



**Campus Administrative Policy**

**Policy Title: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review**

Policy Number: 1004 Functional Area: Academic & Faculty Affairs

Effective: ~~May 14, 2018~~ July 1, 2021  
Date Last Amended/Reviewed: ~~February 26~~ May 14, 2018  
Date Scheduled for Review: July 1, ~~2025~~ 2028  
Supersedes: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review, ~~July 1~~ May 14, ~~2015–2018~~

Approved by: ~~Dorothy A. Horrell~~ Michelle Marks  
Chancellor, University of Colorado Denver

Prepared by: ~~Assistant Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs~~ Special Assistant to the Provost

Reviewing Office: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Responsible Officer: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Applies to: ~~University of Colorado~~ CU Denver  
~~University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus~~

**A. INTRODUCTION**

Consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, ~~CU Denver and CU Anschutz~~ the University of Colorado Denver and University of Colorado Denver Anschutz Medical Campus ~~have~~ 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~~ (primary unit; dean and dean’s advisory/review committee ~~within the school/college/library)~~; second-level review (~~Vice-vice Chancellor’s~~ chancellor’s Advisory advisory Committee or VCAC, provost, and chancellor); and for tenure cases, third-level (president). ~~and The~~ Board of Regents makes the final decision on tenure.

**B. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A. Introduction..... 1  
B. Table of Contents..... 1

C.	Policy Statement .....	2
1.	Primary Unit Criteria.....	3
2.	Schedule for Reviews.....	3
3.	Standards for Review .....	6
4.	Limitations on Reviewer Participation.....	7
5.	Candidate Responsibilities .....	8
6.	Primary Unit Responsibilities .....	8
7.	Primary Unit Review (Step 1 of the First-Level Review).....	10
8.	Dean’s Review (Step 2 of the First-Level Review) .....	14
9.	Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) (Step 1 of the Second-Level Review).....	16
10.	Provost’s Recommendation (Step 2 of the Second-Level Review) .....	17
11.	Decision by the Chancellor (Step 3 of the Second-Level Review).....	18
12.	Presidential Review (Third-Level Review).....	18
13.	Board of Regents Decision.....	18
14.	Administrative Appeal .....	18
15.	Grievance Rights .....	19
A.	Introduction.....	1
B.	Table of Contents.....	1
C.	Policy Statement .....	2
1.	Primary Unit Criteria.....	2
2.	Schedule for Reviews.....	3
3.	Standards for Review .....	4
4.	Limitations on Reviewer Participation.....	5
5.	Candidate Responsibilities .....	6
6.	Primary Unit Responsibilities .....	7
7.	Primary Unit Review (Step 1 of the First Level Review).....	9
8.	Dean’s Review (Step 2 of the First Level Review) .....	10
9.	Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) (Step 1 of the Second Level Review).....	11
10.	Provost’s Recommendation (Step 2 of the Second Level Review) .....	13
11.	Decision by the Chancellor (Step 3 of the Second Level Review).....	13
12.	Presidential Review (Third Level Review).....	14
13.	Board of Regents Review.....	14
14.	Administrative Appeal .....	14
15.	Grievance Rights .....	15

**C. POLICY STATEMENT**

All evaluations of tenured and 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 APS #1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Comprehensive Review Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review and Promotion –and this campus policy. Primary unit<sup>1</sup> Primary unit procedures for

<sup>1</sup> Per APS 1022, “The primary unit is composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment,

reappointment, tenure, and promotion are subject to periodic review (at least every 3-5 years) by the Office of the Provost to ensure compliance with Board of Regents Law and Policy and campus and CU System administrative policies.

