



- Title:** **Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for the Evaluation and Development of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**
- Approval:** Revisions to “Teaching Criteria,” section 5.b.ii.2.b, were approved by the SPA Faculty on August 31, 2020 and by the Provost on August 4, 2020.
(replaces all previous versions)
- Previous:** Approved by the SPA Faculty in August 2020; Adopted by Resolution of the SPA Faculty Council, March 8, 2006 and Amended in 2012, 2016, and 2017.
- Effective:** **July 1, 2020**
- Related:** University of Colorado Regent Laws & Policies:
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies>
University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements (APS):
<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps>
University of Colorado Faculty Handbook:
<https://www.cu.edu/oaa/faculty-affairs/faculty-handbook>
CU Denver Campus Level Policies:
https://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/employees/policies/Pages/default.aspx
-

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Policy Statement
3. Timing and Scheduling of Reviews
 - a. CU Denver Campus Administrative Policy Statements on Timing of Reviews
 - b. Regent Law Statements on Timing of Reviews
4. SPA Review Procedures and Committees (Structure, Composition, and Responsibilities)
 - a. RTP Committee (aka Primary Unit Review Committee)
 - b. Dean’s Review Committee (aka DRC or First Level Review)
 - c. Dean’s Review
 - d. SPA Appellate Review
5. Standards and Criteria for Review
 - a. Regent Standards (excerpts from APS #1022)
 - b. SPA Criteria for Review (aka Primary Unit Criteria)
 - i. General Criteria for Faculty Evaluation
 - ii. Specific Criteria for Faculty Evaluation
 1. Pre-Tenure Comprehensive Review
 2. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
 - a. Research Criteria
 - b. Teaching Criteria
 - c. Service and Leadership Criteria
 3. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
 4. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

1. Introduction

This document describes the policies, procedures, and criteria adopted by the School of Public Affairs to implement those portions of the University of Colorado Laws, Policies and Administrative Policy Statements of the Board of Regents and CU Denver (hereinafter, “campus”) policies related to the periodic review of faculty performance for the purposes of School decision making on questions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Section 5.b. describes the criteria for evaluating faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service for assessing faculty members for periodic reviews. This document also describes the procedures (including decision structures) to be used in making decisions concerning these criteria and evidence in individual cases.

2. Policy Statement

All of the School’s criteria and policies for tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review are governed by the procedures and standards set forth in the Laws & Policies of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado, and are outlined in the University of Colorado’s Administration Policy Statement (APS) #1022, as well as CU Denver campus level policies. SPA has made every effort to ensure compliance with these higher level policies and procedures, however, as policies and procedures are amended from time to time, or if a discrepancy is found, the higher level policy will prevail.

3. Timing & Scheduling of Reviews

No later than the end of the spring semester prior to the academic year in which a SPA faculty member becomes a candidate for periodic review (pre-tenure comprehensive review, review for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor, and post-tenure reviews), the candidate shall be so informed by the Dean’s Office in writing, which notice will also include a timetable for the review process. To ensure that all faculty scheduled for review in an upcoming academic year are given adequate notice, the Office of the Dean shall maintain a continuously updated database indicating when all tenure-track faculty are scheduled for what form of periodic review, and when.

By August 1 of the upcoming review year, the RTP Chair – having solicited reviewer suggestions from each candidate for review by the end of the previous spring term – shall prepare a list of potential external reviewers for each candidate for review for whom external review is required. By the end of the academic year preceding the review year, the RTP chair or Dean’s Office representative will also inform all candidates for periodic review of what materials and supporting documentation they must provide to the RTP Committee, including deadlines for the production of such materials and documentation in the fall of the upcoming academic year.

3.a. CU Denver Campus Administrative Policy Statements on Timing of Reviews

The following statements are taken from the CU Denver Campus Administrative Policy 1004, “Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion” (July 1, 2015 version):

“C.2.b. Requirement for Comprehensive Review

Assistant professors are required to undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor. 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.

C.2.c. Timing of Reviews

1. Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.
2. 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.
3. Regent 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.

