Department of Nursing

CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble

The following Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure criteria were developed and adopted by the tenure-track and tenured Nursing faculty in accordance with the criteria and standards provided by University documents. They are designed to provide guidance concerning the interpretation of those activities expected of a tenure-track or tenured Nursing faculty member.

The University of Colorado policies and criteria for personnel actions are defined in the University of Colorado Board of Regents' Laws and Policies [*Regent Laws Article 5: Faculty, Part C: Appointments and Tenure; Regent Policy 5. Faculty, D. Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion] available on the website https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies*; University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements [*APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion; APS 1018 Justification for Appointment with Tenure (Outside Hire with Tenure)], available on the website https://www.cu.edu/ope/1022* and *https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1018*]; and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy *[Policy 200-001] available on the website https://www.uccs.edu/vcaf/sites/vcaf/files/inline-files/200-001.pdf*.

The tenured faculty in the Department of Nursing assess the influence of the teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service of its tenure-track and tenured faculty on the discipline of nursing and related fields. The mission of the Department of Nursing is to develop exceptional nurses through innovative and experiential education, scholarship and service. Our values that are at the core of the teaching/learning relationship are a spirit of inquiry; innovation; experiential learning; diversity; ethics; excellence; caring; community engagement and advocacy; and collaboration and partnerships. The department is committed to quality teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and effective leadership and service to the department, college, university campus, university system, profession, and community. The department embraces the teacher-scholar-leader model with an emphasis on the integration of teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service. While professional practice is not evaluated as a separate category, it may be incorporated throughout and contribute to teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate exemplary ethical standards in teaching, research/scholarship/ creative works, and leadership and service. The department values collaboration within and outside of the department, collegiality, the development of a faculty member as a 'whole' person, and a culture of wellness including work/life balance.

The criteria presented in this document are to be considered criteria for the review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review in the Department of Nursing in the Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Candidates currently within Nursing may choose to use these criteria or the criteria under which they were hired for reappointment, promotion to associate professor, and tenure, and will include the criteria under which they choose to be evaluated in their dossiers. Candidates for promotion to full professor and post-tenure review must use the criteria in place at the time of the review. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; education and training in the discipline; conduct that reflects professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and

disseminating knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

The indicators of faculty achievements in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service contained in this document are criteria for review of candidates. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in nursing. These indicators will be used as a framework to make a professional judgment about a candidate's record consistent with a candidate's expertise and current practice. The items listed here as indicators of quality teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service are suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole will not be reduced solely to quantitative calculations, but will also consider the quality of the works presented.

The indicators provided in this document serve as a framework for all tenure-track and tenured faculty for self-assessment and peer review, as well as indicators for appropriate rank at the time of appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and during post-tenure reviews. It is expected that faculty will demonstrate growth in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service with an increasing number of indicators over time in rank. Expectations of individual faculty members will take into account any approved differentiated workload distribution of responsibilities during the time being evaluated, as defined by the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) and/or a differential workload document. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances within the policies and procedures of the campus and university. These criteria are published to 1) assist faculty in interpreting the Regents' standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure by clarifying the conditions under which candidates meet requirements for advancement; 2) provide the Nursing Primary Unit Committee with well-defined criteria on which to determine a faculty member's accomplishments; 3) provide the Dean's Review Committee and the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC) with Department standards for RPT; and 4) provide criteria for external reviewers to evaluate a candidate's accomplishments towards RPT. In addition to the UCCS requirements in the dossier, Nursing requires candidates to submit a copy of their initial contract, any revised contracts, and any subsequent differential workload documents [Faculty Responsibility Statements (FRS)].

Faculty may be hired with or without credit for prior service towards tenure and rank. Credit for prior service towards tenure and rank is negotiated at the time of hire and described in the initial letter of offer.

The criteria provided for *the initial reappointment review, comprehensive review, tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to full Professor* in the teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service categories reflect a 40% teaching, 40% research/scholarship/creative works, and 20% leadership and service workload distribution. If the faculty member utilizes an approved differentiated workload related to teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and/or leadership and service, then the expectations related to quality and growth in the affected categories will remain the same but the evidence required will be evaluated accordingly.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW (Second year)
At this level of review, candidates will provide evidence of the initiation of efforts to establish effective programs of teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and demonstrate willingness to serve in department and professional capacities (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001)*.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW (Fourth year):
At this level, candidates will have demonstrated that adequate progress is being made toward tenure. The faculty member is becoming established as a teacher and researcher, and is a contributor to the Department, and to some extent, to the campus or wider community through leadership and service (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001)*. At the comprehensive review level, candidates should not be awarded ratings of *meritorious* or *excellent*. Evaluations should reflect that adequate progress is being made toward tenure.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
At UCCS, the review for promotion to Associate Professor generally occurs at the same time as the tenure review. At this level, tenure and/or promotion may only be awarded to faculty members who are judged "meritorious" in each of the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service, and "excellent" in either teaching or research/scholarship/creative works. Candidates and evaluators are referred to UCCS RPT Policy, Section VII, Standards for Review, and subsections: A) Tenure, and B) Early Tenure (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001)*.