1. Primary Unit Criteria

- a. Each ~~school and college and the library~~ primary unit shall have ~~primary unit~~ criteria that are 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 review and reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Primary unit criteria are subject to approval by the dDean of the school or college in which the unit resides, and the Provost.
- b. ~~Should the~~ If primary unit ~~revise its tenure~~ criteria are revised during ~~the a~~ faculty member's tenure probationary period, ~~affected the~~ affected the faculty members may, ~~at that time,~~ elect to be evaluated for reappointment or tenure based on either the ~~basis of the~~ criteria at time of hiring-hire or the revised criteria. If ~~The faculty member~~ elects to be evaluated based on the revised criteria, ~~is required to make a formal, written request to the dean if they wish to be evaluated under Primary Unit criteria in effect at the time of the tenure review,~~ rather than the criteria in place when they entered the track, this choice must be indicated in writing and submitted to the dean. The dean is required ~~to to~~ provide written respond-acknowledgement in writing of to the faculty member's ~~request choice.~~ request choice. ~~The faculty member's request and the dean's approval~~ Both documents must be placed in the dossier.
- b.c. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current (most recently approved) primary unit criteria shall apply.
- e.d. Primary unit criteria must to-be included in the candidate's dossier to assist personnel-review committees in understanding the criteria and standards by which the candidate is being evaluated.

2. Schedule for Reviews

- a. ~~Appointment Length~~ Probationary Period.
- a. Faculty on the tenure track typically undergo comprehensive review in their fourth year; faculty with successful comprehensive reviews undergo review for tenure in their seventh year. The time leading up to promotion and tenure review is the probationary period.

---

tenure, and promotion. In schools and colleges with departmental organizations, each department will usually constitute a primary unit. In a school or college without such organization, all tenured and tenure-track faculty members have the responsibility for developing the terms of the working structure whereby the primary unit is defined. The primary unit may be a division, or may be the school or college as a whole. In some instances, the primary unit may involve faculty from cognate departments or institutes.”

(1) Prior Service Credit. Regent Law Article 5.B.4.D(3)-APS 1022 states: “Typically, 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-hire and must be included in the letter of offer. See the CU Denver University Administrative Policy Faculty Affairs website for further information.

~~(2) Faculty Members Hired without Terminal Degrees. As stated in Regent Law, Article 5.B.4.D(3): “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.”~~

~~(3)~~(2) Alterations to the Seven-Year Probationary Period.

(a) Approved Leave.

- As stated in APS 1022: “If a faculty member utilizes family medical leave or parental leave during the tenure probationary period, and the leave period is of sufficient length that the faculty member’s performance cannot be appropriately evaluated during that period, the faculty member shall be granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and is subject to approval by the dean and the chancellor.”

- \_\_\_\_\_

- As stated in APS 1022: “A faculty member may apply for leave for reasons other than family medical leave or parental leave during their probationary period. If the faculty member requests leave, with or without a requested extension of the probationary period, the request shall be reviewed by the chair and dean and the dean will issue a recommendation to the provost. The request is subject to provost approval. Any change to the probationary period because of leave shall be in increments of one year.”

(b) Tenure Upon Hire. If an individual’s professional accomplishments warrant, the tenure probationary period may be waived and tenure may be recommended upon hire. When this occurs, it must be documented in the letter of offer. Recommendations for tenure at

the time of hire are subject to review and approval following the procedures outlined in this policy.

- (c) Request for Early Consideration for Tenure. Tenure-track faculty members seeking early tenure are required to have undergone comprehensive review before they may apply for tenure. As stated in APS 1022, all faculty members in a unit, no matter when they are considered for tenure, are held to the same standards. 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.

~~b. Requirements for Comprehensive Review~~

- ~~(1) Assistant professors are required to undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor.~~
- ~~(2) 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.~~

e.b. Timing of Reviews

- (1) Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.
- (2) The comprehensive ~~reappointment~~ review for reappointment is typically conducted in the fourth year of the initial four-year appointment. If the comprehensive ~~reappointment~~ review is unsatisfactory, the fifth following year is the terminal year.
- (3) ~~Regent rules regarding~~ Typically, candidates are reviewed for -tenure ~~provide for review~~ in the seventh year. and, if tenure is approved, it is effective ~~the award of tenure~~ at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is the terminal year.