C.2.d. Failure to Submit a Dossier

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

“C.3. Standards for Review

C.3.a. Tenure

1. Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive review as specified in section C.2.B, before applying for tenure consideration.”

“C.3.b. Promotion

1. *Associate Professor.* At CU Denver, 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 leadership and service; occasionally, experienced individuals are hired as tenure-track associate professors.”

3.b. Regent Law Statements on Timing of Reviews

Alterations to the 7-Year Probationary Period: As stated in Regent Law, Article 5.B: “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.”

Prior Service Credit. Regent Law Article 5.B. states: “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.

4. SPA Review Procedures and Committees (Structure, Composition, and Responsibilities)

The successful implementation of the criteria and standards described in Section 5 of this document requires decision structures and procedures that the faculty deem to be both fair and capable of achieving an accurate determination in individual cases. The principal structures for this purpose are (1) the SPA Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee (aka “primary unit” committee); and (2) the Dean’s Review Committee.

The RTP Committee plays two roles: (a) a developmental role with faculty to clarify SPA expectations and criteria and to advise faculty in appropriate methods for meeting University standards; and (b) a judgment role in determining whether reappointment, tenure and promotion are granted. The Dean’s Review Committee (DRC) determines whether, in its view, the RTP Committee fairly and accurately applied this document’s criteria to evaluation of a faculty member’s record in its assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. The DRC will conduct a *full* review of the candidate’s record, and it shall determine whether, in its view, the RTP Committee’s assessment was based on substantial evidence within the candidate’s record. If it finds that it was not, it shall specify the areas in which its judgement differs from that of the RTP Committee, and why.

The RTP Committee Chair will be a tenured full professor on the SPA faculty, and will be appointed by the Dean, upon a vote of the SPA Faculty Council in the spring term, to serve for the upcoming academic year. Once elected, the RTP Chair shall serve no more than three consecutive one-year terms. The chair of the Dean’s Review Committee shall be a tenured SPA faculty member at or above the rank of faculty subject to review.

4.a. RTP Committee (aka Primary Unit Committee)

In consultation with all candidates for review in the upcoming academic year and with the RTP Chair,

the Dean will appoint at least two additional members of the RTP Committee for the year in addition to the chair. In confidential consultation with the Dean, the candidate for review may request recusal from participation in the RTP process a faculty member the candidate has reasonable cause to believe would not be capable of fairly evaluating the candidate's record.

The RTP Chair, supported by the Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will advise and assist the candidate in the preparation of materials for pre-meeting committee review. For purposes of comprehensive pre-tenure review, review for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor, external evaluations of the candidate shall be obtained by the RTP Chair, in consultation with RTP Committee members and other faculty. The number of external reviewers being not less than the minimum required for such review by Denver campus and CU system guidelines. Additional letters may be sought at the RTP Committee's discretion.

External reviewers will be selected by the RTP Committee Chair in consultation with other members, and the faculty at large as needed. For the purposes of comprehensive review, one such reviewer shall be chosen from a list of not less than two names submitted to the RTP chair by the candidate for review. For the purposes of application for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the applicant shall submit a list of no less than three possible external reviewers, from which two shall be chosen by the RTP Chair. The identities of external reviewers shall not be disclosed to the candidate for review. External reviewers will be asked by the Committee to assess the candidate's qualifications for achieving the School's tenure and promotion criteria at the level of either meritorious or excellence as described in Section 5 of this document.

To the extent legally permissible, the identities of all reviewers will be held in confidence by the committee. The committee will review the candidate's materials as presented in keeping with the criteria, evidence, and standards described in Section 5 of this document, and will then vote a recommendation on the candidate's record to the Dean. Deliberations conducted by the RTP Committee, all correspondence between Committee members regarding the capabilities of candidates for review, and all external evaluations obtained by the Committee in support of those deliberations are of a confidential nature; and campus policies and procedures regarding the handling of confidential personnel material shall apply.

