III.C.iii  Other Special Programs

Other programs sponsored by the Department, such as the Statistical Consulting Service, are governed by written agreements negotiated at the time the program is initiated. Such governing documents may be modified by mutual agreement, but the Department reserves its right to withdraw its sponsorship at any time with the approval of the voting faculty.

Article IV

Personnel Policy

IV.A  Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

IV.A.i  Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

The Laws of the Regents contain criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) decisions throughout the University of Colorado system. This section interprets these general criteria for the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences of the University of Colorado Denver. The interpretations are necessarily subjective, but highlight the typically required achievements that contribute to reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions in this department.

IV.A.i.a  Primary Unit Criteria for Comprehensive Review

The principal purpose of a comprehensive review is to evaluate the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The comprehensive review provides internal and external feedback to improve the record for the tenure case. If there is not a realistic prospect for a successful tenure review, then the candidate should not be reappointed. Additionally, the program requirements of the department shall be considered at the time of reappointment.

IV.A.i.b  Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Regents’ criteria are as follows:

Tenure:  Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research or creative work.
**Associate Professor:** Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and promising accomplishment in research.

**IV.A.i.b.1 Teaching:** Tenure-track faculty members are expected to effectively teach their assigned courses and to participate in mentorship and training of students outside the classroom. A *meritorious* rating in teaching requires that the candidate is at least meritorious both in classroom teaching and in mentorship and training of students according to the criteria detailed below. An *excellent* rating requires excellence in both categories. Other teaching related activities and accomplishments may further strengthen the case for excellence.

**Classroom Teaching:** Classroom teaching is understood as planning, preparation, instruction, and assessment of students in regularly assigned courses including online courses.

- **Meritorious:** A *meritorious* rating requires a consistent record of effective teaching in assigned undergraduate and graduate courses. Teaching a variety of courses can help strengthen the case for a meritorious rating. Characteristics of effective teaching include competence in the material taught; quality course design consistent with the course description; satisfactory student evaluations and peer reviews; effective organization and use of class time; thoughtful student assessment through suitable assignments and timely feedback; availability, accessibility and helpfulness during office hours; respectful treatment of all students; a fair and consistent grading scheme in accordance with departmental standards; and compliance with any other department, college and university policies.

- **Excellent:** An *excellent* rating requires a sustained record of highly effective classroom teaching, which is characterized by strong student learning; high quality lectures, assignments, course organization and content; ability to adapt teaching styles to reach students at all levels in a variety of situations; high levels of classroom interaction; successful implementation of innovative teaching techniques; and high student satisfaction.

**Mentorship and Training:** Mentorship and training of students is understood as dedicated support of their professional development. This includes supervision of or collaboration with students in honors projects, Master’s projects or theses, or Ph.D. dissertations. It also includes more general student training through independent studies, readings courses, industrial or other internships, modeling competitions, summer workshops, or mentorship or training of teaching assistants.

- **Meritorious:** A *meritorious* rating requires a record that demonstrates dedication and ability to effectively work with students outside the classroom.

- **Excellent:** An *excellent* rating requires a strong record of successfully working with multiple students and demonstrated readiness to supervise doctoral students. Other indicators, which may strengthen the case for excellence include student research awards; successful placement of students in competitive positions in academia, industry, or government institutions; and joint publications with a clear contribution from students as lead or co-authors.
Additional Indicators of Excellence in Teaching:  Additional indicators that may strengthen the case for excellence in teaching include teaching awards; general curriculum development; the design of new courses; outreach to public schools and teachers; educational work with other organizations; publications related to the general scholarship and the practice of teaching and learning; and educational grants.

IV.A.i.b.2 Research:  Pre-tenured faculty members are expected to develop an active research program and to publish their work in high quality refereed journals. For the purpose of tenure, research is understood as the scholarship of discovery.

To earn tenure, a candidate must have produced a sustained record of accomplishment in the mathematical and statistical sciences that is of sufficient quantity and quality to demonstrate that

1. the candidate has established a productive research program with a clear plan of sustained research productivity after tenure;

2. the candidate’s work is of high quality and is respected by leading scholars;

3. the candidate has become an independent researcher who has grown substantially beyond the PhD.

The candidate’s research record is considered meritorious if it satisfies the above three criteria. It is considered excellent if, in addition, it demonstrates that

1. the candidate has built a strong reputation and is well-known in his/her field; and

2. the candidate has established a strong research program producing impactful results.

To satisfy the above criteria, the overall contribution, visibility, significance, and impact of the research will be judged as a whole. The following evidence will be used to assess the research record.

1. Quantity and quality of refereed publications.

   (a) The number of quality publications should be sufficient to establish that the productivity of the candidate’s research program compares favorably with that of other researchers with similar training and experience in their field. Papers in conference proceedings will be considered for this purpose only if they are rigorously refereed and of journal quality. Papers published prior to employment at CU Denver will be considered for this purpose, provided the candidate maintains a high level of productivity at CU Denver; however, greater emphasis will be given to work produced at CU Denver.

