



Campus Administrative Policy

Policy Title: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review

Policy Number: 1049 Functional Area: Academic & Faculty Affairs

Effective: November 15, 2022
Date Last Amended/Reviewed: November 15, 2022
Date Scheduled for Review: July 1, 2027
Supersedes: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review (July 1, 2021)

Approved by: Donald M. Elliman, Jr.
Chancellor, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

Prepared by: CU Anschutz Office of Academic and Student Affairs
Reviewing Office: CU Anschutz Office of Academic and Student Affairs
Responsible Officer: CU Anschutz Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (EVC-ASA)

Applies to: CU Anschutz

A. INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, CU Anschutz 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: first-level (primary unit; dean and Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee within the school/college); second-level (vice chancellor’s advisory committee or VCAC, EVC-ASA, and chancellor); and for tenure cases, third-level (president). 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..... 2
 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)	12
9. Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) (Step 1 of the Second-Level Review).....	14
10. Executive Vice Chancellor’s Recommendation (Step 2 of the Second-Level Review).....	15
11. Chancellor Review (Step 3 of the Second-Level Review).....	15
12. Presidential Review (Third-Level Review).....	16
13. Board of Regents Review	16
14. Administrative Appeal	16
15. Grievance Rights	17

C. POLICY STATEMENT

All evaluations of tenured and tenure-track (or “tenure-eligible”) faculty for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion must be conducted in accordance with [University of Colorado APS 1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review](#) and this campus policy.

Primary unit¹ procedures for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion are subject to review and approval by the Office of the EVC-ASA to ensure compliance with Board of Regents Law and Policy and campus and CU System administrative policies.

1. Primary Unit Criteria

- a. Each primary unit shall have 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 subject to comprehensive review (also referred to as mid-term review, interim review, or mid-course review), tenure, or promotion review. Primary unit criteria are subject to approval by the dean of the school or college in which the unit resides and the EVC-ASA.
- b. If primary unit criteria are revised during a faculty member’s probationary period, the faculty member may elect to be evaluated for comprehensive review or tenure based on either the approved criteria at time of hire or the revised criteria. If the faculty member elects to be evaluated based on the revised criteria, rather than the criteria in place when they entered the track, this choice must be made explicit in the faculty member’s dossier or indicated

¹ 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, 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.”

in writing and submitted to the dean. Acknowledgement by the dean (or the dean's designee) must also be included in the dossier.

- (1) Faculty members who are evaluated for promotion to associate professor without a coincident evaluation of tenure may elect, in writing or in a statement in the faculty member's promotion dossier, to be evaluated for promotion based on the approved primary unit criteria at the time of appointment or the current (most recently approved) primary unit criteria.
- c. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current (most recently approved) primary unit criteria shall apply.
- d. Primary unit criteria must be included, or an electronic link must be provided, in the candidate's dossier to assist review committees in understanding the criteria and standards by which the candidate is being evaluated.

2. Schedule for Reviews

- a. Probationary Period. Faculty on the tenure track typically undergo comprehensive review in their third or fourth year as assistant professor; faculty with successful comprehensive reviews undergo review for tenure and promotion in their seventh year. The time prior to tenure and promotion review is the probationary period.

Faculty members in the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy, and Colorado School of Public Health are exceptions to this rule. At these schools, there is no time limit for tenure review, and the time leading up to review for promotion to associate professor is the probationary period.

- (1) Prior Service Credit. APS 1022 states: "Typically, up to three years of full-time service in the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period." The number of years of prior service credit to be applied to the *tenure* probationary period must be negotiated at the time of hire and must be included in the letter of offer.

(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 is of sufficient length that the faculty member's performance cannot be appropriately evaluated during that period, the faculty member will 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 must be approved by the dean and 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 will 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 Extension. In accordance with university, campus, and school/college policies, a faculty member may request an extension to the probationary period. An extension is subject to approval by the dean and EVC-ASA.
- In the School of Dental Medicine and College of Nursing, a faculty member may apply for a one-year extension to the tenure clock, in accordance with university, campus, and school/college policy.
 - In the School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, which do not have a tenure clock, a faculty member may apply for a promotion clock extension of up to three years, in accordance with university, campus, and school policy.
- (d) Request for Early Consideration for Tenure. Assistant professors on the tenure-track 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.
- In the School of Dental Medicine and College of Nursing, an unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock, in accordance with school/college policy.