For the purpose of post-tenure review and in consultation with candidates for such review and the RTP Chair, the Dean will adjust the membership of the RTP Committee to ensure that all members are at or above the rank of the candidate for review. In some instances (and in consultation with the candidate and the RTP Chair), this may include senior faculty external to the School, who is a subject matter expert, which it shall be the prerogative of the faculty member being reviewed to nominate, appointment subject to the assent of the Dean and Chair of the RTP Committee.

For the purpose of reviewing applications for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the RTP chair and the Dean will invite all tenured SPA faculty members who wish to do so to participate in advising the RTP Committee on the tenure decision.

4.b. Dean's Review Committee (aka DRC or First Level Review Committee)

The Dean will appoint the members of the Dean's Review Committee each year. Each candidate for review, at their option, may request the appointment of an additional member of the DRC for the purpose of that candidate's evaluation. This request should be made in writing to the Dean. This person may be a member of the SPA faculty (at or above the level of review being applied for), or may be a tenured faculty member of another School or department on campus or elsewhere in the university system (at or above the level of review being applied for) who has subject matter expertise in one or more subject areas in which the candidate has declared competency for review purposes. The level of scholarly achievement of an external appointee shall be commensurate with that of a tenured SPA faculty member; and such appointments are subject to the approval both of the Dean and the chair of the RTP Committee.

This committee will review all recommendations made to the Dean by the RTP Committee, to assure that

such recommendations were made fairly and accurately (i.e., in keeping with Section 5 of this document) as well as a thorough assessment of the candidate's strengths and weakness in accordance with campus policy. Any appeal submitted by a candidate to the Dean of a letter of recommendation made by the RTP Committee will be referred to the Dean's Review Committee. At its discretion, the Dean's Review Committee may consult with faculty elsewhere on campus in making this determination, either on its own initiative or at the request of a candidate for review.

4.c. Dean's Review

The Dean's Review Committee will report to the Dean on each case forwarded to it, either upholding the RTP Committee's decision or recommending other action. If the recommendations of the Dean's Review Committee differ with those of the RTP Committee, the case shall be remanded to the RTP Committee for reconsideration and resubmission of recommendations to the Dean. Final action on all academic personnel matters in the School of Public Affairs rests with the Dean of the School, prior to subsequent action at the campus and university levels.

4.d. SPA Appellate Review

In the event that a faculty member wishes to appeal either a periodic or annual post-tenure performance assessment, the faculty member shall so inform the Dean in writing, which statement shall include the specific bases for the appeal. If the appeal does not prove susceptible to informal resolution, the Dean shall, within 10 days of the receipt of the written appeal, appoint a PTR Appellate Review Committee, consisting of not less than three members. Appointees to the Committee may not have participated in the original assessment of the faculty member's performance. The Committee may include full-time faculty members from other academic units within the University of Colorado at or above the rank of the SPA faculty member filing the appeal. Appointment of external members of the PTR Appellate Review Committee shall be subject to the approval of the Dean and the RTP Committee Chair. The faculty member filing the appeal may request the recusal of any faculty member they determine may not be able to objectively evaluate the case.

5. Standards and Criteria for Review

5.a. Regent Standards (excerpts from APS #1022)

Comprehensive Review: "The comprehensive review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate's strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure."

Standards for Performance for 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 leadership and service to the University and the faculty member's profession, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/creative work."

Standards for Performance for Promotion: "All candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor must meet the University's standards of performance as approved by the Board of Regents:

- o Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and increasing accomplishment in research, scholarship/creative activity, or clinical service/professional practice, as articulated in the primary unit criteria.
- o Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, 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 or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas."

5.b. SPA Criteria for Review (aka Primary Unit Criteria)

5.b.i General Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

The learning community of faculty and students of the School of Public Affairs assumes that all tenure-track faculty members have an active, compelling, and coherent research agenda, the collective effect of which is (1) to assure the School's national prominence in contributions to knowledge relevant to public affairs; and (2) to create a learning laboratory for students. Although faculty will develop individualized approaches to the generation of a well-regarded record of research-based scholarship, all tenure-track faculty are expected to make a significant, original contribution to knowledge in their chosen field(s) of specialization, and to publish those contributions in authoritative venues appropriate to their disciplines.