   (b) In cases of co-authorship, the weight of the candidate’s contributions relative to the other collaborators will be considered.

   (c) To demonstrate independence, a significant component of the record should consist of either i) publications with several different researchers or research groups, ii) papers co-authored only with students, or iii) singly authored papers.

2. External review letters. External review letters from leading scholars in the candidate’s field are required to assess how the candidate’s research record is perceived and how the candidate’s impact and productivity compares with other researchers in their field who have recently obtained tenure at research universities. For a meritorious rating, the letters should
indicate that the candidate is producing high quality work and is well respected by leading
researchers. For an excellent rating, the letters should indicate that the quality and impact of
the candidate’s research are excellent by the standards of the research community and that
the candidate has established a strong reputation.

3. Grant activity. External research funding provides strong evidence of the quality and potential
impact of the research and that the candidate’s research record is well respected. Strong
reviews of unfunded proposals will also be considered. The role of grants and proposals
will be evaluated in the light of the criteria set by the funding agencies and in the calls for
proposals, and the success rate.

4. Other indicators of excellence. The following evidence may strengthen the case for excel-
ence by providing additional indicators of quality, impact, or reputation: citations of research
results; honors and awards; invitations to visit other institutions or to speak at important con-
ferences, particularly invited plenary lectures; the use of one’s work in the academic, public,
or private sectors; or significant professional service activities indicating a strong reputation
(e.g. membership on respected editorial boards).

IV.A.i.b.3 Service: The criteria for evaluating service are intended to encourage junior faculty
to be involved and conscientious citizens of the department and of their professional community.
The department generally avoids making large service demands of tenure-track faculty so that
they can focus their energies on their research and teaching activities. For tenure, a meritorious
rating in service is characterized by

1. solid service to the Department as an involved and conscientious faculty member, includ-
ing attendance at faculty meetings, service on committees, and competent execution of all
assigned responsibilities; and

2. some professional service (for example, refereeing or reviewing papers).

Demonstrated leadership in service is not part of the criteria for tenure, and is not expected.

IV.A.i.c Primary Unit Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The Regents’ criteria are as follows:

Professor: Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equiva-
 lent, and (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, re-
search, scholarship or creative work, and service.

Promotion to full professor is based entirely on demonstrated growth and accomplishment,
not potential. The overall criterion is leadership, becoming an individual looked to by others,
which constitutes a substantial step beyond the expectations for an associate professor; for an
individual granted tenure after some service as an untenured associate professor, growth during
the entire period as an associate professor is considered. Thus, an important part of the stature
of a full professor is the ability to set one’s own goals, and to reach them at a level that will be
acknowledged by peers, internally and externally, as representative of professional excellence and leadership.

Different individuals will attain or exceed excellence in different areas, as they compile “a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent.” The standard applies to teaching, research, and service as a whole, so that required or sufficient criteria in any one area cannot be specified. For example, teaching that goes beyond excellent, to truly outstanding, could be combined with research that falls a bit below excellence and service that shows strong leadership to make a successful case for promotion; as another example, the analogue with teaching and research reversed could also occur. In such considerations, teaching and research each carry greater weight than service. As a guide, it is appropriate to discuss what could contribute to excellence in each area in the view of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences.

Teaching: At the full professor level, the criteria for excellence in teaching are similar to those at the tenure level; however, factors other than classroom teaching and student mentorship can play a larger role in establishing a record of excellence. For example, strong contributions to the teaching mission of the department through curriculum development; design of new courses; educational grants; publications related to the scholarship and practice of teaching and learning; or outreach to public schools might offset a record of student mentorship that falls slightly below excellent as defined in the tenure criteria.

Research: To demonstrate excellence at the full professor level in research, the overall issue is evidence of a strong scholarly reputation, in which one’s work has impact in one’s field and is cited, used, or built upon by others. This represents leadership in research. Very strong letters from leading scholars are necessary and especially important. Publications in highly respected outlets are also necessary, on a sustained, long-term basis. Other indicators can provide additional evidence of excellence, such as high productivity, high rates of citations by other researchers, use of one’s work in the academic, public, or private sectors, invitations to speak at important conferences, significant external funding, honors and awards, and other visible professional activities, e.g., membership on respected editorial boards, organization of major conferences, and invitations to visit other research institutions.

Service: For excellence in service, the most important achievement in a general sense is self-initiated leadership that makes significant contributions to the department, college, campus, and/or system; and being an individual looked to by others for guidance. This may take the form of major responsibilities in the department, mentorship of students or younger colleagues, substantial roles on committees at higher levels, and so on. Also important are leadership roles in the professional community, such as officer in a professional society, organizer of a conference, member of an editorial board, and professional service to community organizations; and outreach to the Denver community, including civic duties related to mathematics and science education.