If candidates choose to apply for early tenure, the standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure clock will apply for early tenure review. Candidates must have a record of achievement in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member applying for tenure at UCCS in the seventh year. Regent policy calls for meritorious performance in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service, as well as excellence in either teaching or research/scholarship/creative works. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure review. The department chair and tenured faculty have a responsibility to advise tenure-track colleagues on the wisdom of going up for early tenure review and should not encourage any colleague to stand for early tenure review unless they are confident that their colleague's record is tenurable. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock. (*APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion and UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*)

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
Promotion to full Professor is self-initiated and the evaluation period begins from when the individual is first awarded tenure and/or Associate Professor status. The Department has adopted the University's standard for promotion to full Professor. Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's dossier must reflect 1) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be *excellent*; 2) a record of significant contributions to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and 3) a record since receiving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research/

scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service *(University of Colorado Board of Regents Policy 5: APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion; and UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001)*.

Promotion to full Professor requires that candidates be judged as making significant contributions in all three areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service since receiving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. The evaluation for promotion to Professor is based largely on activities and progress since the award of tenure, but also considers candidates' career as a whole. Differentiated workloads should be considered based on needs of the Department, College and University. Differentiated workloads will be documented by the Chair of the Department and Dean of the College and evaluated based on actual percentages of the differentiation.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The purpose of the post-tenure review is to 1) facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of Nursing; and 2) ensure professional accountability.

Since post-tenure appointments may be subject to workload differentiations, the dossier will be evaluated based on approved workload distributions. If no evidence of approved workload distribution is provided (via letter from the Department Chair and Dean), the faculty will be evaluated on Teaching (40%), Research/Scholarship/Creative Works (40%), and Leadership and Service (20%).

Post-tenure reviews shall be conducted by one review committee consisting of tenured faculty members from Nursing. The committee shall consist of at least three (3) members and will be appointed by the tenured department faculty who shall also designate the committee chair.

Standards and processes for post-tenure review of faculty are governed by *Article V of the Laws of the Regents*. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in *UCCS Policy # 200-016*. The Department of Nursing faculty adopts the UCCS campus Post-Tenure Review policy (*UCCS Policy 200-016*) with the following additions:

1) Candidates will submit a personal statement addressing the current professional plan. The personal statement will articulate how the faculty member has met or has made significant progress toward meeting the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member's current professional plan. Reasons that goals and performance objectives have not been (or will not be) met will be explained. If goals and performance objectives were changed during the period under review, reasons for the change will be explained (e.g., change in differentiated workload, change in administrative duties, etc.).

2) Candidates will prepare a single binder with the following:

      a) Curriculum vitae

      b) Faculty differentiated workload statement(s) (if applicable)

      c) Current professional plan (established per *UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016*). The professional plan developed by the faculty member at the time of tenure or at the last

post-tenure review shall be the main focus of the review. The committee will review the faculty member's self-set goals from the professional plan, the personal statement, and the curriculum vita to determine whether accomplishments are evident in the areas outlined in those goals. The outcome of the review will be a determination of whether appropriate effort was made in the targeted areas selected by the faculty member.

d) Personal statement addressing progress since the last review

e) Annual summary evaluation reports (e.g., merit reviews) from previous 5 years, including evaluation letters from all levels of review.

f) All methods of teaching evaluation from the previous 5 years. These will include a minimum of 3 methods of teaching evaluation each academic year, one of which is the required FCQs. Faculty members will describe the methods of teaching evaluation utilized and include the results of the evaluation including but not limited to the summary sheets from FCQ's and at least one peer review of teaching evaluation.

g) Professional Plan addressing next five years. The professional plan is a qualitative document that provides an overview of the likely areas of professional accomplishment over the next five years.

h) Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FERPA) from last five years.

Faculty who receive a "below expectations" rating on any Annual Performance Rating will be reviewed according to *UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016 (https://www.uccs.edu/vcaf/sites/vcaf/files/inline-files/2017-JUN-27_200-016-Post-Tenure-Review-APPROVED.PDF).*

During the post-tenure review, faculty members will be considered to "meet expectations" if they have met or have made significant progress toward meeting a majority of the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member's current professional plan. The post-tenure review committee may also determine that a faculty member has "exceeded expectations" or is "outstanding" based on the documentation provided by the faculty member.

