



University of Colorado Denver

Downtown Denver Campus

Campus Administrative Policy

Title:	Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
Source:	Office of the Provost
Prepared by:	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chair, Downtown Denver Campus Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee
Approved by:	Roderick Nairn Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Effective Date:	July 1, 2010
Replaces:	8 July 2005
Application:	Denver Campus

A. Introduction

Consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, the Downtown Denver Campus of the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver) has adopted policies and procedures designed to provide a thorough and fair review of all tenure-track and tenured faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Reviews occur at various levels: primary unit; first-level review (dean and dean's advisory/review committee within the college/school/library); second-level review (Vice Chancellor Advisory Committee, provost and chancellor); president; and Board of Regents. Primary units in the colleges, schools, and the library have policies and procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This administrative policy statement specifies the policies and procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates at each level. It applies to the Downtown Denver Campus.

1. Related Documents

- A candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion has specific rights and privileges in the review process. These are described in the University of Colorado's *Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion* <https://www.cusys.edu/policies/Academic/Standards-Tenure-Promotion.pdf>

- The Downtown Denver Campus guidelines for dossier construction and candidate information can be found at:
http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/center-for-faculty-development/resources/Documents/StrategiesForSuccessFall2009ELECT.pdf
- As per Regent Law, Article 5B: (<https://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/Article5B.htm>)
“The process leading to award of tenure is an evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation.”
- The UC Denver Downtown Campus hires with tenure policy can be found at:
http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/Pages/default.aspx .
- Information about tenure for librarians can be found at:
http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/Documents/AurariaLibraryprimaryunitcriteria.pdf

2. Primary Unit Criteria

- Each college or school and the library must have primary unit criteria that are to be made available to all tenure track faculty at the time of the initial appointment and at the beginning of any year in which a tenure track faculty member is to be considered for comprehensive reappointment review, tenure, or promotion.
- Primary unit criteria are to be included in the candidate’s dossier to assist personnel committees in understanding the standards by which the candidate is to be evaluated.
- Primary unit criteria must be reviewed as part of the self-study process for Academic Program Review, which each academic unit undertakes every seven years (<http://administration.ucdenver.edu/admin/policies/OAA/AcademicProgramReview.pdf>)
The primary unit criteria must be approved by the chancellor or his/her delegate (the provost).

B. Table of Contents

- Introduction
- Table of Contents
- Policy Statement
- Schedule for Reviews
- Standards for Review
- Limitation on Reviewer Participation
- Candidate Responsibilities
- Primary Unit Responsibilities
- Letters of Evaluation for External Reviewers
- Dean’s Responsibilities
- Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee
- Provost’s Recommendations
- Decisions by the Chancellor
- Grievance Procedures

C. Policy Statement

All evaluations of tenure track faculty at all levels for comprehensive reappointment review and for tenure and promotion must be conducted in accordance with the University of Colorado's *Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion* <https://www.cusys.edu/policies/Academic/Standards-Tenure-Promotion.pdf>,

D. Schedule for Reviews

1. Appointment Length

Tenure-track appointments are typically for an initial four-year appointment with eligibility for a three-year reappointment, contingent upon a successful comprehensive reappointment review.

- a. **Prior Service Credit:** As stated in Regent Law, Article 5B: "Up to three years of full-time service in the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period." Years of prior service credit must be negotiated at the time of hiring and must be included in the letter of offer. A separate form must be signed by the faculty member, and approved by the chair, dean, and provost: the campus prior service credit form can be found at: http://ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/policies-forms/Documents/PRIOR%20SERVICE%20CREDIT%20AGREEMENT.doc .
- b. **Faculty Members Hired without Terminal Degrees:** As stated in Regent Law, Article 5B: "A faculty member appointed to the rank of assistant professor without a terminal degree may decide at the time of the initial appointment whether the probationary period will begin at the time of the initial appointment or upon receipt of the terminal degree. Such a decision shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and the chancellor."
- c. **Alterations to the 7-Year Probationary Period:** As stated in Regent Law, Article 5B: "Unless waived by the faculty member and approved by the dean and chancellor, a decision upon a tenured appointment as a member of the university faculty shall be made after a maximum probationary period of seven years of continuous full-time service as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor."