IV.A.i.d Primary Unit RTP Committee

RTP Committees are formed at the department level to perform the department review of faculty members. These committees usually consist of faculty members above the rank of the faculty member under review.
IV.A.i.d.1 **Membership.** For each candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the department chair appoints three 3-member subcommittees to carry out an evaluation in the areas of teaching, research and service. The candidate may object to the inclusion of some faculty members, and if the matter cannot be resolved with the department chair, a final resolution will be made by the executive committee.

IV.A.i.d.2 **Augmenting the primary unit.** On occasion it may be deemed necessary to invite a person outside the department to serve on a subcommittee. Such a person should have the credentials to carry out an evaluation in the area the subcommittee is examining. Selection of such outside evaluators is made by the department chair in consultation with the candidate. Outside evaluators may vote within their subcommittee, but are not allowed to vote in any departmental vote on the candidate, unless the department agrees to extend voting privileges to these evaluators. In the case that there are fewer than 3 rostered professors in the department and external professors are required in a promotion to professor action, these external professors will be allowed to vote with the department.

IV.A.i.d.3 **Role of department chair.** The department chair may not be a member of any subcommittee, but will facilitate the functioning of the subcommittees. The department chair will write a separate evaluation of the candidate to be sent with the Department’s evaluation to the Dean of the College. The department chair may not vote in any departmental vote on the candidate. If the department chair is the candidate or is unable to perform the duties outlined in this section, the most senior professor in the department shall take over the duties of the department chair with regard to the RTP process.

IV.A.i.d.4 **Voting privileges by type of action.** There are no voting restrictions within a subcommittee. In any departmental vote on the candidate, only those members of the department at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring may vote on the candidate (except for the chair, who may not vote).

IV.A.i.d.5 **Activities of subcommittees.** The subcommittee’s role is to perform a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate in one of the three areas, write a report of the evaluation and make a recommendation to the department on a rating of “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent” of the work. The evaluation is based on the materials in the dossier in the light of departmental records and publicly available information. Any such sources should be summarized in the subcommittee reports. The written report is to be signed by all members of the subcommittee and a signed minority report may be included. In cases of reappointment and early tenure, suggestions for how a candidate’s rating could be improved may also be included. The subcommittee chair (or designee) presents the written report and gives a verbal summary to the department at a special meeting. The department discusses the report and can either accept it or return it to the subcommittee for revision. Upon acceptance of the report (by consensus, unless this can not be achieved) the department proceeds to vote (by secret ballot) on the candidate’s work as being “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” The report and this final vote are then forwarded to the Dean of the College by the chair of the Department.

In carrying out their charge, each subcommittee is responsible for certain actions dependent on the area being evaluated. The teaching subcommittee must visit the candidate during a class
period in which the candidate is actively involved with teaching and must prepare a written summary of the visit, which is included in the dossier. The teaching subcommittee shall also evaluate any written material provided by the candidate.

The research subcommittee is responsible for evaluating both the quality and quantity of the candidate’s research record. Outside letters help evaluate the quality of a candidate’s research. The research subcommittee must assess the areas of expertise and possible biases of the writers of these outside letters. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest. All letters received are included in the candidate’s file. These letters must be treated as confidential; they shall not be shared with the candidate, though a redacted summary of the evaluation, prepared by the subcommittee, shall be shared in writing with the candidate. Other factors that may be considered are outlined in the primary unit criteria (Sections IV.A.i.a, IV.A.i.b, IV.A.i.c). Such factors must be clearly identified with the weight attached to them in the subcommittee’s report. If these other factors are forms of measurement, an indication of why they are unbiased shall be included.

The service subcommittee is responsible for evaluating both the quality and quantity of the candidate’s service record. While the quantity and types of service activity vary with the rank of the candidate, quality does not. The subcommittee shall solicit evaluations of service done outside the department if they have not already been obtained by the candidate. These evaluations will be included in the file and given to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to respond prior to any vote on the subcommittee report. Service done within the department is evaluated by the candidate’s direct supervisor for the activity.