TEACHING

The Department of Nursing recognizes that individual faculty have a personal philosophy of teaching-learning and it is expected that these philosophies will be congruent with the values of the Department and of the profession. Interprofessional engagement both within and outside of the department is encouraged. We recognize and value the scholarship of teaching and its influence on and integration with the practice of teaching. We expect that engagement of students in the teaching-learning process will be reflected in both philosophy and practice. Teaching is evaluated by examining teaching effectiveness, course development, evaluation, innovation, and curriculum development.

Candidates will articulate the specific item(s) in the teaching statement that fulfill the criteria presented and provide evidence in the dossier. Candidates will build a body of evidence to demonstrate and support their quality of and growth in teaching. The teaching statement and representative evidence presented will demonstrate a progressive improvement in teaching during the time under review. Candidates are encouraged to describe linkages between their teaching and research/scholarship/creative works and/or leadership and service.

Curriculum evaluation, development, and/or accreditation may count in the category of Teaching Quality Indicators.

For each level of review, the department will place emphasis on the teaching contribution and progressive growth of the individual. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice, are coherently organized, and are delivered in a manner to promote critical thinking. In addition, candidates will articulate how their courses reflect the vision, mission, philosophy and core values of the department. It is expected that candidates provide evidence of the relationship between the course learning objectives and the curricular needs and requirements of the program and how any accreditation or program standards are addressed in their courses.

Candidates will submit a minimum of three methods of teaching evaluation for the period under review. One of the required methods of teaching evaluation for each academic year will be the summary Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) or a similar, campus-approved system for each course taught during the time under review. The remaining method of evaluation can be the candidates' choice from those listed in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A).

Initial Reappointment Review (Assistant Professor)
Candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching and articulate a personal teaching philosophy that reflects the use of evidence-based teaching strategies. This commitment to teaching is demonstrated through ongoing self-reflection and analysis of formative and summative evaluations that lead to continual growth and progress in achieving course outcomes and applying teaching strategies that address the learning needs of the student. Self-reflection promotes the identification of personal strengths and opportunities for growth as a nurse educator. As an outcome of this reflection, candidates identify and seek appropriate resources to advance as a nurse educator. Candidates will also maintain a collegial working relationship with peers, staff and administration.

Comprehensive Review (Assistant Professor)

In addition to the expectations for the initial reappointment review, candidates will demonstrate continued use of evaluation data to make appropriate course level changes (minor or major if indicated). Other expectations during the comprehensive review are demonstration of collaboration with others within the department, mentoring students around professional practice, independent course management, and mentorship to other faculty. Implementation of alternative assessment strategies, changes in teaching practice, innovations in teaching methods, utilization of mentorship for teaching improvement, and course or curriculum development or revision will be taken into consideration. Candidates will participate in course review and evaluation, accreditation, and curriculum development and evaluation.

For a rating of *making progress towards tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress in teaching towards tenure as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation, the criteria listed above, and at least three indicators from those listed in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). In cases in which this standard is not met, candidates may work with an appropriate mentor. Candidates must provide an explanation for not meeting the expectations and develop an appropriate plan to meet the tenure expectations. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a program requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

In addition to the expectations for the comprehensive review, candidates will demonstrate growth as teaching professionals, and proficiency in the classroom and/or clinical teaching. Continued growth as an expert nurse educator would be demonstrated by incorporating national trends and accreditation standards that contribute to programmatic curriculum development. In addition, candidates will mentor peers and faculty in teaching and pedagogy, participate in peer evaluation of teaching, and assume a leadership role in undergraduate and/or graduate student projects. Candidates will demonstrate involvement in curriculum development and evaluation through participation in course evaluation, accreditation, and curriculum development and evaluation.

For a *meritorious* rating, candidates must demonstrate commitment to, continuing development of, and effectiveness in teaching as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation, the tenure and/or promotion criteria listed above and at least three (3) indicators from those listed in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a program requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, candidates must demonstrate, along with the qualities for meritorious, sustained effectiveness, competence, distinction, and leadership in teaching as documented by evidence for additional indicators as delineated in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A).

Promotion to Full Professor
In addition to the expectations for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, candidates will provide leadership and mentoring in the teaching role, and demonstrate participation and leadership in curriculum development and evaluation. Candidates will mentor other faculty to improve teaching effectiveness, conduct peer course reviews and evaluations, participate in or lead accreditation or recognition processes, and mentor others in curriculum development and evaluation.