2. Requirement for Comprehensive Review

- a. Assistant professors are required to undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
- b. For associate professors on the tenure-track, the hiring process may constitute the comprehensive review. When this occurs, it needs to be documented in the letter of offer.

3. Timing of Reviews

- a. Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.

- b. The comprehensive reappointment review is typically conducted in the fourth year of the initial four-year appointment. If the comprehensive reappointment review is unsatisfactory, the fifth year is the terminal year.
- c. Regental rules regarding tenure provide for review in the seventh year and, if tenure is approved, the award of tenure at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is the terminal year.

4. Failure to Submit a Dossier

A faculty member who declines or fails to submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time or submits a dossier with missing material is deemed not to have applied for reappointment or tenure.

5. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty members are strongly encouraged to teach, conduct research and creative activities, and serve at the Downtown Denver Campus for at least three years before going up for tenure. They are required to have undergone comprehensive review as specified in D.2, above, before they may apply for tenure consideration. The standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure schedule apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock. Department chairs and colleagues have a responsibility to advise tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early tenure.

6. Deadlines

- a. Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (hereafter referred to as "Provost's Office") on January 15 (or the Monday following January 15, if the 15th falls on a Saturday or Sunday). College, school, and library deadlines must be sufficiently early in the fall term to meet this deadline. In the case of mid-year appointments, consult with the Provost's Office regarding the date dossiers are due.
- b. Deans who wish to submit dossiers to the Provost's Office after the due date (see preceding paragraph) must submit a request for a delay in the submission date, in writing, to the provost and the chair of the Downtown Denver Campus Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereafter referred to as the "VCAC"). Failure to submit a dossier or a request for delay may result in procedural ineligibility.

E. Standards for Review

1. Tenure

- a. Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive review as specified in D.2., above, before they may apply for tenure consideration.

- b. Tenure may be awarded only for demonstrated meritorious performance in each of teaching, research/creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research/creative work.

2. Promotion

- a. *Associate Professor.* The Denver Campus review for promotion to associate professor occurs at the same time as the tenure review. There is no consideration for promotion to associate professor separate from consideration for tenure. Promotion to associate professor requires considerable successful teaching experience and accomplishment in research or creative work, and service; occasionally, experienced individuals are hired as tenure-track associate professors.
- b. *Professor.* Promotion to professor requires (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

F. Limitations on Reviewer Participation

1. Confidentiality

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

2. Conflict of interest

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

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

A candidate for promotion or tenure may object to the participation of a colleague in the review process due to conflict of interest only if the conflict of interest has been documented previously via an official complaint made to the appropriate administrative office. A request to prevent an individual from participating in the review process should be made by the candidate, in writing, to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Faculty Affairs) by September 1 of the review year. If the Associate Vice Chancellor agrees to the

candidate's request, he/she will ask the chair of the primary unit, the dean, and the VCAC chair to exclude the colleague in question from the personnel review.

3. Participation at only one level of the process

A faculty member may speak to and vote only at one level on a case undergoing review and may not be present during or contribute to or influence in any way discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of the process. For example, a faculty member who votes on a case in his/her primary unit may not participate in discussions or vote on the case when it is reviewed by the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee or the VCAC.

G. Candidate Responsibilities

1. Dossier

The candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is responsible for a clear, accurate, and detailed presentation of the record. The dossier is to be assembled according to the guidelines available in *Strategies for Success*, and all teaching, research, and service accomplishments must be both clearly presented and factually accurate. An inaccurate or deliberately misleading presentation may be considered academic dishonesty and subject to sanctions.

Reviewers at all levels will review and judge the record of accomplishments in teaching, research and creative work, and service only as represented in the dossier.