~~d. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure~~

~~Tenure-track faculty members seeking early tenure are required to have undergone comprehensive review as specified in C.2.b (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.~~

e.c. Deadlines

- (1) A faculty member failing to submit a dossier with all required materials at the scheduled time is deemed not to have applied for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

- (2) Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the [Provost's Office](#) ~~the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs~~ by [January 15<sup>th</sup> the established deadlines \(see the Provost's faculty affairs website or contact the office of faculty affairs\)](#). For mid-year appointments, consult with the [office of faculty affairs](#) ~~Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Office~~.
- (3) Deans who wish to submit dossiers after the due date (see preceding paragraph) must submit a written request for a delay to the [Provost's office of faculty affairs](#). ~~Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs~~.

### 3. Standards for Review

#### a. Tenure

- (1) Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive review ~~as specified in C.2.b (above)~~, before applying for tenure-consideration.
- (2) ~~To be awarded t~~To be awarded Tenure, a candidate must ~~may be awarded only for~~ demonstrated at least meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, ~~research~~scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or ~~research~~scholarly/creative work.
- (3) As required by Regent Policy 5.D.2(B), "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." (These requirements only apply to faculty hired on or after July 1, 2020.)

#### b. Promotion

- (1) Associate Professor: 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~~scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; occasionally, experienced individuals are hired as tenure-track associate professors.
- (2) 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~~ or librarianship, research ~~scholarly~~/creative work and leadership and service.

4. Limitations on Reviewer Participation

a. Confidentiality

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

b. Conflict of Interest

- (1) ~~A~~ ~~m~~Members of the primary unit, the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee, or the campus-level VCAC should recuse ~~him/herself~~ ~~themselves~~ from the deliberations when ~~he/she~~ ~~they~~ believes that there ~~is, or may be,~~ ~~is~~ a real or perceived conflict of interest with the candidate.
- (2) 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~~ ~~the~~ ability to participate objectively 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 are not considered conflicts of interest that would preclude an individual from participating in a promotion or tenure decision.~~
- (3) A candidate for promotion or tenure may ~~object to the participation of~~ ~~request in writing that~~ a colleague ~~in be~~ ~~recused from~~ the review process only if a conflict of interest has been documented previously via an official complaint made to the appropriate administrative office. A written request to prevent an individual from participating in the review process should be made by the candidate to the associate vice chancellor for Academic faculty affairs by September 1 of the review year. If the ~~A~~ ~~associate~~ ~~V~~ ~~vice~~ ~~C~~ ~~hancellor~~ agrees to the candidate's request, ~~he/she~~ ~~exclude~~ the colleague in question will be excluded from the ~~personnel~~ review process and ~~inform~~ the appropriate parties will be informed.

c. Participation at only one level of the process

~~A faculty member may speak to and vote at only 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~~ A faculty member may serve as a member of a primary unit review committee and participate in a faculty vote at the primary unit level (see C.7 below); however, no individual can vote in more than one level of the review process. For example, a faculty member who votes on a case in their 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.

5. Candidate Responsibilities

a. Dossier

- (1) The candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is responsible for preparing and submitting a clear, accurate, and detailed presentation of their record. The primary unit head shall advise the candidate on compiling the dossier.
- (2) Reviewers at all levels will review and judge the record of accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly/creative work and leadership and service only as represented in the dossier.

b. Additional materials

- (1) The candidate may add materials to the dossier after the review process has begun in accordance with primary unit policy and deadlines. Most often those materials confirm a recent addition to the candidate's record: confirmation of an article accepted, a grant awarded, an academic honor or recognition, a book contract signed, etc.
- (2) If materials are added during a higher level of the review process, they shall also be provided to all other bodies who already previously reviewed the candidate, who may take them into account and/or respond.

6. Primary Unit Responsibilities

a. Department Chair/Primary Unit Head

- (1) 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 school/college dean's office, or library dean's/director's office in a timely fashion; and
  - (c) re-reviewing cases, if required.
- (2) The department chair/primary unit head is also responsible for overseeing the process by which external reviewers are selected.

b. Dossier

The primary unit head is responsible for including in the dossier the primary unit criteria, letters of evaluation from external reviewers, the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) report, results of the faculty vote (see below), the previous VCAC and personnel action letters, subcommittee reports, and letters of evaluation from external reviewers and any other relevant materials (e.g. reports of primary unit evaluation subcommittees).

c. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers

(1) Solicitation of External Letters

(a) The primary unit is responsible for soliciting external letters of evaluation. Primary unit procedures should describe the process used in selecting external reviewers. The primary unit may offer external reviewers a modest stipend for their work.

