University of Colorado Colorado Springs

College of Business and Administration

Primary Unit

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria

Effective July 1, 2020

I. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria

A. Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

"Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of: teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (to the university, profession and/or public); and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or scholarly/creative work." (Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.D.2, 2018)

The College of Business (COB) considers the candidate's total record when making a tenure decision. These standards apply equally to tenure and promotion decisions, whether made together or separately. The candidate must show continued accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service since being employed at UCCS. In addition to the criteria below, the COB requires external letters for promotion or tenure. Refer to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, section II.C below.

1. Scholarly/Creative Work Standard:

"A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution." (Regent Law, Article 5.D.2 (B), 2018)

The COB at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) holds that for an untenured assistant professor to be awarded promotion to associate professor with tenure, he/she must have six to eight articles in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed book chapters (counting in print and in press) to be meritorious, with at least 75% of the required six to eight scholarly contributions being from peer-reviewed journal articles. The use of peer-reviewed publications as a requirement for tenure provides evidence of a candidate's impact beyond the institution.

The COB defines peer review as a process of independent review prior to publication of a faculty member's work by an editorial board or committee that is widely acknowledged as possessing expertise in the field. This independent review should provide for critical but constructive feedback; demonstrate a mastery and expertise of the subject matter; and be undertaken through a transparent process, although the individuals involved may be anonymous.

These publications may include works in journals or other outlets that employ a comparable review process in which the work has undergone a rigorous review by experts in the relevant content area. These articles may be in discipline-based, pedagogical, or practice-based outlets.

The standard of six to eight peer-reviewed publications is set in recognition that some journals are regarded as more prestigious than others by the COB and are typically more challenging to the authors. A Tier 1 peer-reviewed journal is not required to be rated meritorious or excellent. A junior faculty member with one or more articles in higher quality journals may be eligible with fewer publications. Candidates may request that these quantity standards be revised downward depending on the quality and prestige of the publications and national standards in functional areas. The case for deviations based on publication quality must be documented by the candidate in their scholarly/creative work statement. Appendix A provides some illustrative guidelines but does not provide an exhaustive list of impact and quality indicators.

A representative case for a **meritorious** rating may include:

- **6** peer-reviewed publications with **at least 2** publications in a Tier 2 peer-reviewed journal.
- **8** peer-reviewed publications with **at least 1** publication in a Tier 2 peer-reviewed journal.

Excellence is defined as exceeding the standard for meritorious by quantity, quality, or a combination thereof. A representative case for an **excellent** rating may include:

- **7** peer-reviewed publications with **at least 4** publications in a Tier 2 peer-reviewed journal.

These are only examples to show the mix of publications expected. Other factors may be considered. For example, sole authorship, external grants, peer-reviewed proceedings, and conference presentations contribute positively to the scholarly/creative work record of the candidate. The COB values collaboration and co-authored papers. Sole-authored or first-authored papers may be given greater consideration. Candidates shall make their case for the quality and quantity of their scholarly/creative work record. Appendix A provides guidance about impact and quality indicators of scholarly work.

When an offer for a tenure-track position is made to an individual with prior publications, the candidate and the Dean of the COB will negotiate how publications prior to joining UCCS will count towards tenure and will be specified in the offer letter.

2. Teaching Standard:

"All personnel actions for tenured or tenure-track faculty shall be based, in part, on the evaluation of teaching. Faculty members shall be evaluated in a formative manner annually to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary adjustments and evaluated in a summative manner for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion, and post-tenure review."

"Summative evaluations require more in-depth assessment and evaluation and shall employ multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. A minimum of three assessment components shall be used, one of which must be data from the FCQ or similar, campus-approved mechanism".

"In accordance with regent policy 5.D, a recommendation of 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." (APS 1009 II B, 2020)

The COB defines "beyond one's immediate instructional setting" as outside the COB. Furthermore, the COB recognizes that a candidate's performance in teaching is multi-dimensional. Therefore, evaluation of teaching uses three measures of teaching effectiveness, weighted as follows:

- Student FCQs – Class Factor and Student Comments, weighted at 40%
- Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching, weighted at 40%
- Peer-Evaluations, weighted at 20%

In addition, the COB uses a separate criterion for a rating of **excellent** in teaching.

The COB recommends that for each measure, trends over time in teaching effectiveness be examined, rather than focus on an individual course, semester, or year in isolation. In addition, the COB recognizes that teaching effectiveness may differ between undergraduate and graduate courses and between online

and campus courses. Candidates are required to discuss each of these measures in their teaching statement.

Appendix B provides some illustrative examples but does not provide an exhaustive list of measures of teaching effectiveness. Details for the three measures are included below.

a. Student FCQs -- Class Factor and Student Comments

Student evaluations, which include both numeric and student comments, serve as one indicator of durable performance.