**IV.A.i.d.6 Process.** The timelines for comprehensive review and tenure review and promotion review are determined by the college. The timeline for comprehensive review is very short and the process should be started in the Spring term prior to the Fall term review. Candidates who wish to stand for promotion to professor or early tenure must inform the chair of the department of their intention before the end of the Spring semester preceding the semester of evaluation and will thereafter follow the timeline for other RTP cases. Such candidates may withdraw this request for consideration at any point prior to the submission of the dossier to the Dean of the College (including after the departmental vote). As soon as an RTP candidate has been identified, the process of obtaining external letters is initiated. The candidate may submit a list of outside evaluators and may also indicate specific scholars to exclude to the department chair. The department chair, with appropriate consultation, draws up a larger list of prospective external reviewers, respecting any exclusions of the candidate. The chair then solicits external reviewers from these lists until sufficiently many have agreed (3 for comprehensive review, 6 for tenure review and 7 for promotion to professor). The final make up of the set of external reviewers may contain no more than 1/3 drawn from the candidate’s list. After the candidate has submitted their list of external reviewers and the necessary documents to send to the reviewers, they must start preparing their dossier. A checklist of what must be included will be given to the candidate by the department chair (but the candidate is not limited to these items). At least 6 weeks prior to the college’s deadline for submitting files, the department chair will appoint the RTP subcommittees and select a chair for each (who must be tenured). The subcommittees have 4 weeks to complete their evaluations. When the subcommittee reports are ready, a special meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote on a candidate will be called by the department chair. At this meeting the subcommittee reports will be discussed and voted upon. If any report is sent back to the subcommittee for revision, a follow-up special meeting will be called the following week. When all the reports have been accepted, a final vote on the department’s recommendation will be taken by secret ballot. When the department
recommendation is ready, the reports and votes will be given to the chair to forward to the Dean. The chair prepares an independent recommendation that also goes to the Dean. In the cases of reappointment and promotion to professor, the department may take into account other factors that have a material bearing on the appointment, such as program requirements. However, the merit of the candidate is the only consideration for tenure cases. If, for any reason, the case is sent back to the department from any level, another special meeting will be called to deal with the concerns and new votes will be taken in all areas.

IV.A.i.d.7 Dossier. The following documents shall be included in the candidate’s dossier if available:

**General:**
- Current CV
- Professional Plan
- Faculty Reports on Professional Activities for the previous five years.
- Merit ratings and summaries from previous 5 years.

**Teaching:**
- Teaching statement, summarizing philosophy, activities and accomplishments.
- Course information for each course taught for the previous five years.
  - Syllabus.
  - Final grade distribution.
  - Copy of final exam and summary of raw scores on the exam.
- FCQs
- Reports of all classroom observations performed over the previous five years by observers designated by the chair, including observations performed by the teaching subcommittee.
- Summaries of student feedback received by the chair or associate chair, or obtained during exit interviews, if applicable, unless the chair determines that this input is unsubstantiated, prejudicial, inaccurate, or inappropriately biased.
- Additional statements by students in written form.
- Letters from alumni within 2-5 years of graduation.
- Results of departmental assessments of student learning if available and applicable to the candidate. For example, comparative analyses of student performance on uniform finals or in subsequent courses.
- Enrollment data and DFW rates.
Research:

- Research statement, summarizing accomplishments and plans.
- Annotated bibliography of all publications. For each paper, the candidate should provide a brief description of the research contribution. For coauthored papers, an explanation of the candidate’s contribution should be included.

Additional information may be obtained and evaluated by the subcommittees as justified or as specified by departmental policy. A written summary of this information shall be included in the dossier and given to the faculty member, and the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a written response prior to any votes on the subcommittee reports.

IV.A.ii Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

IV.A.ii.a General Procedure

1. Each TT faculty member will be evaluated annually by the TT-MEC. The committee will assign a numerical performance rating in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service. Guidelines for determining the performance ratings are given in Section IV.A.ii.f. A weighted average of these three ratings determines an overall numerical rating.

2. The TT-MEC will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members. The committee shall also report to the faculty a summary of the anonymous raw scores.

3. The TT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.

4. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each TT faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.

5. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee’s comments should fairly reflect the evidence.

6. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years. The TT-MEC will take into account a faculty member’s role when evaluating their performance. Thus, faculty members who have been hired in special areas will be evaluated in accordance with those circumstances.

7. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g.
8. If a tenured faculty member receives an overall rating of “below expectations” or “failing to meet expectations”, a triggered post tenure review will be conducted (see Section IV.A.iv.)

IV.A.ii.b  Differential Work Loads and Evaluation Weights

The merit ratings in teaching, research, and leadership and service will be averaged with respect to a set of individual weights. The baseline weights are the weights determined by the faculty member’s contract: either the standard weights (40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service), or the weights determined by the workload distribution specified by the faculty member’s differentiated workload agreement (see Section IV.A.vi). However, in cases of a temporary workload adjustments (for example, a course buyout funded by a research grant, or a course release for a major service responsibility), the baseline weights will be adjusted by 10% for each additional course reduction or increase.

The weights for a faculty member on sabbatical or on leave will be the same as the weights from the previous year unless the dean approves different weights.