(b) The department chair, division coordinator, associate dean, or dean/director of the school, college, or library must approve the letters requesting external evaluation before the primary unit sends them out.

(c) The external evaluators should be informed that their names, institutional affiliations, and letters are confidential and every effort will be made to ensure they remain confidential.

(d) All letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier.

(2) Responsibility of the External Reviewers

(a) External reviewers are provided the primary unit criteria and are asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work record and to measure that record against the primary unit criteria. Reviewers are asked to evaluate both the quality and quantity of the scholarly/creative work.

~~(3)~~—

~~(4)~~—

~~(a)~~—

(3) Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers

~~(b)~~(a) The candidate supplies a list of potential external reviewers to the primary unit from which one or two reviewers should be chosen. 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.

(b) The candidate may also indicate specific reviewers to exclude from consideration because their evaluations might be prejudiced.

~~(5)~~(4) 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.

(5) Requirements for External Letters

(a) External Letters for the Comprehensive Review. At least three external reviewers are required, with at most one selected from the candidate's list.

(b) External Letters for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion to Full. At least six external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two selected from the candidate's list.

(6) Rank and Affiliation of External Reviewers

(a) External reviewers should be at peer or higher-ranked institutions.

(b) External reviewers for comprehensive (reappointment) review and promotion/tenure review should be tenured associate professors or professors. For promotion to professor, the external reviewers should be tenured professors. Exceptions may be made when external reviewers have specialized expertise.

(c) External reviewers must provide a biographical sketch or short vita to be included in the dossier.

~~(6)~~(7) Documentation of External Evaluations.

In the confidential external letters section of the candidate's dossier, the primary unit should provide a copy of the approved letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters and full and complete documentation concerning:

(a) the selection of external reviewers;

(b) each evaluator's biographical sketch or short vita;

(c) whether the candidate or the primary unit recommended the evaluator;

~~(a)~~(d) the relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit.

7. Primary Unit Summary Review, Vote and Recommendation (Step 1 of the First-Level Review)

(1) For the purpose of assisting the primary unit in making 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.

(2) The primary unit evaluation committee (PUEC) provides-conducts a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, using the primary unit's written criteria. The primary unit committee's role is to evaluate, not to advocate for the candidates. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. While program requirements of the primary unit may be considered at the time of reappointment, only the merit of the candidate may be considered in recommending the award of tenure. At the completion of the evaluation process, the committee will issue a recommendation.

~~(3)(1) Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on tenure. The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual votes. 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. The recommendations shall record the primary unit's evaluation of and votes on the candidate's teaching (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), research/scholarship or creative work (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) and leadership and service (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) as well as the overall recommendation and vote.~~

~~(4)(3) Following the committee recommendation, and consistent with its primary unit bylaws, the faculty of the primary unit must vote on the action under consideration.<sup>2</sup> prepare a summary of the evaluation including a statement describing the procedures followed, and make a recommendation for action including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation and the results of any vote taken, and include this information in the dossier.~~

~~(4) Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on tenure. Only members of the primary unit holding the rank of full professor shall vote on promotions to full professor. The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual votes. 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 (or promotion)" is not sufficient. The~~

---

<sup>2</sup> APS 1022 allows for deviation from prescribed procedures when primary unit size and/or requirements for non-duplicative voting warrant an alternative process; however, any deviation from the procedures stated in system or campus policy must be voted on and approved by the full faculty and approved by the chancellor or chancellor's designee.

recommendations letter shall record the primary unit's evaluation and of and votes on regarding the candidate's teaching (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent), research/scholarship or scholarly/creative work, (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) and leadership and service, (not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent) as well as the overall recommendation and vote. The number of faculty members present for the vote must be reported. A unanimous vote is not required. Negative comments or votes or split votes should be explained and a minority report may be submitted.

(a) At comprehensive review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate is on track for tenure; not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or not on track for tenure.

(b) For tenure and promotion review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate's performance is excellent, meritorious, or not meritorious.