All faculty are expected to establish effective classroom instruction and assessment, such that students obtain knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their careers based on current knowledge, theory, research, and practice; enhance students' knowledge and professional growth outside of classroom settings (for example: advising; participation on advanced seminar projects, theses, or dissertations; enhancing student learning through research and community service projects, internships, facilitation of student participation in actual policy or management processes.)

SPA's mission is built on public service, and all faculty, particularly after the award of tenure, are expected to provide meaningful leadership and service to the university community, Colorado, and their own national professional communities. Faculty are expected to serve the School, campus, university, community, and professional societies and organizations. Given the mission of SPA, service also includes activities that link academic and practitioner realms, featuring contributions of professional expertise to governmental institutions and non-profit organizations. Such activities are expected to bring professional recognition and public support to SPA and the Denver campus, and impact policy and practice.

5.b.ii. Specific Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

5.b.ii.1 Pre-Tenure Comprehensive Review

Relative progress toward attainment of a tenurable record established in the professional development plan will constitute the primary measure of performance at the pre-tenure level. For instance, by the beginning of the third year of service the candidate for review should have begun to demonstrate both promise and productivity in amassing evidence of the sort listed in section 2.2 of this document, with a predominant emphasis on teaching and research.

By the beginning of the fourth year of membership on the faculty, during which the first comprehensive external review of the assistant professor's record is conducted by the SPA and CU Denver Campus RTP Committees, the candidate for review should be able to produce evidence of continuing progress toward tenure, as verified by external (as well as internal) scholarly review; that is, a development trajectory progressing toward a tenurable record. At this stage of development, evidence should include:

- multiple articles in academic or professional journals and/or book chapters subject to peer review (i.e. about six after the third year), which reflect a trajectory that can feasibly meet the quantity and quality expected for tenure (see section 2.3 below) and additional such work at various stages of preparation and external review for publication;
- an indication of consistently strong teaching evidenced through multiple forms of evaluation of teaching (see University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement 1009 for recommended forms of multiple evaluation, which include peer assessments, student focus groups, mid-term student evaluations, self-evaluation reports, course syllabi evaluations); and improved teaching performance and/or efforts to take training

in teaching effectiveness in the event that previous teaching evaluations had indicated areas in which significant improvement was warranted;

- a record of continuing service to the School, campus, governmental institutions and/or community-based organizations, and professional societies and organizations.

At the time of comprehensive review, the SPA RTP Committee shall report in its recommendation to the dean whether or not the colleague under review is proceeding on a trajectory leading toward either meritorious or excellent professional performance in the realm of teaching, research, and service. In this review, the Committee shall advise the colleague undergoing review as to what steps should be taken to achieve excellence in either teaching or research. The pre-tenure colleague shall then work with their mentoring committee to help implement this advice toward developing a tenurable record.

5.b.ii.2 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In accordance with Regent Policy, the School requires that candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor “demonstrate meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. . . . In addition, candidates must demonstrate excellence in either teaching or research/creative work.” See [Regent Policy 5](#).

Candidates are reminded that 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.” See [APS 1022, section V.I](#).

5.b.ii.2.a Research Criteria

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality research. Per CU Denver policy, the following six overarching criteria will be used by SPA to assess research:

1. The quality and quantity of research publications;
2. The significance and/or impact of the research on one’s field;
3. The coherence of one’s research program;
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research;
5. The degree to which the research demonstrates a continuous record of scholarly activity, growth and/or evolution; and
6. How the candidate’s research and productivity compares to others with similar training and experience in the candidate’s discipline and/or allied fields.

A successful research record may be judged as either (1) *meritorious* or (2) *excellent*. Assessments will be made on all of the six criteria listed above and judgments of a meritorious or excellent record are made at the discretion of the RTP committee, external reviewers, and the campus-level tenure and promotion committee.

