaluations, the EE primary unit committee coincides with the EE primary unit and consists of all full-time tenured faculty.

As part of the reappointment evaluation, the primary unit committee will solicit at least 3 letters from external evaluators concerning the candidate’s research/scholarship.

To be reappointed, the candidate must receive a meritorious evaluation in all three areas and must be on track to achieve a record of excellence in either teaching or research. Candidates should be advised to focus their efforts on achieving a record of excellence in either teaching or research. (Being highly
meritorious in both will not result in a positive recommendation for tenure; there must be a record of excellence in one.)

Candidates are responsible for their own careers and records, but the department has an obligation to provide advice and mentoring where needed.

**Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in research, teaching and service. Tenure-track faculty will be under review for tenure and promotion no later than their seventh year of appointment. Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may request a deferral in his/her tenure evaluation under certain conditions (maternity leave, etc.) Per Regent’s policies, a faculty member may also request early evaluation of tenure.

A pre-tenured faculty member (the candidate) seeking tenure must present his/her record in the form of a dossier. It is the responsibility of the department chair or a faculty member chosen by the department chair to help the candidate prepare the dossier. The candidate should refer to the University’s “Standards Processes and Procedures” document for a guide to the steps involved in the evaluation process.

Primary unit evaluators (the candidate’s primary unit committee), assisted by external reviewers, provide an evaluation of the candidate in all three Regent-mandated categories—teaching, research/scholarship and service. External evaluators normally focus primarily on the research/scholarship record of the candidate though they may also comment on the teaching and service record, if they have knowledge of such activities.

Six letters from external evaluators are required; the candidate’s primary unit committee selects these evaluators. The candidate may also recommend certain fields or sub-fields from which external evaluators may be chosen, to provide a comprehensive evaluation in the multi-disciplinary world of Electrical Engineering. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility to determine the external evaluators. While the completion of the dossier is the responsibility of the candidate, the primary unit committee has the responsibility to provide an in-class review of the candidate’s teaching and to solicit a set of student letters of the candidates teaching. The primary unit committee must perform a detailed and multifaceted analysis of all material provided in the candidate’s dossier.

The possible evaluation ratings per category (teaching, research and service) are excellent, meritorious and not meritorious. To achieve tenure, a candidate must be evaluated by the majority of the primary unit committee and by the subsequent levels of evaluation (college and campus) to be at least meritorious in all areas and excellent in at least one of the teaching or research areas. A record will be kept of the primary unit committee’s votes in each of the three areas and will be reported to the Dean and the Dean’s Advisory Committee.

Each candidate will have a somewhat different profile of achievements and strengths. Any candidate recommended by the primary unit for tenure should add overall strength to the Department and help it maintain excellence in teaching, research/scholarship and service.

**Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

Any tenured associate professor may apply for promotion to full professor. Normally, the interval between achieving tenured associate professor status and applying for full professor status is
about seven years, but a candidate with a record he/she feels meets the standards for full professor may apply at any time after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. The candidate shall put together a dossier, assisted by the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair. The candidate may nominate three to four external evaluators among whom at most two will be selected by the committee. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility in selecting the external evaluators where at most a third of these evaluators are among those nominated by the candidate.

The University’s policy “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion” sets the standard for full professor as having: “(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 can be shown to 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, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”

Full professors are expected to continue to be highly productive members of the department and to take leadership roles as appropriate.

Full professors are expected to have an overall record of excellence that shows evidence of substantial and continued growth in accomplishments. To achieve a record of overall excellence, the candidate should not rely on the extra strength in one of the categories to compensate for the weakness in the other. A continued record of service is an important component of the evaluation for full professors. It should demonstrate service to the department, particularly as mentors to junior colleagues, college, university, and profession.

Criteria for Successful Post-Tenure Review

University policy requires that every tenured faculty member undergo post-tenure review every five years. For associate professors, the primary unit of the department, in its totality, serves as the post-tenure review committee. For reviewing the full professors’ record, the committee must consist of full professors only. If necessary, the department Chair, in consultation with the primary unit committee members from the department, shall add tenured faculty (within the College of Engineering and Applied Science) to form a one-time committee of at least three members, which will evaluate the candidate’s record.

The post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member’s professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member’s record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance report, including FCQs, peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member’s five-year professional plan. The possible evaluation ratings per category (teaching, research and service) are above expectation, meeting expectation and below expectation. According to The University’s policy “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion”, if the evaluation produces a “below expectation” rating (still in effect after any appeal of such a rating), the faculty member so rated must develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) that includes specific goals, timelines and benchmarks to measure progress. The PIA process is complete when a rating of “meeting expectation” is achieved and the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle.
PROMOTION CRITERIA
The following lists accomplishments for research, teaching, and service that would be components leading to the rating of meritorious or excellent in the three areas of evaluation.