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates will demonstrate expert teaching skills. Candidates are dynamic and excel in substantial development/implementation of courses, teaching materials and strategies, and assessment of learning and program outcomes. They model the relationship of theory, research and practice, and effectively translate complex and difficult concepts into understandable content. Faculty participate in and model appropriate interprofessional engagement both within and outside of the department as applicable. They are recognized by peers and others as master teachers, mentor others, and may receive honors for teaching. Candidates may design and test innovative teaching strategies.

Candidates will demonstrate that their courses reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, promote critical thinking, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of nursing. Candidates will ensure that courses reflect the Department philosophy and mission, course learning objectives meet curricular needs and requirements, and courses meet the accreditation and/or professional curriculum requirements. Furthermore, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, utilization of teaching and learning evaluation strategies, and continued development of skills in presenting material.

For a rating of *excellent*, candidates must demonstrate continuing growth and expert teaching skills as measured by multiple methods of teaching evaluation. Candidates must provide multiple indicators to support effective and expert teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a program requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance. Candidates will demonstrate leadership in curriculum development, mentor others in course development, and may provide leadership on university, state or national committees (i.e. curriculum development, professional standards, and/or certification).

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS

The Department of Nursing recognizes that research, scholarship and creative works can take many forms. We value the generation of new knowledge through research, as well as the translation of existing knowledge to advance our profession. We recognize the scholarship of teaching and learning in nursing, the scholarship of professional nursing practice, and the scholarly study of evidence-based practice as forms of research.

In the assessment of research, scholarship and creative works, we place greater emphasis on items that have undergone peer review than those that have not. Therefore, items listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B) under Quality Indicator 1 are most important. Non peer-reviewed work will also be considered as part of a candidate's record but will be weighted as less influential than peer-reviewed work in consideration of the body of work. Consistent with this, other non-peer-reviewed works (Quality Indicator 2; Appendix B) will be considered on their scholarly merit and impact on the profession. For assessment of grants/contracts, the department places greater emphasis on extramural grants. Therefore, items listed under Quality Indicator 3 (Appendix B) are most important. Intramural grants (Quality Indicator 4; Appendix B) will also be considered as part of candidate's record, but will be weighted as less influential than extramural peer-reviewed grants/contracts in consideration of the body of work.

Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate research merit. Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity in a variety of scholarly pursuits that reflect a clear and focused line of study over a period of years. Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, the relevance of the topic of those items to the profession (e.g., how does the information enhance the profession; how does it move the profession forward) and the rationale behind the journals in which papers were disseminated. Faculty are encouraged to seek venues to communicate their research results that will reach a national or international audience. This may be accomplished by publishing some research findings in journals with a broader, interdisciplinary readership or high visibility, or by presenting research data at conferences that attract participants from the broader community.

Nursing encourages collaborative and interdisciplinary research, and recognizes that senior or sole authorship will be less frequent in collaborative studies than for more autonomous research. Work with other collaborators (within the department, college, UCCS, CU system, or at other institutions) will be considered equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants or contracts if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution to the paper, grant or contract; otherwise, the collaborative work will still be counted as part of a candidate's overall record but will be weighted as less influential. Faculty are encouraged to take a leadership role in some of the multi-authored publications and be able to articulate that role clearly.

The department also encourages collaboration with and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research. Co-authored papers, grants, or contracts will be considered as equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants, or contracts if the first author is a student (undergraduate or graduate) collaborator, and the work will be counted as equivalent to a candidate's own line of scholarship.

Initial Reappointment Review (Assistant Professor)
Candidates will define a focused program of study and present evidence of research/scholarship/creative works potential and progress toward publication. This might include copies of drafts or work in progress or submitted for publication, presentations at professional meetings, and/or grant proposals in preparation. Candidates may identify a mentor or collaborator (either within or outside the Department of Nursing).

Comprehensive Review (Assistant Professor)
For a rating of *making progress toward tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress in scholarship towards tenure by presenting multiple scholarly activities, compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B). Candidates will present clear evidence that a focused research program has been established that will produce rigorous, publishable research that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline or field. Exceptional quality of scholarly work will be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where there is a lower quantity of work (for example, as first author in at least one peer-reviewed publication). Activities will include items that are peer-reviewed or presentations deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional or national levels. Performing in the role of principal investigator or co-investigator, candidates will seek internal and/or external funding for their research.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
Candidates must demonstrate a body of work that makes an original scholarly contribution and reflects a clear, focused line of study. A variety of completed work as principal investigator and co-investigator, compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B), must be submitted as evidence of a productive research program. Scholarship should ideally reflect both intra- and interdisciplinary collaboration. It is expected that candidates will be presenting at national and international meetings and seeking external research funding. In all cases, the quality of the research, scholarship, or creative works, and impact on the profession or field are of utmost importance.