2. Additional materials

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

H. Primary Unit Responsibilities

1. **Department Chair/Primary Unit Head.** The department chair/primary unit head is responsible for (a) fully advising candidates of the areas of performance that will be examined, the standards of performance that must be met, and the primary unit criteria used in making decisions about performance; (b) ensuring that dossiers are reviewed and submitted to the college, school or library dean's office in a timely fashion, and (c) re-reviewing cases, if required. The department chair/primary unit head is also responsible for overseeing the process by which external reviewers are selected and their evaluations utilized.
2. **Dossier** The primary unit is responsible for including the primary unit criteria, the previous VCAC and personnel action letters, subcommittee reports, and letters of evaluation from external reviewers.
3. **Primary Unit Summary, Vote, and Recommendation**
 - a. For the purpose of assisting the primary unit in making its recommendations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion, each primary unit will elect or appoint (having previously voted on the method to be followed) from among its members an evaluation committee for each candidate being considered during an academic year. The

committee may consist of both tenured and non-tenured members, but usually consists of tenured faculty members. In a small primary unit, all members of the unit may constitute the evaluation committee.

- b. The primary unit provides a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. The primary unit's role is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The program requirements of the unit shall be considered at the time of reappointment. The merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendation for the award of tenure. Other criteria that may have a material bearing on the decision being made can be considered, but this does not include instances of formal disciplinary action unless the reason for the disciplinary action affects whether or not the candidate meets the primary unit criteria for teaching, research/creative work, or service.
- c. Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on decisions relating to tenure, except that non-tenured members of the primary unit may be permitted to vote on decisions relating to tenure when authorized by the dean of the school or college and the chief academic officer (or his/her designee, such as the provost). The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual vote (e.g., "six of eight faculty members were present and voted 4-2 in favor of promotion and tenure"). A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes should be explained and a minority report may be submitted. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend tenure" is not sufficient. See Appendix C for a sample primary unit letter.
- d. Following its bylaws, the primary unit must vote on the action under consideration, prepare a summary of the evaluation, and a recommendation for action, and include this information in the dossier.
 - (1) For assistant professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one recommendation.
 - (2) For associate professors without tenure, the issue of tenure is one action requiring one recommendation.
- e. The department chair/head of the primary unit promptly informs the candidate orally of the primary unit's recommendation and provides the candidate with a copy of the primary unit recommendation letter and the chair's letter (if applicable) at the time the letters are inserted in the candidate's dossier.
- f. Form UCD-7. This form is completed and signed by the department chair/primary unit head and placed in the appropriate section of the candidate's dossier.

I. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers

1. Responsibility of the External Reviewers

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

2. Affiliation and Location of External Reviewers

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

3. Rank of External Reviewers

- a. External reviewers for comprehensive reappointment review and promotion/tenure review should be tenured associate professors or professors
- b. For promotion to professor, the external reviewers should be tenured professors.
- c. Exceptions may be made when external reviewers hold high positions in education, business, government, or the arts.
- d. External reviewers must provide a biographical sketch or short vita.

4. Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers

- a. The candidate may recommend to the primary unit a list of potential external reviewers from which one or two reviewers may be chosen (see section 7, below).
- b. Persons recommended by the candidate to write evaluation letters must not be relatives or close personal friends. Also, professional colleagues who may be biased (for or against) the candidate, or not able to give a fair, honest assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments, should not be asked to serve as external reviewers.
- c. The candidate may also indicate specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations might be prejudiced against the candidate.

5. Confidentiality

- a. The names and institutional affiliations of external reviewers and their letters of evaluation are confidential and must not be divulged to or provided to the candidate.
- b. Copies of external evaluators’ letters are retained only in the Provost’s Office and must not be retained in the department, division, or dean’s office.

6. Solicitation of External Letters

- a. The primary unit or the dean, not the candidate, must solicit external letters of evaluation. Primary unit bylaws should describe the process used in selecting external reviewers. The primary unit may offer external reviewers a modest stipend for their work.
- b. It is in the best interest of both the candidate and the primary unit if the external letters are solicited in late spring or early summer prior to the fall review.
- c. Several more evaluators than the minimum required should be contacted to determine their willingness to serve, since some evaluators agree to assist but never do.
- d. The external evaluators should be informed that their names, institutional affiliations, and letters are confidential and will not be divulged or provided to the candidate.

- e. Before the primary unit sends letters requesting the external evaluations, the department chair, division coordinator, associate dean, or dean of the college, school, or library must approve the letters.
- f. See Appendix A for a sample request letter to external evaluators for comprehensive reappointment review and Appendix B for a sample request letter to external evaluators for promotion and tenure.
- g. All letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier.