Teaching
Meritorious
• Active participation in teaching activities of the department, including: presenting a series of lectures covering one or more topics; coordinating a course, acting as primary instructor in a course, advising students, mentoring students, being seminar series organizer, being small group or laboratory teacher, being involved in continuing education activities.
• Obtaining meritorious peer reviews of class meetings and other teacher-student venues.
• Curriculum advising and participation in curriculum review or revision for the program.
• Obtaining meritorious peer teaching evaluations.
• Developing or redeveloping teaching materials for students, continuing education courses and/or other faculty training.
• Obtaining good course FCQs.
• Obtaining solicited and unsolicited opinions of students and recent graduates, if available. Solicited evaluations are carried out by the Primary Unit Committee.
• Being invited to present lectures/seminars at UCD and at other institutions.
• Serving on thesis and project defense committees in the department and the College.

Excellent
• Acquiring teaching, curriculum development or equipment grants.
• Developing multidisciplinary curricula.
• Publishing in refereed engineering education journals, refereed conference proceedings on teaching methods or curricular innovations.
• Publishing textbooks for undergraduate and graduate level pedagogy.
• Obtaining a combination of excellent FCQs and faculty peer teaching evaluations.
• Achieving university and college level recognition of teaching excellence in the form of awards.

Less than meritorious evaluations are based on a record that does not exhibit merits as those described above. Little effort to improve teaching and uninspired or ineffective student mentoring are indications of a less-than-meritorious record.
Research
Meritorious
• Maintaining sustained research focus, building a coherent body of research findings/innovation.
• Demonstrating sustained effort to obtain funding from external funding sources.
• Maintaining an active publishing record in appropriate journals and refereed conference proceedings.
• Being co-investigator on grants (support role for other UCD faculty).
• Obtaining UCD Faculty Development Awards and other internal funding, in the absence of external funding.
• Presenting invited research seminars at national conferences and meetings.
• Successful involvement of students in research activities including supervision/hiring of research assistants, mentoring/initiating senior design projects, or enabling of student research experience (travel to conference, workshop) that is not part of the standard curriculum.
• Being involved in entrepreneurial activities such as patents, licenses, contracts with venture capitalists or other developers of research finding, to achieve practical applications.

Excellent
• Obtaining external funding for research, including serving as principal investigator in some cases and receiving funding from competitive sources.
• Serving as a primary mentor to graduate students who complete their MS. This mentoring should include an effort to publish journal papers or conference papers with students.
• Maintaining an ongoing, upper-tier peer-reviewed journal publication record with some evidence of primary authorship with the exception of students.
• Creating new opportunities for research collaboration with academic institutions of superior reputation as evidenced by collaborative external funding awards and co-authored upper-tier peer-reviewed journal publications.
• Achieving national and/or international reputation, as may be evidenced by external letters of reference, keynote addresses at national/international meetings, science citations and h-index.

Less than meritorious evaluations result from a record that is seriously lacking in some of the areas described above. Having neither any grant support (even as a collaborator or from internal university sources) nor any publications are signs of a less-than-meritorious record.
Service

**Meritorious**
- Demonstrating willingness to perform department service (serving on committees, being involved in ABET activities, maintaining labs, advising students, being faculty advisor to student clubs/organizations, etc).
- Demonstrating willingness to provide mentorship and guidance to junior colleagues.
- Participating in faculty seminars.
- Being involved in professional societies, especially serving as an officer or committee Chair.
- Performing outreach to the community (lectures, guest presentations, coaching pre-college students, serving on boards and committees, etc).
- Engaging in departmental, college-wide or university-wide services, including faculty governance.
- Participating as a reviewer for publications and grant proposals.

**Excellent**
- Chairing a committee and taking a lead role to produce a high impact document on a department, college or campus level.
- Exhibiting externally documented exceptional leadership in a professional society.
- Assuming a substantive leadership role at the regional or national level, e.g., chairing committees, or accepting positions as officer of local or statewide professional organizations.
- Assuming an editorial role in a journal.
- Exhibiting high impact outreach to the community as evidenced by external reviews, independent media sources, etc.
- Participating in national funding agencies or grant review sections.
- Establishing new high level visible programs in the College or the University.
- Serving as session organizer or Chair for national meetings.

Less than meritorious evaluations result from a record that is seriously lacking in some of the areas described above. The candidate’s unwillingness to undertake a reasonable level of service to the department, the college and campus, the profession, or the larger community qualifies for a less than meritorious evaluation.