For candidates in an administrative role (e.g., department chair, associate dean), work on grant development for the department, college, campus, university may be considered in the category of Scholarship Indicators.

For a *meritorious* rating, candidates must demonstrate they have established an emerging regional and/or national reputation with demonstrated scholarly productivity based upon a clearly defined research agenda or line of research by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B). The record of research shall demonstrate quality and consistency over time and potential for distinction in the field or profession. These activities must include items that are peer-reviewed and are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, candidates must demonstrate that they are mature productive scholars with an established national and/or international reputation based upon a clearly defined research agenda or line of research. Candidates will not only present a balance of scholarly activities reflecting the rating of meritorious, but they will also present a record of research that

demonstrates continuing development and sustained quantity and quality over time, as well as significant contributions to, and distinction within, the field or profession.

Promotion to Full Professor
In addition to the expectations for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, candidates will provide evidence of a sustained, focused program of study. Nursing encourages collaborative research and recognizes that senior or sole authorship will be less frequent in collaborative studies than for more autonomous research. Work with other collaborators (within the department, college, UCCS, CU system, or at other institutions) will be considered equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants or contracts if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution to the paper, grant or contract; otherwise, the collaborative work will still be counted as part of a candidate's overall record but will be weighted as less influential. Faculty are encouraged to take a leadership role in some of the multi-authored publications. The department also encourages collaboration with and mentoring of junior faculty, graduate and undergraduate students in research. Co-authored papers, grants or contracts will be considered as equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants or contracts if the first author is a student (undergraduate or graduate) or junior faculty collaborator.

For a rating of *excellent*, candidates will demonstrate substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure. Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate research excellence. Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of a steady rate of productivity in a variety of scholarly pursuits over a period of years. Publication in peer-reviewed journals that are congruent with the faculty member's research plan would be expected. Additionally, candidates will have a robust track record of extramural funding submission that aligns with the discipline or field. Other indicators of scholarly maturity may include publication of a scholarly book, continuity of seeking grant and/or contract funding, invitations to provide keynote addresses at major national conventions, or invitations to contribute to handbooks in the discipline or field of practice. Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, the relevance of the topic of those items to the profession (e.g., how does the information enhance the profession; how does it move the profession forward). Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to impact an evaluation in cases where the quantity may be less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity. In addition, there must be evidence of national or international esteem for a candidate's publications as important and authoritative works in a candidate's specialty discipline or field. This may be accomplished by publishing research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting research data at conferences that attract participants from the broader community. Furthermore, invited presentations and/or consultation in a candidate's field of expertise will substantiate a candidate's reputation and prominence.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

The Department of Nursing values leadership and service that contribute to and help advance the discipline of nursing while supporting our mission and goals. We recognize that leadership and service can take many forms and can be informal as well as formal. In the assessment of leadership and service the department places greater emphasis on the formal forms of leadership and service as indicated by the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Generally, leadership roles in service activities are considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.

We expect all candidates to regularly and consistently contribute to service within the department regardless of their level of reappointment, review, tenure, and/or promotion. As candidates advance through the reappointment, review, tenure, and/or promotion process, they will demonstrate a progression toward assuming leadership roles within the department with subsequent progression of the provision of service and leadership to include the college, campus, university, profession and community arenas.

Initial Reappointment Review (Assistant Professor)
Candidates will begin a process of identifying appropriate service contributions. Candidates must have met their departmental service obligations including regular attendance at department meetings; collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration; and participation in campus and college events. Candidates will be planning for increased service contributions within the department and additional service contributions within the college.

Comprehensive Review (Assistant Professor)
For a rating of *making progress toward tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress in leadership and service towards tenure by demonstrating initial efforts in appropriate types and levels of leadership and service contributions as listed in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Candidates must have met their growing commitment and obligations to the department and college and be planning for service contributions to the campus, university, profession, and community. Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration, and participation in at least one graduation during each academic year are expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
For a *meritorious* rating, in addition to meeting their primary obligations to the department and college, candidates will also have contributed leadership and service to the campus, university, profession and/or community as listed in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration, and participation in at least one graduation during each academic year are expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities to the department and college, and assuming leadership roles or multiple service contributions within the

department, college, campus, university, profession, and community. In evaluating leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Promotion to Full Professor
For a rating of *excellent*, candidates must provide evidence of meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department, in addition to multiple leadership and service contributions to the college, campus, university, profession and/or community as delineated in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Candidates will demonstrate collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration, participate in at least one graduation during each academic year, and show dedication to helping the department achieve its goals. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