IV.A.ii.c  Sabbaticals and Leaves

The merit committee does not evaluate a faculty member’s performance in teaching or leadership and service for any semester in which the faculty member is on sabbatical or leave. Instead, the faculty member is given default merit ratings in each category for the period of the sabbatical or leave. The default ratings in teaching and leadership and service are determined by averaging the faculty member’s ratings over the most recent two years that were actually evaluated by the committee. If a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave for only one semester of the calendar year, the merit committee will evaluate his or her performance for the other semester and average the resulting scores with the default ratings to determine the final ratings for the year.

IV.A.ii.d  Faculty Files

Each faculty member is responsible for assembling his or her file with sufficient information so that the merit committee can evaluate his or her progress accurately. The TT-MEC could, but is not required to, contact the faculty member for clarification of the submitted documents. The file should include the following materials:

1. A thoughtful, concise summary (usually, no more than two pages) for each of the three areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service. This is usually the principal item used by the merit committee to evaluate the faculty member. It should include a self-evaluation of how the faculty member views his/her performance within the context of the faculty member’s Professional Plan and should indicate the overall impact the faculty member has made.

   (a) The research summary statement should include

   - A vision for the development of the faculty member’s research program as well as a statement on research activity and positive impact on the researcher’s field.
   - The current status (appeared, accepted, submitted, or in preparation) of papers and what type of publication (refereed journal, refereed proceedings, non-refereed proceedings, edited book chapters, etc.) should be given.
   - A listing of ongoing research grants, research grants submitted, research awards, and invited or contributed presentations.
(b) The teaching summary statement should include

- Summary of classes taught, FCQs for each course, number of students in each course, and an indication of whether the course was taught for the first time.
- Written account of how each course was conducted, as described in Section IV.E.iv.
- Summary of mentoring and training activities.
- Summary of other contributions related to teaching.
- Summary of efforts to improve teaching.

(c) The leadership and service statement should list the service activities and indicate the impact of service at all levels (departmental, college, campus, university, or professional community).

2. Current CV.

3. Faculty Report on Professional Activities for each of the previous 3 years.

4. Professional Plan

5. Materials required for evaluation of classroom teaching, as specified in Section IV.E.iv.

IV.A.ii.e **Expectations**

This section defines minimum expectations for TT-faculty members with respect to research, teaching and leadership and service. In all of these areas, faculty members are expected to perform their duties ethically and professionally. It should be noted that expectations vary according to individual faculty member’s roles within the department and their professional rank. It is also emphasized that meeting or exceeding these expectations is not necessarily sufficient for earning tenure or promotion.

**IV.A.ii.e.1 Teaching** Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to effectively teach a variety of courses (as defined in Section IV.E) and to participate in the mentorship and training of CU-Denver students outside of assigned classes.

Expectations for mentoring students vary according to the faculty member’s rank and role in the department. Tenured faculty members are normally expected to serve as thesis or project advisors for PhD or MS students, or to supervise undergraduate honors projects. In the event there are no available students whose research interests align with those of a particular tenured faculty member, then that faculty member would be expected to make other contributions to the professional development of students, such as independent studies, readings courses, modeling competitions, summer workshops, or mentoring/training of teaching assistants.

In contrast, untenured TT faculty members are not necessarily expected to advise graduate students early in their careers; however they should be working to demonstrate both an openness and ability to advise students whose research interests align with their own (for example, by serving on student committees; or by designing special topics and/or readings courses to educate students in research areas of interest to the faculty member).

**IV.A.ii.e.2 Research** Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain an active program of research and or scholarly activity and to regularly disseminate their work in reputable peer-reviewed venues. Ratings above “meeting expectations” require regular refereed
publications in reputable peer-reviewed journals and/or conference proceedings. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are also expected to share their expertise with other members of the department to promote a strong research community for the department. For example, it is expected that all tenured and tenure-track faculty members participate in department seminars and thesis/dissertation committees when feasible and appropriate.

IV.A.ii.e.3 Leadership and Service  Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that contribute to the mission of the department and University. The minimal expectation is to competently and collegially carry out a fair share of departmental service assignments, and to assist in the administration of the department’s affairs. Additionally, faculty members are expected to contribute their disciplinary expertise to address issues of importance to the community at large. Particularly important are contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member’s area of expertise.

IV.A.ii.f Merit Rating Guidelines for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

The following 5 point numerical scale will be used to evaluate each tenured or tenure-track faculty member in each of the categories of teaching, research and leadership and service:

- Outstanding (4.5-5.0),
- Exceeding Expectations (3.5-4.25),
- Meeting Expectations (2.5-3.25),
- Below Expectations (1.5-2.25),
- Failing to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.25).

IV.A.ii.f.1 Teaching  The main factors determining the teaching rating for TT faculty members are 1) classroom teaching, 2) mentorship and training of CU-Denver students, and 3) other contributions.

Classroom Teaching:  Classroom teaching performance will be evaluated according the criteria described in Section IV.E.