These criteria and standards have been approved by the Electrical Engineering Faculty.

Miloje Radenkovic, Chair
Department of Electrical Engineering

Marc S. Ingber, Dean
College of Engineering and Applied Science

Roderick Naim, Provost
University of Colorado Denver
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Mechanical Engineering Departmental Criteria and Standards for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

This document codifies the Mechanical Engineering Department’s criteria and standards for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The purpose of this criteria and standards document is to outline the expectations for a tenure-track faculty member to be judged as excellent or meritorious in teaching, research, and service as they proceed through the tenure and promotion process. The criteria will apply equally to tenured and non-tenured faculty who are on the 40-40-20 evaluation track and will be reflected in their yearly performance review and in tenure and promotion decisions. The University standard for granting tenure is that the faculty member must have a record that is evaluated as excellent in either research or teaching and at least meritorious in the other two categories. The University standard for promotion to full professor is that the faculty member must have a record that is evaluated as excellent overall and have demonstrated significant and sustained growth in research, teaching and service since obtaining tenure. Faculty undergoing evaluation for tenure or promotion are responsible for preparing their dossier in accordance with the University and College policies.

The Mechanical Engineering Departmental criteria for Research, teaching and service are:

I. Research

The fundamental hallmarks of an excellent research record are quality publications and external funding. These hallmarks are integrally related as quality publications are required to attract research funding, and research funding is necessary to support students to maintain publishing productivity. Publications and external funding will be evaluated using a two or three year rolling average for yearly evaluations and using the entirety of the research record at the University of Colorado Denver for tenure and promotion. Evaluation of a faculty member’s research record will include appropriate measures of impact.

- To achieve a rating of meritorious in research, faculty must be active in proposal writing to external funding sources and maintain an active publishing record in appropriate journals with some evidence of primary authorship (with the exception of students). Faculty must develop clear research thrusts. Participation in national conferences and patents will count as research activity.

- To achieve a rating of excellence in research, faculty must have demonstrated success as PI in obtaining external funding that includes student support. Faculty should demonstrate sustained effort to obtain funding from competitive external funding sources. Faculty should actively advise student research. Faculty must also maintain an active publishing record in appropriate upper-tier journals with some evidence of
primary authorship (with the exception of students). Refereed publications in national conferences and patents will count as research activity.

II. Teaching

Faculty teaching responsibilities necessarily include classroom instruction and individual mentoring of students. Faculty may also participate in research in engineering education, college and departmental educational initiatives and other teaching related activities. The nominal teaching load for 40-40-20 faculty is four courses per academic year unless special arrangements are made with the department subject to the Chair’s approval and departmental need.

- To achieve a rating of meritorious in teaching, faculty must receive average to good course evaluations where evaluations should include FCQ’s, and some combination of faculty peer review, and other means of assessment. Faculty should individually mentor student projects or theses.

- Excellence in teaching requires the same level of effort as excellence in research. To achieve a rating of excellence in teaching, faculty must receive good to excellent course evaluations where evaluations should include FCQ’s and some combination of faculty peer review, and other means of assessment. Faculty should individually mentor student projects or theses. Faculty should be involved in some of the following activities related to teaching: Mentoring GTA’s with teaching responsibilities, textbook publishing, and working on college and departmental educational initiatives. Excellence in teaching also requires that the faculty member receives external funding for education activities or equipment and that the faculty member publish in upper-tier venues in engineering education. Excellence in teaching will also require appropriate external review documenting the excellence in teaching.

III. Service

Faculty service is required for the maintenance and improvement of the Mechanical Engineering Program. Departmental service responsibilities include, but are not limited to, developing and assessing the curriculum, advising students and performing various evaluations of faculty performance. Faculty service may also include performing College and University tasks and service to professional and scholarly societies. Faculty are expected to attend College and Departmental meetings. All tenured or tenure-track faculty must maintain a level of service that is commensurate with the 20% evaluation requirement.
• To achieve a rating of meritorious in service, faculty must maintain a service load commensurate with the 20% evaluation requirement. Service may be in any of the areas mentioned above.

• To achieve a rating of excellence in service, faculty must meet the requirement to be meritorious and have performed service that has significant impact.

These criteria and standards have been approved by the Mechanical Engineering Faculty:

______________________________ //signed// __________________________
Samuel W.J. Welch, Chair
Mechanical Engineering Department

These criteria and standards have been accepted and approved by:

______________________________ //signed// __________________________
Marc S. Ingber, Dean
College of Engineering and Applied Science

______________________________ //signed// __________________________
Roderick Nairn, Provost
University of Colorado Denver