For achieving either a meritorious ranking or excellent ranking, all scholarly work should be of high quality. The candidate is responsible for providing adequate evidence of research quality in their dossier, which will be assessed by the RTP Committee and external reviewers. Quality can be determined in a variety of ways (i.e., criteria 2-6 in the list above). At a minimum, for a *meritorious* ranking, the candidate’s research should demonstrate an overall emphasis on improving knowledge and practice in their field or sub-field. The candidate also should have a well-developed and coherent research program (e.g., through grants, reputation among colleagues, working or publishing with students), and publish in quality outlets (e.g., national reputation, acceptance/rejection rates, impact scores, size of the audience or subscription base, and national reputation of the editor(s) and authors publishing therein).

For a ranking of *excellent*, the candidate should go beyond meeting the requirements

for meritorious research in terms of quality. This requires demonstrating a clear impact on the field and/or achieving a national reputation for one's research (e.g., evidenced through honors/awards, citations, reviews of one's work, media coverage, publications in particularly high ranking journals). For a ranking of excellent, a candidate's research record also should demonstrate a high level of creativity and originality.

With respect to the quantity of publications, the School sets general targets. For a research record to be judged *meritorious*, the candidate is expected to publish at least eight peer-reviewed publications in academic outlets (e.g., journal articles), a sufficient number of which should demonstrate independence of research (e.g., single-authorship, letters from co-authors attesting to independence, serving as a principal investigator on grant-funded research). For a research record to be judged *excellent*, the candidate is expected to publish at least twelve peer-reviewed publications in academic outlets, with sufficient evidence of a high level independence including at least four single-authored publications. A single or first-authored scholarly (not edited) book may count for up to four peer-reviewed journal articles. Publications must be in print or accepted for publication (without the need for further refereeing) at the time of submission of the dossier. Research published prior to the candidate's start at SPA may be considered as part of the record of research. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of manuscripts accepted for publication or in press. Note that evidence of particularly high quality research may be used to justify exceptions to the quantity standard for research. Candidates must provide some form of evidence of the quality of each of their publications in their dossier (e.g., journal rankings, national reputation, citations, or other forms of impact).

While peer-reviewed publications will be prioritized in assessing the candidate's research, other forms of scholarly products may be substitutable in certain limited cases. These include, but are not limited to, externally funded grants, professional reports based on academic research, , textbooks, book reviews, papers published in conference proceedings, book chapters, and edited books. To merit substitution for a peer-reviewed publication, an alternative scholarly product will be expected to be substantial in content and impact. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence as to why the content and impact of a particular scholarly product merits substitution.

5.b.ii.2.b Teaching Criteria

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality teaching. Candidates who have taught courses at other institutions prior to starting at SPA may include evidence of their teaching record from other institutions in their dossier. The following eight overarching criteria will be used to assess teaching:

1. Clarity and rigor of the candidate's teaching materials;
2. Demonstrated expertise in and knowledge of both scholarly subject matter and teaching methods appropriate to the courses the candidate teaches;
3. Creativity and innovation in course development, design, and/or delivery;
4. Responsiveness to teaching feedback and students' concerns;
5. Professionalism and sensitivity of the candidate in addressing diversity issues, broadly conceived, both inside and outside of the classroom;
6. An ability to engage students intellectually and supportively beyond the classroom;
7. Ongoing participation in pedagogical development and regular course improvement, including implementation of multiple forms of teaching evaluation; and
8. Evidence of sharing of pedagogical expertise or contributing to the advancement of teaching or learning.

To demonstrate achievement of the aforementioned criteria, candidates must submit

multiple forms of evidence. Such evidence can include (but is not limited to): course syllabi and assignments, peer or mentor evaluations, qualitative and quantitative FCQ data, non-FCQ student evaluations, commendation letters from current or former students, samples of graded assignments (with associated grading rubrics), assessments of learning given in the classroom, innovative teaching activities, teaching awards, publications directly related to pedagogy, a teaching philosophy statement that includes an overview of curricular or pedagogical innovations, an account of service-learning projects, supervision of independent studies, theses and dissertation advising, student mentoring, a record of successful student outcomes (e.g., scholarships/fellowships, admission to graduate programs, acceptance of scholarly work at professional conferences, and/or publication of scholarly work in academic journals), ability to effectively teach across multiple levels or formats (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, online), and participation in the design of courses or curriculum.

