

Department of Electrical Engineering

Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review Process and Procedures September 22, 2011

**Revised June 1, 2020 to reflect new Regent Policy 5.D.2(B)
requirements for excellence in teaching.**

The Primary Unit

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

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

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

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

Criteria for Reappointment (also called the comprehensive review)

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

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

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

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

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

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

The CU System Administrative policy (APS) 1022, “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion” sets the standard for full professor as having: “(A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”

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

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

Criteria for Successful Post-Tenure Review

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

The post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member’s professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member’s record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance report, including FCQs, peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member’s five-year professional plan. The possible evaluation ratings per category (teaching, research, and service) are above expectation, meeting expectation and below expectation. According to The APS 1022, if the evaluation produces a “below expectation” rating (still in effect after any appeal of such a rating), the faculty member so rated must develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) that includes specific goals, timelines and benchmarks to

measure progress. The PIA process is complete when a rating of “meeting expectation” is achieved and the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle.

PROMOTION CRITERIA

The following lists accomplishments for research, teaching, and service that would be components leading to the rating of meritorious or excellent in the three areas of evaluation.

Per Regent Policy 5.D, a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.

Teaching

Meritorious

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

Excellent

- Acquiring externally funded teaching, curriculum development or equipment grants
- Developing multidisciplinary curricula.
- Publishing in refereed engineering education journals and/or refereed conference proceedings on pedagogical innovation or curricular innovations.
- Publishing textbooks for undergraduate and/or graduate level pedagogy.
- Internal and external peer evaluations documenting the impact on efforts to improve the quality of teaching
- Institutional or external teaching awards in recognition of excellence in teaching
- Evidence of inclusion of high-impact practices, inclusive pedagogy, or other teaching strategies followed by evaluation of these tools as effective methods for teaching in the discipline, such that teaching practices across the campus or beyond are positively impacted

Less than meritorious evaluations are based on a record that does not exhibit merits as those described above. Little effort to improve teaching and uninspired or ineffective student mentoring are indications of a less-than-meritorious record.

Research

Meritorious

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

Excellent

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

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

Service

Meritorious

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

Excellent

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

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

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

Stephen Gedney, Chair
Electrical Engineering Department

Date

Martin L. Dunn, Dean
College of Engineering, Design and Computing

Date

___ See memo dated August 6, 2020 ___
Roderick Nairn, Provost
University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical
Campus

August 4, 2020 ___
Date