7. Nature of the External Letters

- a. *External Letters for the Comprehensive Review.* At least three (3) external reviewers are required, with at most one (1) selected from the candidate's list, and at least two (2) selected outside the candidate's list.
- b. *External Letters for Promotion and Tenure* For promotion and tenure, at least six (6) external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two (2) selected from the candidate's list, and at least four (4) selected from outside the candidate's list.

8. Documentation of External Evaluations

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

- a. a copy of the approved letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters;
- b. full and complete documentation concerning:
 - (1) the selection of external reviewers;
 - (2) each evaluator's biographical sketch or short vita;
 - (3) whether the candidate or the primary unit recommended the evaluator;
 - (4) the relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit;

J. Dean's Responsibilities

1. First Level Review, Summary, Vote, and Recommendation

- a. The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee, as defined in the bylaws of the college, school, or library, reviews the candidate's dossier, votes on the proposed action, and forwards to the dean an evaluation and a recommendation for action. The first level review is a thorough assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- b. A member of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. (See section F.2 for the definition of conflict of interest.)

- c. The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote (e.g., all three members were present and voted unanimously in favor of promotion and tenure). A statement such as “we do/do not recommend tenure” is not sufficient. A unanimous vote is not required.
- d. A copy of the review committee’s letter is provided to the candidate at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate’s dossier.

2. Dean’s Recommendation

- a. The dean prepares an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement. See Appendix D for a sample letter.
- b. The dean should advise the provost at the earliest opportunity of potentially problematic cases. If the dean anticipates being unable to submit the dossier to the Provost’s Office by the January 15 deadline, s/he must request an extension, in writing, to the provost and to the chair of the VCAC Committee.
- c. If the first level review committee and/or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the dean must discuss the nature of the disagreement with the chair of the primary unit. The primary unit reconsiders its original recommendation and reports the reconsidered judgment, in writing, to the dean and the review committee. If the reconsideration process will lead to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the dean should notify the Provost’s Office in writing and provide a probable time table for submission.
- d. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee, and/or the dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in the context.
- e. The dean must promptly inform the chair of the primary unit orally of the dean’s recommendation. The chair of the primary unit must promptly inform the candidate orally of the dean’s recommendation. The dean provides the candidate with a copy of the dean’s letter to the provost at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate’s dossier.
- f. Form UCD-7. The dean completes the appropriate section of the form and signs it.
- g. The dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, completes and signs the dossier checklist, and forwards the complete dossier to the Provost’s Office by January 15.

K. Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC)

1. Membership

- a. Faculty of the colleges, school, and library elect representatives to the VCAC. Each of the colleges, schools, and the library has one representative, except for CLAS, which has three representatives, who must be from different departments. Colleges, schools,

and the library are encouraged to consider the need for a diverse VCAC as they elect representatives to the committee.

- b. Faculty members of the VCAC must be tenured and hold the rank of associate professor or professor. Associate professors may participate in considering and voting on applications for promotion to professor.
- c. Faculty members may not serve on both the first level review committee (the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee) and the VCAC.
- d. Faculty members who serve on the VCAC may not be considered for promotion to professor while they are on the committee.
- e. Associate deans and department chairs are not eligible to serve on the VCAC.
- f. Members of the VCAC must not be advocates for any candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, and their advocates, must not discuss the candidate's case with the chair or members of the VCAC.
- g. A member of the VCAC may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to or influence the discussion, and must abstain from and not be present during voting on the case, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. (See section F.2 for the definition of conflict of interest.)
- h. When faculty members agree to serve on the VCAC, they are expected to honor this commitment by attending all committee meetings.

2. Role and Responsibilities

- a. The VCAC assists with the campus level review of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The committee is advisory to the provost.
- b. The VCAC is responsible for reviewing and evaluating dossiers and making recommendations for all tenure-track candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and all tenured candidates for promotion to professor. The committee makes individual and collective judgments. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in Regental laws and policies.
- c. All members of the VCAC review, vote on, and make recommendations on the following VCAC actions:
 - (1) comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor prior to the award of tenure
 - (2) promotion to associate professor and professor
 - (3) award of tenure
 - (4) appointments of new faculty members if they are requesting tenure and/or promotion at the time of the hiring

- d. Committee deliberations and votes are confidential. The committee provides written recommendations to the provost.