A teaching record may be judged as either (1) *meritorious* or (2) *excellent*.

For a teaching record to be judged *meritorious*, the evidence submitted must clearly, consistently, and compellingly demonstrate that the candidate has met the eight overarching criteria outlined above.

For a teaching record to be judged *excellent*, the candidate must have a teaching portfolio that demonstrates continuous excellence in the classroom and a strong record of contributions to the improvement of pedagogy and teaching practice. Candidates must meet all of the criteria required for an evaluation of *meritorious* described above, and aim for six or more of the ten conditions listed below, at least one of which must demonstrate 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 (per Regent Policy 5.D.2).

1. Receive one or more SPA, University, or disciplinary teaching awards.
2. Give teaching-related presentations at workshops, short courses, professional conferences, or peer institutions.
3. Publish one or more refereed journal articles focusing on pedagogy.
4. Publish a textbook in the field of public administration, public management, public policy, criminology, criminal justice, or related field.
5. Facilitate student-directed research projects that are presented at an appropriate professional venue or are published in a peer-reviewed journal.
6. Facilitate student research and engagement in community-based projects.
7. Engage in substantial advising and mentoring of students.
8. Demonstrate applications of high-impact teaching practices (e.g., service-learning projects, diversity, and inclusion, and writing intensive assignments), with evidence of quality from multiple forms of teaching evaluations.
9. Engage in training and mentoring of new faculty or presenting pedagogical innovations to other faculty.
10. Other equivalently important/substantive work related to teaching.

Please note that meeting six of the above-mentioned criteria alone does not guarantee evaluation as excellent. All pedagogical work will be evaluated based upon its quality (namely: prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, impact, overall scope and time-commitment) If a candidate demonstrates that one of the conditions listed above is extraordinarily high in quality, that condition may be considered substitutable for another condition on the list. Assessment of the quality of a candidate's teaching should take into account the expectations and capacity of pre-tenure faculty given their requirements for maintaining a research trajectory.

5.b.ii.2.c Leadership and Service Criteria

For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality service. The following two overarching criteria will be used to assess service:

1. The quantity and breadth of service.
2. The overall competence of the candidate's service efforts (e.g., capability, commitment, contribution, collegiality, ability to complete assigned tasks, duties, and responsibilities in a timely and effective manner).

A successful service record may be judged as either (1) *meritorious* or (2) *excellent*.

For a service record to be judged *meritorious*, the evidence submitted must demonstrate: (a) Consistent and competent participation on committees at the school-level; (b) regular attendance at formal SPA or University events; (c) consistent and competent service on University or institutional committees; and (d) disciplinary service, which may include but is not limited to reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals, serving on committees for disciplinary organizations or societies, or serving as an officer for a professional society.

For a service record to be judged *excellent*, the candidate must meet all of the criteria required for an evaluation of *meritorious* and fulfill at least two or more of the following conditions:

1. Receive one or more service awards.
2. Hold significant and increasingly responsible positions of leadership (e.g., committee chairships, program directorships, managerial positions, journal editorships) within SPA, University, and/or discipline.
3. Make substantial contributions in areas of expertise to community-based projects, task forces, committees/boards, or provide regular voluntary (non-remunerated) expert advice to community organizations, agencies, or non-profit groups.
4. Regularly serve as an expert for the media on topics important to areas of expertise.
5. Serve as expert witness or jury consultant regarding areas of expertise.

Please note that quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as *excellent*. All service will be evaluated based upon its quality (e.g., prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth,) as well as quantity (e.g., overall scope and time-commitment). If a candidate demonstrates that one of the conditions listed above is extraordinarily high in quality or quantity, that condition may be considered substitutable for another condition on the list.

5.b.ii.3 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; 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 activity, and service.