(5) The PUEC prepares a document with the following information: 1) a summary of the evaluation, including a statement describing the procedures followed; 2) a recommendation for action, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements; 3) the results of any vote taken. This document must be included in the dossier.

~~(5)~~(6) For assistant professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one recommendation.

~~(6)~~(7) 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.

~~(7)~~(8) 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.

## 8. Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers

### a. 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.~~

### b. Affiliation and Location of External Reviewers

~~External reviewers should be faculty members at institutions outside the University of Colorado system, preferably at "peer" or higher ranked~~

institutions.

~~e.—Rank of External Reviewers~~

- ~~(1)—External reviewers for comprehensive (reappointment) review and promotion/tenure review should be tenured associate professors or professors.~~
- ~~(2)—For promotion to professor, the external reviewers should be tenured professors.~~
- ~~(3)—Exceptions may be made when external reviewers have specialized expertise.~~
- ~~(4)—External reviewers must provide a biographical sketch or short vita to be included in the dossier.~~

~~d.—Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers~~

- ~~(1)—The candidate supplies a list of potential external reviewers to the primary unit from which one or two reviewers should be chosen (see section 7.g below).~~
- ~~(2)—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.~~
- ~~(3)—The candidate may also indicate specific reviewers to exclude from consideration because their evaluations might be prejudiced.~~

~~e.—Confidentiality~~

- ~~(1)—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.~~
- ~~(2)—The external evaluators' letters and their vitae are retained only by the Human Resources Office and copies must not be retained in the department, division, or dean's office.~~

~~f.—Nature of the External Letters~~

- ~~(1)—External Letters for the Comprehensive Review. At least three external reviewers are required, with at most one selected from the candidate's list, and at least two selected outside the candidate's list.~~
- ~~(2)—External Letters for Promotion and Tenure. At least six external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two selected from the candidate's list.~~

~~g.—Solicitation of External Letters~~

- ~~(7)—The primary unit or the dean 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.~~

- ~~(8) The department chair, division coordinator, associate dean, or dean/director of the school, college, or library must approve the letters requesting external evaluation before the primary unit sends them out.~~
- ~~(9) The external evaluators should be informed that their names, institutional affiliations, and letters are confidential and every effort will be made to insure they remain confidential.~~
- ~~(10) All letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier.~~

~~h. Documentation of External Evaluations~~

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

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

9.8. Dean's Responsibility Review (Step 2 of the First-Level Review)

a. First Level Dean's Review Committee, Summary, Vote, and Recommendation

- (1) The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee, as defined in the bylaws of the school, college, 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.
- (2) When a~~A~~ member of the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee has a conflict of interest, the member may not be present during any discussions of the case, and must not contribute ~~in any way~~ to or influence the discussion. The member, and must be recused themselves from voting and must not be present during ~~voting on the case~~the vote, where s/he has a conflict of interest with the candidate. (See section C.4.b for the definition of conflict of interest.)
- (3) The Dean's Advisory/Review Committee evaluates the candidate and issues a recommendation vote for action. must specify the number of members present and the actual vote. ~~must specify the number of members present and the actual vote.~~ A statement such as "we do/do not recommend tenure" is not sufficient. ~~A unanimous vote is not required.~~ The recommendation letter shall record the Dean's Review Committee

evaluation of and votes on regarding the candidate's teaching (~~not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent~~), research/scholarship or scholarly/-creative work, (~~not meritorious, meritorious or excellent~~) and leadership and service, (~~not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent~~) as well as the overall recommendation and vote. The number of committee members present for the vote must be reported. A unanimous vote is not required.

(a) At comprehensive review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate is on track for tenure; not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or not on track for tenure.

~~(a)~~(b) For tenure review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate's performance is excellent, meritorious, or not meritorious.

~~(3)~~(4) The dean's office will provide the candidate with a copy of the review committee's recommendation at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate's dossier.

b. Dean's Recommendation

- (1) The dean prepares an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement.
- (2) If the ~~first level~~Dean's review~~Review/Advisory committee~~Committee and/or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the dean must ~~discuss~~communicate in writing 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~~dean's review committee. If the reconsideration process will lead to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the dean should notify the ~~Associate Vice Chancellor's Office~~office of faculty affairs in writing and provide a probable time for submission.
- (3) 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. This statement shall be included in the dossier.
- (4) 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.