Mentorship and training of CU Denver students\(^1\)  This category is defined as

1. Supervision of or collaboration with students in honors projects, master’s projects or theses, or Ph.D. dissertations.
2. More general student training through independent studies, readings courses, seminars, internships, REUs, modeling competitions, workshops, or mentorship or training of teaching assistants.

The ratings in this category will be based on the faculty member’s contributions over the last 3 years according to the following guidelines:

\(^1\)CU Denver students include anyone taking a course or enrolled in a degree program at CU Denver.
• Exceptional: A record that demonstrates significant contributions and high involvement that substantially exceeds the expectations described in Section IV.A.ii.e.1. Some examples of such a record follow:
  – Strong record of successfully supervising multiple students.
  – A consistent record of supervising students along with other major contributions toward mentoring or professional development of students (such as frequently offering readings courses, leading summer workshops or REUs, or providing a leadership role in the mentorship or training of teaching assistants).

• Fair Share: A mentoring record consistent with the expectations described in Section IV.A.ii.e.1.

• Minimal: Little or no mentoring activity.

Other contributions: Faculty members are encouraged (but not required) to engage in activities that advance the broader teaching missions of the Department and the University. Some examples include participation in STEM related educational activities, curriculum development, development of online courses, mentorship of non CU-Denver students, teaching outside the University, educational grants, or publications related to the general scholarship and practice of teaching and learning. Contributions in this category will be evaluated by the merit committee to determine an increment to the baseline teaching rating described below.

Overall Teaching Rating: The final numerical rating will be determined by the merit committee using the following table as a guide. This table specifies a baseline score determined by the two categories of classroom teaching and mentorship and training of CU Denver students. This baseline score represents the minimum score the faculty member should receive. Other teaching contributions will be evaluated by the committee to determine an increment to the baseline rating.

Baseline ratings (without other contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Teaching</th>
<th>Mentorship and Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.A.ii.f.2 Research The descriptions below list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member’s research accomplishments. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member’s performance.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding. Highly productive research program typically characterized by some combination of the following
  • Large number of publications in high quality journals.
• Significant research grant funding.
• Large number of citations, or other indicators of impact.
• Awards, major invited talks.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding expectations. Strong research program typically characterized by some combination of the following
• Frequent publications in high quality venues.
• Regular submission of quality research grant proposals.
• Invited talks at conferences.
• Citations of recent work or other evidence of impact.

2.5-3.25 Meeting expectations. Active research program typically characterized by
• Regular publications in peer-reviewed venues.
• Presentations at conferences, workshops, seminars and/or colloquia.

1.5-2.25 Below expectations. Weak research program characterized by
• Occasional publications in low quality venues.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations. Inactive or problematic research program characterized by
• no publishing activity, or
• evidence of deficiencies in professional integrity.

IV.A.ii.f.3 Leadership and Service The descriptions below list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member’s contributions in leadership and service. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member’s performance.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Major contributions to the department, college, university, or mathematics community. Indication of leadership or positive impact of service.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding expectations; significant contributions at some level.

2.5-3.25 Meeting expectations; solid, reliable service.

1.5-2.25 Below expectations; limited service and contributions.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations; unwillingness or inability to accept service responsibilities in the department, lack of collegiality or behavior that negatively impacts the department.

IV.A.ii.g Appeals
Faculty members may appeal their merit evaluations by submitting a written justification (not to exceed two pages) to the chair within 5 business days after receiving their evaluation from the chair.
1. The written appeal will be reviewed by an appeals committee, which consists of the executive committee, excluding any members of the merit committee. The faculty member has the right to veto the sitting of any one member of the appeals committee. If needed, the chair will appoint additional members to the committee to ensure that it has at least three members.

2. The appeals committee will consider the written appeal and will either uphold the original merit rating, or will forward the appeal to the merit committee, which must provide a written response. In the latter case, the appeals committee will determine whether to uphold the original rating or to recommend a change to the rating.

3. If the appeals committee recommends a change in the rating, the chair will reconsider the case to determine the final rating for the faculty member.

4. If the chair assigns a different rating than is recommended by the appeals committee, both the chair’s rating and the recommendation of the appeals committee will be communicated to the dean.

5. If not satisfied with the result at the departmental level, the faculty member may pursue the appeal at each subsequent level following the process established in the College and Campus Bylaws.

6. For tenured faculty, if a “below expectations” or “failing to meet expectations” rating is sustained after the appeals process is completed, a triggered post tenure review will be conducted.

IV.A.iii Professional Plans

Each tenured or tenure-track member of the department must have a Professional Plan on file in the department office after their first year of appointment. The plan outlines a 5-year forecast of the faculty member’s activities in research, teaching and service. The Professional Plan form is available from the college. These plans can be amended at any time to take into account unforeseen changes. The plans must be reviewed and resubmitted at least once every five years, in particular, just prior to a post tenure review (see below).