The record established following tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must reveal not only continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching, research, and service activities, but represent the highest standards of professional performance. Judgments concerning research performance will be guided by the quantity and quality of publications and their significance and impact as a body of scholarly work. More specifically, a significant volume of important books and/or articles published in journals (the contents of which are subject to peer review) or book chapters recognized as

contributing to the field of knowledge is essential to promotion to Full Professor.

Judgments concerning teaching performance will be guided by a sustained record of outstanding course evaluations, strong curriculum development, pedagogical innovations, and distinguished leadership. Judgments concerning service performance will be guided by a significant level of service contributions with demonstrated leadership in a variety of areas, which may include the School, campus, and university as well as contributions to local, state, national, and international organizations, agencies, institutions, and professional associations and societies. In employing standards concomitant with promotion to the highest academic rank conferred, the RTP Committee shall apply the most rigorous criteria to performance outcomes.

Application for promotion to full professor will include preparation of a Continuing Professional Development Plan, as described in § 2.5. below. A tenured associate professor at SPA may apply for promotion to full professor at any time; the normative minimum period for such application is five years subsequent to promotion to associate professor.

5.b.ii.4 Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with campus and university policies, tenured professors at SPA will stand for review every five years, as dated from the professor's most recent promotion. To assist in post-tenure review primary unit committee deliberations, all candidates for post-tenure review will prepare and present to the SPA RTP Committee a Continuing Professional Development Plan. Post-tenure review shall be conducted by the RTP Committee, acting in its capacity as Post-Tenure Review Committee. On its own initiative or at the request of the faculty member being reviewed, an external member of the RTP Committee for the purposes of such review may be appointed, subject to the approval of both the Dean and the Chair of the RTP Committee. A candidate for review may likewise request the recusal from committee membership on the candidate's case a colleague the candidate has reason to believe is not capable of fairly assessing the candidate's record.

Continuing Professional Development Plan. The plan will include a reflective self-assessment of professional performance since the most recent review in the areas of teaching, research, and service; and a statement of intended future activities in each of these three areas during the upcoming 5-year period. This statement may include a description of institutional support which may be sought to assist in making such improvements.

Professors hired with tenure will prepare and present to the chair of the RTP Committee a professional development plan within the first year of their appointment on the SPA faculty.

The chair of the RTP Committee and the Chair of the APC shall review this plan and shall advise the newly hired colleague as to any areas in which the Plan might benefit from further discussion.

Assessment of Performance of Faculty Standing for Post-Tenure Review (PTR). In evaluating the professional performance of faculty standing for post-tenure review, the RTP Committee shall include a characterization of such performance as *Outstanding*, *Exceeding Expectations*, *Meeting Expectations*, *Below Expectations*, or *Fails to Meet Expectations*. It shall be the responsibility of the RTP Committee to prepare (and amend as necessary) operational definitions of these categories of assessment, subject to the approval of the SPA Faculty Council. Per Regent Policies: "Faculty members who have achieved summary evaluations of "meeting expectations" or better on their annual merit evaluations (see the administrative policy statement "Performance Ratings for Faculty") since the last PTR (or since receiving tenure if this is their first PTR) shall undergo Regular Review. Faculty members who receive a summary evaluation of "below expectations" at any time during a five-year PTR cycle shall undergo Triggered Review (see APS on Performance Ratings for

Faculty for more information on Triggered Review, Extensive Review, and the Performance Improvement Agreement). Faculty members who do not agree with their annual Performance Ratings may request reconsideration of the rating through established procedures in the department or college/school. In the case that the PTR committee determines that the faculty member is not "meeting expectations," the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. The PIA shall include specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that can be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. If the goals of the PIA have been met, as evidenced in the next annual merit evaluation after the term of the PIA, the faculty member continues in the current review cycle. If the goals of the PIA have not been met, an extensive review process shall be initiated (See APS on Performance Ratings for Faculty for more information on the Performance Improvement Agreement and Extensive Review). Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the post tenure review process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for insubordination and dereliction of duty.”