3. Procedures

- a. The VCAC convenes early in the fall semester to review recent policy changes and to confirm the spring meeting schedule. Typically, the committee meets every Friday from noon to 2 pm during the spring semester. (Occasionally, the committee is also asked to review one or more cases during the fall semester.) All committee recommendations are generally submitted to the provost by the end of April.
- b. Prior to all VCAC meetings at which candidate dossiers are considered, the chair assigns specific dossiers to committee members or subgroups. The members with specific dossier assignments present those cases to the committee. The presenter is always from a unit different from that of the candidate. After confidential deliberation and vote, the committee prepares a written recommendation to the provost. The chair of the VCAC is neutral and non-voting and is charged with drafting the recommendation to the provost.

L. Provost's Recommendations

1. The VCAC submits written recommendations to the provost, who reviews the dossiers and recommendations and makes a recommendation to the chancellor on each case.
2. If the VCAC and the provost disagree with the recommendation of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and/or the dean, the provost discusses the nature of the disagreement with the dean. The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee and the dean reconsider their original recommendations and report the reconsidered judgment to the provost and the VCAC.
3. The provost communicates directly with the dean about all negative decisions.
4. The provost sends each candidate a copy of the VCAC's letter, which specifies strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. The provost informs the candidate of his/her recommendation. The provost generally notifies each candidate of the recommendation by the end of the academic year.

M. Decisions by the Chancellor

1. The chancellor reviews the recommendations of the provost and makes a final decision for UC Denver about which candidates are forwarded to the President and Board of Regents for consideration for tenure. The chancellor makes the final decision on promotion. The chancellor does not forward negative decisions on tenure and/or promotion to the President's Office.
2. If the chief academic officer (chancellor or his/her designee, such as the provost) finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, he/she may return the case to the primary unit to repeat the process. The chief academic officer may at her/his discretion appoint a responsible party to oversee the process to ensure procedural integrity and fairness to the candidate. If it is determined that the repetition of the process will carry forward into the next academic year, the chief academic officer may extend the

contract of the candidate by one year. The re-evaluation process shall focus on the record as it existed at the time of the first review.

N. Grievance Procedures

In the case of a negative decision, the candidate may—within ten working day of receipt of written notice of a recommendation for denial of tenure—request review by the president. This review shall be made only on the grounds that the process had 1) procedural errors; 2) substantive errors; or 3) evidence of discrimination. (*Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointments, Tenure and Promotions*

https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies/A_Standards-Tenure-Promotion.html

After the final decision, the candidate may choose to file a grievance with the university's Privilege and Tenure Committee. There is an allowable time frame for such a grievance. (See Regent Policy 5-H: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5H.htm>)

Appendix A

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
Sample Letter from Chair or Dean to External Reviewer

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver) I am writing to ask you to serve as an external reviewer of the research/creative work of assistant professor _____, who is being considered for reappointment at this time. Dr. _____ is now in her/his fourth year as an assistant professor. During the seventh year, Dr. _____ may be considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor.

The University of Colorado Denver is comprised of 13 schools and colleges offering 119 degree programs on two campuses, the Downtown Denver Campus and the Anschutz Medical Campus. The Downtown Denver Campus serves as the institution's comprehensive campus, while the Anschutz Medical Campus provides health sciences training in medicine, pharmacy, dentistry and nursing as well as many allied health professions. The Downtown Denver Campus serves more than 13,000 students offering undergraduate and master's degrees through the Schools and Colleges of Architecture and Planning, Arts and Media, Engineering, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Development, and Public Affairs. Doctoral degrees are offered in applied mathematics, civil engineering, health and behavioral sciences, educational leadership, planning and design, and public affairs. Classes are offered during weekday and evening hours, on weekends, at off-campus sites, and online. The Downtown Denver Campus values teaching and research/creative work equally. UC Denver is expected to serve the complex higher education needs of its city, the region which depends on the city and, by extension, the rest of the world.