TENURE TRACK FACULTY WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION

Prior to tenure appointment, most faculty are evaluated based on the following workload:

40% Teaching
40% Research/Scholarship
20% Leadership and service

The Department Chair and Dean may adjust faculty workload distribution (*APS 1006 Differentiated Annual Workloads for Faculty; available at https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1006*). A differentiated workload distribution of responsibilities defined by the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) will be approved by the Department Chair and Dean and used for evaluation, and be submitted with the dossier. If there are senior faculty (Full Professors) for whom a different distribution would be appropriate, the Department Chair, in conjunction with the faculty member and Dean, will develop an agreement documenting a differentiated workload and assignment. If no agreement is in place, the faculty member will be evaluated based on the 40/40/20 percentages above. Faculty who have been on a differentiated workload during the review period will be evaluated based on the average of the workloads during the review period.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT (FRS)

The FRS identifies the proportion of effort by the faculty in 1) teaching, 2) research/scholarship/ creative works, and 3) leadership and service. This statement is negotiated by the individual and the Department Chair and approved by the Dean for a specified period. If a faculty member re-negotiates workload, then the expectations for meritorious and excellent work in the affected categories will be evaluated accordingly. Differentiated workloads need to be documented by the Chair of the Department, approved by the Dean, and will be evaluated based on actual percentages of the differentiation.

DETERMINATION OF PRIOR ACADEMIC WORK AT PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT TOWARD TENURE OR RECOMMENDATION OF HIRE WITH TENURE AND RANK

When candidates are appointed with credit towards tenure and rank, the years of credit will be evaluated by using the criteria adopted by the Department for the tenure process. If, in rare instances, a candidate is being considered for hire with tenure and rank, they will be evaluated by using the criteria adopted by the Department for the tenure and/or promotion process [*APS 1018 Justification for Appointment with Tenure (Outside Hire with Tenure), available on the website https://www.cu.edu/ope/policy/aps-az*].

A Primary Unit Committee (PUC) will be formed for review of the candidate's dossier to determine the appropriate number of years of credit toward rank and tenure. The PUC will review the new faculty member's work and will make a recommendation of rank, years of credit towards tenure, or tenure and rank to the Department Chair and Dean to review and document in

the letter of offer. The review schedule for the individual faculty member is also contained in the initial letter of offer.

When the criteria described here are applied to faculty who were granted time towards tenure and rank, the work performed during that time shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. When candidates are appointed with credit towards tenure and rank, they must continue to demonstrate significant progress in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/ creative works, and leadership and service since their initial appointment at UCCS based on the criteria adopted by the Department for the tenure and/or promotion process. While a faculty member's career record may be considered in personnel actions as described here, the main emphasis of evaluation up through consideration for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, on progress since initial appointment. Candidates under consideration for promotion to full Professor are expected to have a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent, and a record since receiving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and leadership and service.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND REVIEW PROCESS

Appointment of the Primary Unit Committee (PUC)
The PUC will consist of faculty currently at or above the rank being reviewed and who have successfully undergone that level of review. At least one (1) member of the PUC will be from nursing, if possible. The PUC may include a tenured Nursing Department Chair and the Department Chair may serve as the chair of the PUC. Tenured faculty members from Nursing may serve on the PUC or DRC for a tenure-track Nursing Department Chair. Full Professors from Nursing may serve on the PUC or DRC for a Nursing Department Chair under consideration for promotion to Full Professor. If it is necessary to have non-nursing faculty members serve on a PUC, the non-nursing faculty members will be a minority representation when possible, and will preferably be UCCS tenured faculty members at or above the rank being reviewed.

The PUC will consist of at least three (3) members, will consist of an odd number of members, and will be appointed by the Nursing Tenured Faculty. The PUC member list is shared with the College Faculty Affairs Council and Dean. The Dean will affirm that the members of the PUC meet the requirements for serving on the PUC. The PUC members may not serve on the Dean's Review Committee (DRC) or Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC) for a candidate that they evaluated as a member of the PUC.

Responsibility of the Primary Unit Committee (PUC)
During the review process, the chair of the PUC may communicate directly with the candidate for clarification and to request additional materials as needed. After the PUC letter of recommendation is completed, the letter will be reviewed with the faculty member. The order of the review process is as follows:

1) Once the PUC letter has been signed by all committee members and submitted to the Dean's office, the chair of the PUC promptly informs candidates orally of the PUC's recommendation during a face-to-face meeting in accordance with the department/college RPT calendar. There must be no identification of the external reviewers in this or any other communication with candidates.