IV.A.iv Post Tenure Review

Every tenured faculty member will undergo a post tenure review at five year intervals starting five years from the date at which tenure is awarded or the date of the last promotion (whichever is the most recent). This is known as regular post tenure review. Under special circumstances a special post tenure review (triggered or extensive) will be called for outside of this five year cycle (see below).

The post tenure review committee (PTRC) shall consist of three tenured members of the faculty appointed by the department chair. Ideally, there should be no overlap of membership with the current year’s MEC committee and no one who is undergoing a review should be asked to serve. As these constraints may be impossible to satisfy, the membership may be extended to four and members who are under review must recuse themselves while their case is considered.
IV.A.iv.a  Process

In the Spring semester of each academic year, following the annual merit evaluation process, the post-tenure review committee will review the post tenure cases for that year. This review consists of examining the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, the faculty member’s summary of these, including the FCQ’s, peer review of teaching and any other type of teaching evaluation, the curriculum vitae, and the faculty member’s Professional Plan(s) from that PTR cycle. In addition, the faculty member will provide the PTRC with an updated Professional Plan for the next five years. The PTRC will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize the committee’s findings regarding the faculty member’s adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present), meeting the department’s standards, and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research and service. A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member. The report will be forwarded to the Dean and a copy will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. In the case that the PTRC evaluation is not “meeting expectations,” the faculty member may appeal the evaluation according to the procedure given in Section IV.A.ii.g. If the evaluation is sustained through the appeals process, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement.

IV.A.iv.b  Timelines

After the annual merit evaluation process is completed in the Spring semester, each faculty member undergoing regular post tenure review will submit to the PTRC (via the department chair) an updated Professional Plan and any other documentation they wish to be considered in this review. All regular reviews should be completed by the end of the Spring semester in order to be reported to the Dean’s office by their deadline in August.

IV.A.iv.c  Triggered Reviews and Performance Improvement Agreements

In the event that a faculty member receives a “below expectations” rating in the Annual Merit Evaluation process, or a “below expectations” evaluation in a regular post tenure review, and after any appeals are completed, the PTRC will immediately convene a triggered post tenure review session in which the PTRC will assist in the drafting of a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). The faculty member develops a PIA that includes specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. The PIA must be endorsed by the PTRC and by the department chair, and must be approved by the Dean. Usually, PIA’s will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant longer, the PIA may be set up for two years. The campus administration shall designate an advisor or resource office to provide advice to the faculty member and to the PTRC on best practices and models for PIA’s and appropriate benchmarks. The next annual merit evaluation (conducted by the Merit Evaluation Committee) following the term of the PIA shall address whether the goals of the PIA have been met. If the goals of the PIA have been met, the faculty member continues in the current five year post tenure review cycle. If the goals of the PIA have not been met an extensive review shall be initiated.

IV.A.iv.d  Extensive Reviews

Faculty who have received two “below expectations” ratings in the Annual Merit Evaluation process within the previous five years or whose PIA did not result in an evaluation of “meeting expectations”
or better will undergo an Extensive Review. For extensive reviews, the department chair will be an ex-officio member of the PTRC. As with triggered reviews, extensive reviews carried out by the PTRC may be preceded by an appeal procedure for the ratings triggering the extensive review. Faculty members who believe that the appeal board’s determination is mistaken may continue their appeal of the rating through established grievance procedures in the college. No action will be taken to begin an extensive review until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date the second “below expectations” rating is received. Failure by the faculty member to participate in developing or implementing the extensive review is considered to be insubordination and dereliction of duty by the administration and will be subject to sanctions, which include the possibility of termination of employment. In an extensive review the PTRC will examine:

- the five previous annual performance evaluation reports;
- the FCQs from those five years, peer evaluations, and at least one other form of teaching evaluation;
- evidence of research productivity;
- the faculty member’s previous Professional Plan (and any amendments to the plan and differentiated workload agreements, where present);
- the faculty member’s self-evaluation of performance as it relates to the Professional Plan(s);
- record of service activities; and
- any other material the faculty member would like the unit to consider.

The PTRC prepares an evaluative report of the faculty member's teaching, research and service based upon its review of the materials and information covering the period in question. If there is disagreement about the faculty member's performance in research, or if the faculty member or PTRC so requests, the review will also include evaluations from qualified persons external to the University. In this case, the faculty member and the PTRC shall jointly develop a list of external reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the faculty member’s performance in research. As an extensive review is analogous to an initial tenure review, the time taken to complete it should approximate the time needed for an initial tenure review.

The result of an extensive review is the joint production of a development plan. A development plan is similar to a PIA, but more extensive. The evaluation of the success of a development plan is the responsibility of the same members of the PTRC who helped to produce the plan (even if they are no longer members of the PTRC.) The evaluation of the development plan is reported to the Dean of the college. Ordinarily, in cases where the Development Plan has not produced the desired results, the faculty member will have his/her tenure revoked and be dismissed. Under certain circumstances, other sanctions may be imposed. Possible sanctions include: suspension of pay, salary reduction and demotion in rank.