The University of Colorado Denver requires that assistant professors undergo a comprehensive review before their evaluation for promotion and tenure. This comprehensive review must include evaluations from scholars in the candidate's field of specialization. Although the substance of your evaluation will be summarized for Dr. _____, you and your institution will not be identified. Your candor in evaluating Dr. _____'s research/creative work will be greatly appreciated.

At this time, we are soliciting your evaluation of Dr. _____'s demonstrated research/creative accomplishments to date. We ask that your letter be of a constructive and counseling nature, so that we may give Dr. _____ constructive suggestions as to the direction, quantity, and quality of work to be accomplished by the seventh year, when Dr. _____'s tenure review may occur.

For a successful comprehensive review, Dr. _____ should be making ongoing and significant progress toward a research/creative work record which can be expected to have an impact on his/her field. Your evaluation is extremely valuable to us in making this assessment.

Dr. _____'s teaching course load since the time of her/his appointment has been _____ [the specific load over several years and any reductions].

All reappointments, promotions, and awards of tenure at the University of Colorado Denver consider the candidate's record in teaching, research/creative work, and university and public service. I have included a copy of Dr. _____'s current vita; his/her personal statements regarding teaching, research/creative work, and service; copies of the research papers/creative works s/he has submitted to us; and the primary unit criteria used to evaluate Dr. _____'s work.

In evaluating Dr. _____'s research/creative work, please address each of the following points in order:

1. The nature of your acquaintance, if any, with Dr. _____ and your knowledge of and/or familiarity with his/her research/creative work prior to this request.
2. The quality and quantity of the research/creative work, especially in relationship to productivity in this field.
3. The main thrust(s) of the research/creative work and the impact of this research/creative work on this field.
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research/creative work.
5. To what degree the research/creative work is evolving.
6. How Dr. _____'s research/creative work and productivity compare with others with similar training and experience in this field.
7. How you would categorize Dr. _____'s research/creative work accomplishments--below average, average, above average, or outstanding--compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.
8. What suggestions do you have for changes that Dr. _____ should make in planning and carrying out her/his research/creative work for the next three years?

As Dr. _____ will be evaluated by faculty outside of his/her department who may be unfamiliar with your career or field, please include a copy of a current *summary* vita with your evaluation letter.

If you have any questions concerning the comprehensive review, please call me at the telephone number listed below. I would appreciate receiving your evaluation no later than October 15.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist the University of Colorado Denver in this very important academic review process.

Appendix B

PROMOTION and TENURE
Sample Letter from Chair or Dean to External Reviewer

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the University of Colorado Denver, I am writing to ask you to serve as an external reviewer of the research/creative work of [assistant professor _____, who is being considered at this time for tenure and for promotion to the rank of associate professor] [or associate professor _____, who is being considered at this time for tenure]. We are soliciting your evaluation of Dr. _____'s demonstrated research/creative accomplishments to date.

The University of Colorado Denver is comprised of 13 schools and colleges offering 119 degree programs on two campuses, the Downtown Denver Campus and the Anschutz Medical Campus. The Downtown Denver Campus serves as the institution's comprehensive campus, while the Anschutz Medical Campus provides health sciences training in medicine, pharmacy, dentistry and nursing as well as many allied health professions. The Downtown Denver Campus serves more than 13,000 students offering undergraduate and master's degrees through the Schools and Colleges of Architecture and Planning, Arts and Media, Engineering, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Development, and Public Affairs. Doctoral degrees are offered in applied mathematics, civil engineering, health and behavioral sciences, educational leadership, planning and design, and public affairs. Classes are offered during weekday and evening hours, on weekends, at off-campus sites, and online. The Downtown Denver Campus values teaching and research/creative work equally. UC Denver is expected to serve the complex higher education needs of its city, the region which depends on the city and, by extension, the rest of the world.

The University of Colorado Denver requires the research of candidates for tenure and promotion to be evaluated by scholars in the candidate's field of specialization. Although the substance of your evaluation will be summarized for Dr. _____, you and your institution will not be identified. Your candor in evaluating Dr. _____'s research/creative work will be greatly appreciated.