- (5) The dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, completes and signs Form UCD-7 and forwards the complete dossier to the Provost's Office by ~~January 15~~ [the established deadline](#).

~~10.9.~~ Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) [\(Step 1 of the Second-Level Review\)](#)

The ~~P~~provost/~~Executive V~~ice ~~C~~hancellor for ~~A~~cademic ~~and Student A~~ffairs has an advisory committee of faculty to assist in the review of recommendations; the provost determines whether the committee will be elected or appointed ~~(per-~~ [\(See APS 1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion APS 1022\)](#)). Every effort should be made to ensure that the VCAC is as diverse as the constituency it represents.

a. Membership

- (1) Faculty of the schools, colleges, and library elect or nominate representatives to the VCAC. Each of the schools, colleges, and the library has one representative, except for [the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences](#), which has three representatives, who must be from different departments.
- (2) 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.
- (3) Faculty members may not serve on both ~~the first level review committee~~ [\(the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee\)](#) and the VCAC.
- (4) Faculty members who serve on the VCAC may not be considered for promotion to professor while they are on the committee.
- (5) Associate deans and department chairs are not eligible to serve on the VCAC.
- (6) Members of the VCAC must not be advocates for any candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.
- (7) Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must not discuss the candidate's case with the chair or members of the VCAC.
- (8) When a member of the VCAC has a conflict of interest with a candidate, ~~he/she~~ [the committee member](#) may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to, or influence the discussion, and must be recused from and not be present during voting on the case. (See Section C.4.b for the definition of conflict of interest.)
- (9) When faculty members agree to serve on the VCAC, they are ~~required-~~ [expected](#) to attend all committee meetings except under unusual circumstances.

b. Role and Responsibilities

- (1) The VCAC assists with the campus level review of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and is advisory to the provost;
- (2) 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 is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in Regent laws ~~and policies~~ policy and administrative policy statements and is governed by its specific bylaws.
- (3) All members of the VCAC, including the chair, review, vote on, and make recommendations on the following VCAC actions:
  - (a) comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor prior to eligibility for tenure;
  - (b) promotion to associate professor and professor;
  - (c) award of tenure; and
  - (d) appointments of new faculty members if they are requesting tenure and/or promotion ~~at the time of the hiring~~;
- ~~(4) Committee deliberations and votes are confidential;~~
- ~~(5) The committee provides written recommendations to the provost;~~
- (4) After confidential deliberation and vote, the committee prepares a written recommendation to the provost. The chair of the VCAC is charged with drafting the recommendation to the provost. If the vote is not unanimous, the judgments of the minority are summarized and included in the written recommendation.
  - (a) At comprehensive review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate is on track for tenure; not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or not on track for tenure.
  - (b) For tenure review, the vote must indicate – for each evaluative area – whether the candidate’s performance is excellent, meritorious, or not meritorious.

11.10. Provost’s Recommendation (Step 2 of the Second-Level Review)

- a. The provost reviews each case and makes a recommendation to the chancellor.
- b. If the provost disagrees with the recommendation from the first-level review, the provost transmits to the dean the nature of the disagreement. The Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee and the dean reconsider their original recommendations and report their reconsidered judgment to the provost who then makes a final recommendation to the chancellor.

- c. The provost communicates directly with the dean about all negative decisions.
- d. The provost sends each candidate a copy of the VCAC's recommendation, which specifies strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. ~~The provost informs the candidate~~ is informed in writing of ~~his/her the~~ the provost's recommendation. ~~The This written notice provost is~~ usually ~~notifies~~ each provided by the provost ~~candidate of the recommendation in writing by~~ before the end of the academic year.