- In the School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, which do not have a tenure clock, a candidate may not reapply within three years of being denied based on a negative recommendation by the dean.
- b. Timing of Reviews
 - (1) School of Dental Medicine and College of Nursing
 - (a) Reappointment and tenure reviews normally take place in the last year of the current appointment.
 - (b) The comprehensive review for reappointment is typically conducted in the fourth year of the initial four-year appointment. If the comprehensive review is unsatisfactory, the following year is the terminal year.
 - (c) Candidates must be reviewed for tenure by the end of the seventh year, unless an extension has been approved. If tenure is approved, it is effective at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is the terminal year.
 - (2) School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences
 - (a) Tenure-track faculty members may be reviewed for promotion to associate professor without a review for tenure. Candidates must be reviewed for promotion by the end of the seventh year of service unless an extension has been approved. There is no time limit for the review of tenure.
- 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 Office of the EVC-ASA by the established deadlines. For mid-year appointments, consult with the Office of the EVC-ASA.
 - (3) Deans who wish to submit dossiers after the due date must submit a written request for a delay to the Office of the EVC-ASA.

3. Standards for Review

a. Tenure

- (1) Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive review before applying for tenure except when tenure is being recommended upon hire.²
- (2) A faculty member awarded tenure must demonstrate at least meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service and demonstrate excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.
- (3) Per Regent Policy 5.D.2(A), additional requirements for faculty members in the School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, or School of Pharmacy, include:
 - (a) In the School of Medicine, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with national and international reputations for academic excellence who are among the best in their field of academic endeavor and who have demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching.

Professional/administrative leadership and service and/or clinical activities should be weighed into any decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.
 - (b) In its tenure recommendations, the Colorado School of Public Health may consider public health practice/clinical activity and scholarship.
 - (c) In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence, and dedication to, teaching.
- (4) 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.)

² For faculty members in the School of Dental Medicine or College of Nursing who are hired into the Associate Professor or Professor rank without tenure, the hiring process may constitute the comprehensive review. This must be documented in the letter of offer.

- (a) For the School of Medicine and School of Pharmacy, which require excellence in both teaching and scholarship, at least one area must show evidence of impact beyond the institution.
 - b. Promotion
 - (1) Promotion to associate professor requires successful teaching experience and accomplishment in scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, and as appropriate, clinical work. If qualifications warrant, an individual may be hired as a tenure-track associate or full professor.
 - (2) 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 promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, and as appropriate, clinical work.
- 4. Limitations on Reviewer Participation
 - a. Confidentiality
 - (1) Discussion at all levels of the personnel process is confidential. Individual reviewers may not communicate with the candidate, or with anyone not involved in the process, 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) Members of the primary unit, the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee, or the campus-level VCAC should recuse themselves from the deliberations when they believe that there is, or may be, 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 the ability to participate objectively in meetings or deliberations related to a recommendation regarding promotion or tenure.
 - (3) A candidate for promotion or tenure may request in writing that a colleague 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 EVC-ASA by September 1 of the review year. If the

executive vice chancellor agrees to the candidate's request, the colleague in question will be excluded from the personnel review and the appropriate parties will be informed.

c. Participation at Only One Level 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 comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion is responsible for preparing and submitting a clear, accurate, and detailed presentation of their record. The primary unit head (or designee) shall advise the candidate on compiling the dossier.
- (2) Reviewers at all levels will review and judge the record of accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and clinical work 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 school/college 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 that previously reviewed the candidate, which 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 (or designee) 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 or college dean'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 (or providing a link to) the primary unit criteria, letters of evaluation from external reviewers, Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) report, faculty vote (where applicable), and any other relevant materials. The primary unit may solicit letters of evaluation (including from within CU) in addition to the external reviewers' letters required for the review process. All letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier.
- 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 division head, department chair, associate dean, or dean of the school or college 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 with the primary unit criteria and asked to evaluate the scholarly/creative work record and, if applicable, the candidates record of teaching and clinical service, 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 and other academic work.
- (3) Candidate Nomination of External Reviewers
- (a) The candidate must be given the opportunity to supply a list of potential external reviewers to the primary unit. 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.
 - (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 Comprehensive Review. Typically, at least three letters from external reviewers are included in the dossier; however primary unit policies and procedures may allow for exceptions.
 - (b) External Letters for Promotion and/or Tenure. At least three external letters of evaluation are required; however, additional letters are encouraged, within the guidelines established by the primary unit.
 - (6) Rank and Affiliation and Location of External Reviewers
 - (a) External reviewers should be at peer or higher-ranked institutions. School/college policy can make this a strict requirement.
 - (b) External reviewers for comprehensive review and promotion and tenure review should be associate professors or professors. For promotion to professor, the external reviewers should be professors. Exceptions may be made when external reviewers have specialized expertise.
 - (7) Documentation of External Evaluations. The dean's office must maintain 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;³
 - (c) the relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate.
- 7. Primary Unit Review (Step 1 of the First-Level Review)⁴
 - (1) For the purpose of assisting the primary unit in making recommendations, each primary unit will elect or appoint (having previously voted on the

³ In the School of Medicine, this is a strict requirement for tenure cases only.