All reappointments, promotions, and awards of tenure at the University of Colorado consider the candidate's record in teaching, research/creative work, and university and public service.

For promotion to associate professor and award of tenure in the seventh year, Dr. _____ must have (1) demonstrated meritorious performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service, and (2) demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/creative work. Your evaluation is extremely valuable to us in making this assessment.

Dr. _____'s teaching course load since his/her comprehensive review has been _____ [the exact average over the years, not what it would have been without reductions].

I have included a copy of Dr. _____'s current vita; his/her personal statements regarding teaching, research/creative work, and service; copies of the research papers/creative works s/he has submitted to us; and the primary unit criteria used to evaluate Dr. _____'s work.

In evaluating Dr. _____'s research, please address each of the following points in order:

1. The nature of your acquaintance, if any, with Dr. _____ and your knowledge of and/or familiarity with his/her research/creative work prior to this request.
2. The quality and quantity of the research/creative work
3. The main thrust(s) of the research/creative work and the impact of this research/creative work on this field.
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research/creative work.
5. The degree to which the research/creative work has evolved.
6. How Dr. _____'s research/creative work and productivity compare with others with similar training and experience in this field.
7. How you would categorize Dr. _____'s research/creative work accomplishments--below average, average, above average, or outstanding--compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.

As Dr. _____ will be evaluated by faculty outside of his/her department who may be unfamiliar with your career or field, please include a copy of a current *summary* vita with your evaluation letter.

If you have any questions concerning the review, please call me at the number listed below. We would appreciate receiving your evaluation no later than October 15.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist the University of Colorado Denver in this important academic review process.

Sample PRIMARY UNIT Evaluation Letter

Dear Dean _____:

I am forwarding the dossier for Dr. (as assistant professor/ associate professor/ professor) _____. The Department of _____ has carefully evaluated the teaching, research, and service record of Dr. _____ for the purpose of reappointment. The detailed assessments in each area are recorded in the subcommittee letters included with Dr. _____'s dossier.

A general meeting for all faculty in the department was held on November 28, 20XX, to discuss personnel cases. Of the [number] of faculty eligible to vote for tenure at the meeting, [number] were present, and the vote for [reappointment of Dr. _____ for three years at the rank of assistant professor] was [number] in favor, [number] against reappointment, and [number] abstentions.

The subcommittee on teaching finds that Dr. _____ is "extremely well-organized and well-prepared" for classes and that s/he is both prompt and fair in the handling of course materials. Dr. _____'s FCQ scores are consistently above the department average. For fifteen courses taught in the last four years, FCQ scores average 3.2 for course and 3.4 for instructor. Dr. _____'s professionalism and enthusiasm in the classroom are also reflected in the assessments by colleagues who visited classes. In addition, Dr. _____ has developed [number] new courses, including [number] online or hybrid courses, and has been actively and enthusiastically involved in the department's curriculum revision efforts.

The subcommittee on research/creative work and publications notes that Dr. _____ has written three scholarly articles in the short time since his/her appointment. Two have already been accepted, and the other has been submitted to a refereed journal. Dr. _____ is currently preparing one textbook under contract and is planning another textbook. In addition, Dr. _____ presented three papers, including one invited paper, at national professional meetings.

The subcommittee on service finds that Dr. _____ has amassed an "especially impressive" record. Beginning with Dr. _____'s first academic year on the Denver campus, s/he has been a member of two college committees and one university committee. Dr. _____ has carried out his/her duties in a most professional manner and has kept the department well informed about committee activities.

Among the reasons for which Dr. _____ was recruited was the coordination of lower-division courses, a responsibility which s/he has carried out with consummate professionalism. Dr. _____'s efforts have helped to place the program on a more solid academic foundation. Dr. _____'s performance as coordinator is all the more remarkable in view of her/his teaching and research accomplishments.

There is ample evidence that Dr. _____ is performing well. The personnel committee enthusiastically recommends that s/he be reappointed. As chair, I wholeheartedly endorse the department's recommendation.