IV.A.v Sabbaticals

Any tenured faculty member will normally be eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave after having been continuously employed in a tenured or tenure track position for six years since their last sabbatical. Such a sabbatical could include full pay for one semester or half pay for an academic year. The application and approval process for sabbaticals is detailed in the Departmental Policies and Procedures Document.
IV.A.vi  Differentiated Workloads

The Differentiated Workload Policy allows tenured or tenure-track faculty members to renegotiate goals, expectations and workloads in the areas of teaching, research and service in order to devote more time to an area at which they excel. The differentiated workload agreement changes the weighting vector used for annual merit evaluations, and also impacts expectations of performance. However, by CLAS and Regents’ policy, differentiated workloads do not alter promotion and tenure criteria.

IV.A.vi.a  Methods of Designing a Differentiated Workload

- DW-R (Differentiated workload for research). Faculty members with records of scholarly excellence, as indicated by annual evaluations of exceeding expectations or outstanding in this area, or by external research funding for a course buyout, may request
- DW-T (Differentiated workload for teaching). Faculty members with records of teaching excellence, as indicated by annual evaluations of exceeding expectations or outstanding in this area, may request a reduction in research obligations by adding one or more courses to their teaching load or by undertaking substantial and measurable duties in the areas of program and/or curriculum development.
- DW-S (Differentiated workload for service). Faculty members asked to perform exceptionally demanding service or administrative obligations may request to alter the proportions of teaching, research, and service to reflect the increased service responsibilities and a commensurate reduction in effort in another area.

In rare cases, differentiated workloads may be negotiated for reasons other than those specified above. Such agreements fall outside of this policy statement, and are made by mutual agreement between the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean.

IV.A.vi.b  Guidelines

1. Differentiated workloads are negotiated between the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean. Such agreements are made for a limited period of time, up to four years.
2. A DW will include at least 10% effort in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Teaching will not exceed 60% of a tenured/tenure-track faculty member’s workload.
3. The promotion of all faculty members, including those with a differentiated workload, follow the existing University of Colorado RTP protocols. As such, untenured faculty should be aware of possible negative impacts of a differentiated workload in their progress toward achieving their tenure and promotion goals. Thus, special care must be taken in crafting and executing the workload agreements of untenured faculty.
4. The differentiated workload should not impair the ability of the Department and College to meet instructional needs.
5. The differentiated workload program should be budget neutral for the College and the Department. In particular, the costs associated with a reduction in teaching load must be offset by savings elsewhere. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to:
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- Internal redistribution of student credit hour generation in the Department. For example, by adding additional seats to other courses in the department.
- Alterations in frequency and pattern of course offerings.
- Funded course reductions for sponsored research.
- Funded course reductions for service.

For internally funded course reductions (such as indirect cost recovery or salary savings), the cost per course release is the nominal lecturer replacement cost (currently, $4,000). In that case, the faculty member is normally expected to generate sufficient funds as the faculty member’s share, but the department may consider a partial matching if the faculty member’s share is not sufficient.

IV.A.vi.c Process for requesting, approving and implementing a differentiated workload agreement

1. A tenured or tenure track faculty member with a record of excellence in teaching or research may submit a request for a differentiated workload to the Department Chair. A differentiated workload may also be requested for a faculty member by the Department Chair or CLAS Dean.

2. The Chair will evaluate the faculty member’s research, teaching, and service record to determine whether the faculty member is eligible for the differentiated workload.

3. If the faculty member is deemed eligible, the Chair will evaluate the proposed differentiated workload within the context of departmental resources and will advise the faculty member about any implications for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

4. If the Chair supports the request, the chair will help the faculty member prepare a differentiated workload agreement for submission to CLAS Administration that specifies:
   (a) Proposed workload adjustments.
   (b) Expected outcomes as defined by a set of benchmarks that must be achieved within a mutually agreed upon timeframe.
   (c) Formal process for documenting and reporting the benefits of the differentiated workload each academic year; and
   (d) Time limit of the agreement.
   (e) Financial plan for covering the expenses of the differentiated workload.

5. Following discussion between the faculty member, Chair, and CLAS Administration, the Dean will notify the faculty member and Chair of her/his decision, including any revisions to the proposed plan.

6. Upon approval, the faculty member will submit a revised Professional Plan to the Dean’s office.

7. The differentiated workload agreement will be evaluated annually by the Chair. The agreement may be terminated if the Chair determines that the faculty member has not satisfactorily met the requirements of the agreement.

8. At the end of the DW agreement, faculty workload will revert to the standard 40/40/20 split, although the faculty member may submit another DW request.