⁴ Per APS 1022, review procedures at the School of Medicine, Colorado School of Public Health, and Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences may vary. In addition, 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.

method to be followed) from among its members an evaluation committee for each candidate undergoing comprehensive review or tenure and/or promotion review 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) Using the primary unit's written criteria, the primary unit evaluation committee (PUEC) conducts a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the applicable areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and clinical work. The committee's role is to evaluate, not to advocate for the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. While program requirements of the primary unit may be considered at comprehensive review, only the merit of the candidate may be considered in recommending promotion or tenure. At the completion of the evaluation process, the committee will issue a recommendation.
- (3) Following the committee recommendation, and consistent with primary unit bylaws, all eligible faculty of the primary unit must vote on tenure and/or promotion. A faculty vote at comprehensive review is not required, but may be conducted in accordance with primary unit policy.
- (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. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend tenure (or promotion)" is not sufficient. The recommendation shall record the primary unit's evaluation and votes regarding the candidate's teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, and as appropriate, clinical work, 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) If a vote is conducted at comprehensive review, the vote must indicate – for *each* evaluative area – whether the candidate is on track for tenure and/or promotion; not yet on track for tenure and/or promotion, but could meet standards for tenure and/or promotion with appropriate corrections; or not on track for tenure and/or promotion.
 - (b) For tenure or 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 confidential summary of key comments by external reviewers; 3) a recommendation for action, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements; 4) the results of any votes taken. This document must be included in the dossier.
 - (6) For assistant professors in the School of Dental Medicine and College of Nursing, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one recommendation.
 - (7) The department chair/head of the primary unit promptly informs the candidate of the primary unit's recommendation and provides the candidate with access to the primary unit recommendation letter and the chair's letter at the time the letters are added to the candidate's dossier.
8. Dean's Review (Step 2 of the First-Level Review)
- a. Dean's Review/Advisory Committee Recommendation
 - (1) The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee, as defined in the bylaws of the school or college, reviews the candidate's dossier, and votes on the proposed action. (School/college policy determines if a review by the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee is required at comprehensive review.) The committee's evaluation and recommendation are forwarded to the dean for action. The first-level review is a thorough assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
 - (2) When 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 to or influence the discussion. The member must be recused from voting and must not be present during the vote. (See section C.4.b for the definition of conflict of interest.)
 - (3) The Dean's Review/Advisory Committee evaluates the candidate and issues a recommendation. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend tenure" is not sufficient. The recommendation letter shall record the Dean's Review/Advisory Committee evaluation and votes regarding the candidate's teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and as appropriate, clinical work, 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) If a vote is conducted at comprehensive review, the vote must indicate – for *each* evaluative area – whether the candidate is on track for tenure and/or promotion; not yet on track for tenure and/or promotion, but could meet standards for tenure and/or promotion

with appropriate corrections; or not on track for tenure and/or promotion.

- (b) For tenure or promotion review, the vote must indicate – for *each* evaluative area – whether the candidate’s performance is excellent, meritorious, or not meritorious.
- (4) The dean’s office will provide the candidate with access to the review committee’s recommendation.
- b. Dean’s Recommendation
 - (1) The dean provides an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement.
 - (2) If the Dean’s Review/Advisory Committee and/or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the dean must 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 dean’s review committee. If the reconsideration process will lead to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the dean should notify the EVC-ASA 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.
 - (4) The dean must promptly inform the chair of the primary unit of the dean’s recommendation. The chair of the primary unit must promptly inform the candidate of the dean’s recommendation. The dean provides the candidate access to the dean’s letter to the EVC-ASA at the time the letter is inserted in the candidate’s dossier.
 - (5) Recommendations for reappointment or promotion with unanimous support are typically not reviewed beyond the first-level, although all actions must be formally approved by the EVC-ASA and chancellor via the Personnel Matters Report. Additionally, the EVC-ASA may review cases for promotion without tenure and may conduct a periodic review of promotion cases to ensure compliance with university policy.
 - (6) For promotion cases without unanimous support and all tenure cases, the dean (or dean’s designee) reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included and forwards the complete dossier to the Office of the EVC-ASA by the established deadline for review by the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee.

9. Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) (Step 1 of the Second-Level Review)

The Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) is a faculty committee that assists the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (EVC-ASA) in reviewing recommendations; the EVC-ASA determines whether the committee will be elected or appointed (per APS 1022). Every effort should be made to ensure that the VCAC is as diverse as the constituency it represents.

a. Membership

- (1) The Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee is composed of a chairperson and 14 faculty members; two from the School of Dental Medicine, six from the School of Medicine, two from the College of Nursing, two from the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences and two from the Colorado School of Public Health. The procedure for appointing VCAC members is left to the discretion of each school and college.
- (2) Per VCAC bylaws, faculty members of the VCAC must be tenured and hold the rank of professor.
- (3) Any faculty member who participates in a preliminary reappointment, promotion and/or tenure recommendation, either in an administrative capacity or as a member of a school or college review committee, is not eligible to serve on the VCAC.
- (4) Assistant and associate deans and department chairs and division and section heads are not eligible to serve on the VCAC.
- (5) When a member of the VCAC has a conflict of interest with a candidate, 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.)
- (6) When faculty members agree to serve on the VCAC, they are 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 and is advisory to the EVC-ASA.
- (2) The VCAC is responsible for reviewing and evaluating dossiers and making recommendations for all candidates for tenure. In cases of promotion without tenure, the VCAC only reviews cases that did not receive unanimous support at the first-level review. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment,

tenure, and promotion specified in Regent law and policy and administrative policy statements and is governed by its specific bylaws.

- (3) Members of the VCAC must not be advocates for any candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.
- (4) Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must not discuss the candidate's case with the chair or members of the VCAC.
- (5) After confidential deliberation and vote, the committee prepares a written recommendation to the EVC-ASA. The chair of the VCAC is charged with drafting the recommendation to the EVC-ASA. If the vote is not unanimous, the judgments of the minority are summarized and included in the written recommendation.
 - (a) For tenure and promotion review, the VCAC vote must indicate – for *each* evaluative area – whether the candidate's performance is excellent, meritorious, or not meritorious.

10. Executive Vice Chancellor's Recommendation (Step 2 of the Second-Level Review)

- a. The EVC-ASA must review each case for tenure and make a recommendation to the chancellor. The EVC-ASA may review cases for promotion without tenure and may conduct a periodic review of promotion cases to ensure compliance with university policy.
- b. If the EVC-ASA disagrees with the recommendation from the first-level review, the EVC-ASA 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 EVC-ASA who then makes a final recommendation to the chancellor.
- c. The EVC-ASA communicates directly with the dean about all negative decisions.
- d. The EVC-ASA sends each candidate a copy of the VCAC's recommendation, which specifies strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. The candidate is informed in writing of the EVC-ASA's recommendation. This written notice is usually provided by the EVC-ASA before the end of the academic year.

11. Chancellor Review (Step 3 of the Second-Level Review)

- a. The chancellor reviews tenure recommendations of the EVC-ASA and makes a final decision about which candidates are forwarded to the president and Board of Regents for consideration for tenure. The chancellor does not forward negative decisions on tenure to the President's Office.
- b. Reappointment and promotion decisions are approved by the chancellor via the Personnel Matters Report. These decisions do not require higher-level approval.

- c. If the chief academic officer (chancellor or their designee, such as the EVC-ASA) finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, the case will be returned to the primary unit to repeat the process. The chief academic officer may 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 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 Review

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

14. Administrative Appeal

- a. Within 10 business days of receipt of notification, a candidate not recommended for tenure by the chancellor may request a review by the president. The only grounds for presidential review are: (i) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (ii) factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they have affected the outcome; or (iii) 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.

15. Grievance Rights

- a. 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 1, 2021: Adopted (July 1, 2021)
2. History: July 1, 2021: Policy 1004, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion previously applied to both CU Denver and CU Anschutz. A decision was reached to create a separate policy for each campus resulting in Policy 1049 for CU Anschutz (effective July 1, 2021). Policy 1049 is based on 1004 with revisions appropriate to CU Anschutz in addition to revisions required to align campus policy with changes to Regent Policy and Administrative Policy Statement 1022, Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.

November 16, 2021 – The policy was updated to provide clarification regarding the required approvals for extensions of tenure and/or promotion clocks.

June 2022 – Administrative changes were adopted to clarify requirements related to the review and approval of procedures for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion; requests for tenure clock extensions; and procedures for comprehensive review prior to tenure review.

November 2022 – Revised.
3. Initial Policy Effective Date: July 1, 2021 (formerly part of Policy 1004)
4. Cross References/Appendix:
 - [APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review](#)
 - [Regent Policy 5D: Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#)
 - [Campus Administrative Policy 1021, Hire with Tenure](#)