Appendix D

Sample FIRST LEVEL REVIEW or DEAN'S Letter

Dear Dean or Provost _____:

I am forwarding the dossier of Dr. (or assistant professor/associate professor/professor) _____, who is being considered for promotion to professor. The Dean's Advisory Committee has fully considered the case. One committee member examined the dossier and made a presentation to other committee members, all of whom had reviewed the dossier. The four-member committee was unanimous in favor of promotion.

Dr. _____ came to the Downtown Denver Campus in 19XX, after teaching at the University of _____ and at _____ State University. S/he has consistently been of immense value to the department and the institution. S/he is an excellent teacher at all levels of instruction and in the broadest senses of the term, from helping freshmen to advancing the research/creative work capabilities of graduate students. Dr. _____'s research is admired by the best scholars in her/his field. In the last five years s/he has developed a research program that promises to earn him/her an even finer reputation. Dr. _____'s service is extraordinary. The departmental evaluations of her/his work are detailed and specific. I will highlight the contributions that make him/her one of our most valuable faculty members.

Dr. _____ has long been one of the college's finest teachers. S/he is a two-time winner and a three-time finalist for the Excellence in Teaching Award, convincing evidence of students' high regard for him/her. Faculty colleagues who have examined her/his course syllabi, exams, range of subjects taught, and levels of teaching, and observed his/her classroom performance, concur. The quality of her/his teaching is matched by his/her dedication. Since s/he became the program director in ekistics, I have observed first-hand another contribution to the college's teaching function. After assuming his/her responsibilities, Dr. _____ promptly improved procedures to ensure that students were well and fairly served and that academic standards were observed.

As colleagues and external reviewers attest, everything Dr. _____ has done is of high quality and recognizable importance. Some early work was "ground-breaking" and lasting. Her/his more recent work has implications for applied as well as theoretical study. His/her current research/creative work is almost certain to enlarge her/his reputation and that of the campus as s/he continues to investigate problems and to derive results that are "significant" (the adjective most repeated by his/her peers). Dr. _____ has consistently produced excellent published research that external reviewers assumed had already earned him/her a professorship. S/he is certain to produce more.

Dr. _____'s service contributions are of the same high quality as her/his teaching and research/creative work. S/he is always willing to take on responsibility and does an excellent job. As department chair, s/he excelled at complex paperwork and provided leadership to develop coherence and direction for academic programs and research potential. With her/his guidance, the department revised, improved, and expanded its undergraduate curriculum and graduate programs. Dr. _____ is a much sought after speaker and workshop leader in the community, building a good name for the department.

Dr. _____ belongs to that select group of individuals whose teaching, research, and service are all excellent and whose contributions are highly valued. We/I enthusiastically recommend him/her for promotion to professor.

Dossier Checklist for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Candidate's Name: _____

Action: Reappointment Comprehensive Review Tenure Promotion

School/College: _____

A candidate's dossier may be presented in no more than three (3), three-ring binders. If a candidate submits multiple binders, the case for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must be made in Binder #1, with supporting materials in the remaining binder(s).

Items on this checklist are listed in their required order in Binder #1.

- This checklist
- Form UCD-7
- Primary unit criteria
- Previous RTP and personnel actions, if any
- Primary unit recommendation
- if vote not unanimous, explanation and minority report
- First level review/Dean's advisory committee review
- if vote not unanimous, explanation and minority report
- Dean's recommendation
- Summary statement by candidate
- Candidate's current vita
- External letters
- Two (2) lists (candidate's and primary unit's), with indication of who responded
 - Explanation of how reviewers were chosen
 - Copy of the letter(s) sent to reviewers
 - Total number meets requirements explanation if requirement not met
 - Ratio meets requirements explanation if requirement not met
- Teaching
 - Subcommittee report
 - Candidate's statement
 - Supporting material
 - FCQs in separate binder
 - Peer review in separate binder
 - Other in separate binder
- Research/Creative Scholarly Activities
 - Subcommittee report
 - Candidate's statement
 - Supporting material in separate binder
- Service
 - Subcommittee report
 - Candidate's statement
 - Supporting material in separate binder
- ALL Signatures

I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and affirm that it is comprised of _____ binders, is complete, and is consistent with University policy.

Dean's Signature

Date