~~12.11.~~ Decision by the Chancellor (Step 3 of the Second-Level Review)

- a. The chancellor reviews the tenure recommendations of the provost and makes a final decision about which candidates are forwarded to the ~~President~~ president and Board of Regents for consideration for tenure. The chancellor does not forward negative decisions on tenure to the President's Office.
- b. The chancellor makes the final decision on reappointments and promotions. These decisions do not require higher-level approval ~~by the Board of Regents~~.
- c. If the chief academic officer (chancellor or their designee, such as the provost) finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, ~~he/she returns~~ the case will be returned 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 for one year. The re-evaluation process shall focus on the record as it existed at the time of the first initial review.

12. Presidential Review (Third-Level Review)

The president reviews recommendations for tenure submitted by the chancellor. If the president concurs with the recommendation, the case is forwarded to the Board of Regents.

13. Board of Regents Decision

The Board of Regents issues all final decisions regarding the award of tenure.

~~13.14.~~ Administrative Appeal Grievance Procedures

- a. ~~In the case of a negative decision on reappointment or~~ Within 10 business days of receipt of notification, a candidate not recommended for tenure by the chancellor, the candidate—within ten working day of receipt of written notice of the negative recommendation— may request a review by the president. ~~This review will be granted~~ The only ~~on the~~ grounds for presidential review are: that ~~the process had~~ (i) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (ii) substantive-factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they have affected the outcome; or (iii) ~~evidence of discrimination~~ the material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy; or some combination of these grounds (see APS 1022).

- b. The president may determine there are no grounds for appeal and uphold the chancellor's decision. In this circumstance, the case is closed.
- c. If the president determines there are grounds for appeal:
  - (1) The president may remand the case to the campus to rectify errors and require the chancellor to then revise or reaffirm the original recommendation.
  - (2) The president may overrule the campus decision and recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.
  - (3) The president may convene a faculty advisory committee to review the case. The committee may issue a recommendation on tenure or recommend action to rectify errors. If the committee makes a recommendation on tenure, it shall base its recommendation on the dossier available to the chancellor at the time the chancellor issued a decision. Ultimately, the president shall either make the final decision to uphold the chancellor's decision to deny tenure or shall recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

#### 14.15. Grievance Procedures Rights

- a. Following a negative 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. If a candidate is denied reappointment, promotion, or tenure and believes that there have been serious procedural or factual errors in the case, or the denial occurred through the material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy, the candidate may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate grievance committee in accordance with Regent Policy 5.G. Grievance statements must be received by the grievance committee chair within 60 calendar days following the faculty member's receipt of written notification of final action.
- b. A grievance may not be filed until all available administrative appeals have been exhausted.
- c. While procedural errors per se may entitle the candidate to proper reconsideration, such errors may not be used as the justification for personnel recommendations not otherwise justified on the basis of performance.
- d. The faculty governance grievance committee cannot substitute its judgement about an individual's merit for that of other committees and administrators.

#### **Notes**

- 1. Dates of official enactment and amendments:  
 July 8, 2005: Adopted  
 July 1, 2010: Revised  
 July 1, 2015: Revised

July 1, 2018: Revised  
[July 1, 2021](#): Revised

2. History:

March 1, 2018: Revised to: (i) reflect the current policy numbering and indexing process and (iii) to reflect the process requiring tenure track faculty members to make a formal written request to the Dean if they wish to be evaluated under Primary Unit Criteria in effect at the time of the tenure review rather than the criteria in place when they entered the track.

[July 1, 2021](#): Revised to align with changes to Regent Policy and Administrative Policy Statement 1022, Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. In addition, this policy previously applied to both CU Denver and CU Anschutz but a decision was reached to create a separate policy for each campus. Effective July 1, 2021, this policy applies only to CU Denver. The CU Anschutz reappointment, tenure, and promotion policy is stated in Campus Administrative Policy 1049.

3. Initial Policy Effective Date: July 8, 2005

4. Cross References/Appendix:

- [APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for ~~Comprehensive Review~~ Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review and Promotion](#)
- [Faculty Affairs and Undergraduate Enrichment Faculty Assistance Webpage](#)
- [CU Denver | CU Anschutz Official Campus Administrative Policies Website](#)
- [Regent Law, Article 5: Faculty Policy 5D: Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#)
- [Campus Policy 1021, Hire with Tenure](#)