2) The chair of the PUC ensures that the faculty member receives a copy of the PUC letter once the DRC letter has been signed by all committee members and submitted to the Dean's office. *(See policy https://www.cu.edu/policies/aps/academic/1022.pdf.)*

Selection of External Reviewers

Candidates for comprehensive and promotion and tenure reviews will submit suggestions for external reviewers to the Department Chair. External reviewers must have a terminal degree in their field, currently be at or above the rank for which candidates are under consideration (or have held a rank at or above the rank for which candidates are under consideration), and currently be serving at or have served at an institution of higher learning as a tenured faculty member. The Department Chair and the Primary Unit Committee (PUC) will review the candidate's suggestions and may add suggested external reviewers to the list or delete suggested reviewers from the list. The Department Chair will meet with candidates to review the revised list. Candidates may request the exclusion of suggested external reviewers that have been added to the list. Once the final list of external reviewers has been agreed upon by the candidate, Department Chair, and PUC, the list will be submitted to the Dean for review and approval. Upon approval of the external reviewers by the Dean, the PUC Chair and/or program administrator will solicit the external letters of evaluation. Note: external review letters are not required for initial reviews or post tenure reviews. The number of letters required for review shall be the minimum number required by the UCCS RPT Policy *(UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001)*.

Candidates must clearly specify their relationship to the external reviewers (e.g., co-author, etc.). External reviewers are expected to give an "arm's length objective" review. The solicitation of co-authors, mentors, and former colleagues must not constitute a majority of the solicitation letters. Care must be taken to exclude any reviewers whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest, such as a dissertation advisor. Candidates may indicate specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations may be prejudiced against candidates. Persons recommended by the applicant to write evaluation letters *must not* be relatives, or current or former students since evaluations from these individuals might constitute a conflict of interest. *(UCCS Policy 200-001, section VIII. Dossiers, D. Reviewer Responsibilities, I. Primary Unit's Responsibility, b. (4) Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers.)*

Appendix A: Teaching Quality Indicators

1. Influence of the course content/program on students' learning. Examples of evidence may include:
   - student projects
   - pre- and post-tests
   - summative course evaluations
   - formative course evaluations (mid-term or end of term)
     - formative course evaluations are highly encouraged for faculty with minimal teaching experience or faculty teaching a new course or new preparation for the first time.
   - comprehensive examinations
   - course syllabi
   - student portfolios
   - student surveys

2. Influence of instructor's teaching practice on student learning and engagement with the course material. Examples of evidence may include:
   - course evaluations
   - peer evaluations
   - evaluation of faculty member as a guest lecturer for a class internal or external to the department
   - student portfolios
   - student letters
   - practicum evaluations
   - student surveys
   - work with students outside of the classroom setting

3. Influence of the course/program content on students' practice. Examples of evidence may include:
   - supervisor or preceptor evaluations
   - students' self-evaluations
   - course evaluations
   - video recordings (e.g., of student experiences)
   - student portfolios
   - employer surveys
   - student media appearances (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV, social media)
   - student publications

4. Student perceptions of the usefulness of course content. Examples of evidence may include:
   - course evaluations
   - student letters
   - student surveys

5. Advising and/or mentoring relationships with students developed over time to improve professional practice. Examples of evidence may include:
   - master's thesis supervision
   - DNP project supervision
   - undergraduate research
   - independent studies
   - student letters
   - student portfolios
   - supervision of internship experience

6. Professional reputation in teaching with constituents at local, regional, state, or national levels who translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in nursing. Examples of evidence may include:
   - service as an external reviewer of curriculum
   - status on local, regional, state, and national committees
   - letters from colleagues
   - invited presentations or speeches
   - national nurse education certification

7. Successful collaboration with faculty colleagues that results in program success in meeting and exceeding state and national standards within nursing. Examples of evidence may include:
   - leadership and/or participation in the design, alignment, and improvement of program curriculum
   - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to the development, design, alignment, and improvement of programs delivered online
   - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state and national accreditation
   - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that students meet the learning objectives for courses
   - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that course learning objectives meet curricular needs

8. Development as a teaching professional based on past performance and the development of a plan and focus for teaching. Examples of evidence include:
   - continuously improving course evaluations
   - professional development plan
   - student letters
   - annual reviews
   - department chair letter
   - peer evaluations
   - external reviews

Appendix B: Scholarship Quality Indicators

1. Professional publications that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners, the profession, or the field and may be published or accepted for publication. This category of scholarship is considered to be more influential than those in category 2. Examples of evidence include:
   - articles in peer-reviewed journals
   - invited publications (peer-reviewed)
   - peer-reviewed books
   - peer-reviewed textbooks
   - peer-reviewed book chapters
   - peer-reviewed online publications
   - peer-reviewed and/or invited presentations at professional conferences that report original research and/or translate research into practice
   - other indicators of professional impact (e.g., conference presentations)

2. Professional publications that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives that influence peers, practitioners, or other targeted audiences but are not peer-reviewed. These may be published or accepted for publication. (While important to the faculty member's record, this category is not considered to be as influential as those in category 1). Examples of evidence include:
   - books
   - online publications
   - book chapters
   - textbooks
   - articles in journals
   - articles in newsletters
   - curriculum materials
   - editorials
   - monographs
   - critical reviews
   - non-original presentations that advance the knowledge of practitioners

3. Competency and continuity in seeking and/or procuring external grants or contracts for research or support of research, or programs that translate research or improve service. Examples of evidence include:
   - peer-reviewed grant or contract proposals funded
   - peer-reviewed grant or contract proposals submitted
   - leveraging internal grant funding to support applications for external grant or contract funding

4. Competency and continuity in seeking and/or procuring intramural grants or contracts for research or support of research, or programs that translate research or improve service. (While important to the faculty member's record, this category is not considered to be as influential as those in category 3). Examples of evidence include:

- grant or contract proposals funded
- grant or contract proposals submitted

5. Regional, state, national, or international prominence as a researcher, practitioner, or educator. Examples of evidence include:
   - editorship of a professional journal
   - service as a reviewer for abstracts, articles or papers in conference proceedings
   - service as a reviewer for journals in the faculty member's area of expertise
   - service as a reviewer for grant proposals in the faculty member's area of expertise
   - service on a grant funding board in the faculty member's area of expertise
   - service as mentor for other faculty in research, scholarship, or grant preparation
   - interdisciplinary collaboration for research, scholarship, or grant submission
   - collaborative work with practitioners in Nursing to translate research into practice
   - presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives
   - development and implementation of curricula and/or programs reflecting innovative practice and current research
   - reviewer of curricular content for scientific accuracy

6. Professional reputation at local, state, national, or international levels in the faculty member's area of expertise. Examples of evidence include:
   - reviews of candidates' research, papers, presentations, articles, and/or books from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
   - letters of commendation from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
   - elected offices in professional organizations that support the translation of research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's area of expertise

Appendix C: Leadership and Service Quality Indicators

1. Professional leadership and service to the department. Examples of evidence include:
   - regular participation in department meetings
   - department committee or task force leadership
   - department committee or task force membership and participation
   - department search committee chair or member
   - department faculty evaluation committee chair or member
   - service as department chair, program coordinator, or director
   - mentoring faculty in teaching or research/scholarship/creative works
   - representing the department at college, campus, university, professional or community events (e.g., major/minor fair, student recruiting or orientation events, health fairs, etc.)

2. Professional leadership and service to the college. Examples of evidence include:
   - college assembly leadership
   - college assembly participation
   - college committee or task force leadership
   - college committee or task force membership and participation
   - college search committee chair or member
   - college faculty evaluation committee chair or member
   - service as associate dean
   - mentoring faculty in teaching or research/scholarship/creative works

3. Professional leadership and service to the campus. Examples of evidence include:
   - participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the campus Faculty Representative Assembly
   - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service/participation on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
   - campus committee or task force leadership
   - campus committee or task force membership and participation
   - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

4. Professional leadership and service to the university. Examples of evidence include:
   - participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the University Faculty Council
   - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
   - university committee or task force leadership
   - university committee or task force membership and participation
   - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

5. Professional leadership and service to the community. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment will be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:
   - professional service related to the University or Department of Nursing mission, such as board membership, community service projects, and presentations
   - professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation
   - professional practice related to the University or Department of Nursing mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct nursing service
   - development of community partnerships related to service and consistent with the mission of the Department of Nursing

6. Professional leadership and service to regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment will be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:
   - professional service and leadership in the governance of regional, national, and/or international professional organizations
   - professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation, or conference committees and participation
   - reviewer activities for journal manuscripts, abstracts, or grant proposals
   - conference attendance

Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences
NURSING PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY
Version History

Version 1: Initial Version
Approved by the Nursing Faculty, 3/12/2019
Approved by Interim Dean Amy Silva-Smith, 3/18/2019
Submitted to Dr. Tom Christensen, Provost, for approval, 3/18/2019
Approved by Provost, 4/3/2019

_____