In the COB, a composite Class Factor score is computed from the student evaluation scores. The COB recognizes that FCQs with low response rates may not be a representative evaluation and that teaching modality and course level may impact FCQ scores. Candidates shall report their individual course Class Factors over time and provide an analysis that reports scores separately for undergraduate and graduate courses and/or for online and campus courses.

FCQ questions and scales have changed over previous years and the formula for computing Class Factor has had different components. Therefore, the COB uses different criteria for meritorious and excellent based on the FCQs administered at the time.

For the 6-point scale FCQs – prior to Fall 2018:

- For a **meritorious** rating in teaching, a candidate must have average class factor scores greater than or equal to **3.6** in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.
- For an **excellent** rating in teaching, a candidate must have average class factor scores greater than or equal to **4.4** in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.

Class factors are determined as follows:

1. Composite Score = average of questions 3 (instructor effectiveness), 4 (availability), and 9 (instructor's respect).
2. Class Factor = average of questions 6 (how much learned), 7 (course overall), 8 (instructor overall) and the Composite Score

For the 7-point scale FCQs - beginning with Fall 2018:

- For a **meritorious** rating in teaching, a candidate must have average class factor scores greater than or equal to **4.4** in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.
- For an **excellent** rating in teaching, a candidate must have average class factor scores greater than or equal to **5.3** in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.

Class factors are determined as follows:

1. Composite Score = average of questions 8 (instructor encourage interest), 11 (communication), and 10 (instructor's respect)
2. Class Factor = average of questions 1 (organization of course materials), 4 (the course made it possible for me to increase my knowledge, skills, and understanding of the subject), 7 (the instructor explained course ideas in a clear and understandable manner), and the Composite Score.

The COB recognizes that Class Factor scores may be influenced by other factors. The candidate's teaching statement shall provide context for the evaluation of class factor scores. This may include, but is not limited to new course development, changes in text, software or teaching platforms, class size, response

rates, variability in responses, or other unforeseen circumstances. In addition to the numeric scores, the candidate's teaching statement shall provide analysis and discussion of student comments.

b. Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching

The purpose of this self-evaluation is for faculty to demonstrate how they have engaged in continuous improvement of their teaching using a variety of measures of teaching effectiveness. Appendix B provides some illustrative examples but does not provide an exhaustive list of measures of teaching effectiveness.

While Teaching Philosophy should be included in the candidate's teaching statement, this assessment should link philosophy and classroom implementation. For example, if you strive for practical application, you should be developing, monitoring, and assessing practical applications, and you should describe how these have developed and been improved over time. If you emphasize critical thinking, explain how you have improved your course materials over time in support of this goal. Supplemental documents in the dossier should be provided as supporting evidence.

In order to achieve a rating of **excellent** in teaching, this evaluation shall include a discussion of significant accomplishments that demonstrate achievement outside the COB which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning. Section d, Demonstration of Excellence in Teaching "beyond one's immediate instructional setting" provides examples and suggestions.

c. Peer Evaluations

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes. The candidate is required to describe the results of the peer evaluations, identify course changes resulting from the peer evaluations, and discuss the outcome of the changes. The COB recognizes that all teaching improvements may not be successful, however, it is the practice of improvement that should be the goal.

Representative courses should reflect the candidate's mix of courses during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and online course. If the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course. The candidate is required to discuss the logic of selecting the courses for review.

Peer evaluations can consider either teaching techniques or content, with feedback provided to the instructor. Peer evaluators can review teaching styles or techniques in several ways. Some examples include attending class session(s); reviewing recorded materials; reviewing Learning Management System (LMS) discussions; and reviewing methods of student engagement, activities, and assignments. For content review, peer evaluators review representative course materials, such as syllabi, examinations, sample activities, cases, assignments, and LMS organization, etc.

- For a rating of **meritorious**, the candidate must submit **a minimum of 3** peer evaluations. (based on the traditional tenure clock).
- For a rating of **excellent**, **at least 2** of the required minimum peer evaluations must be external to the COB.

To be considered an external review, the peer reviewer must be outside the COB. The UCCS Faculty Resource Center is considered an external reviewer. For external teaching reviews, a peer evaluator is required to have appropriate qualifications for evaluation. Candidates shall submit a vita and justification for the evaluator selected. For external content reviews, a peer evaluator is required to be a faculty

member in a related discipline who has taught a similar or related course within the past 5 years at an AACSB accredited university or university with similar qualification.

d. Demonstration of Excellence in Teaching "beyond one's immediate instructional setting"

As part of the demonstration of teaching effectiveness and meeting the criteria for excellence in teaching, faculty must show demonstrated achievement outside the COB. This may take a variety of forms that include activities at the campus or system level, conferences, or in another university setting. Faculty are required to substantiate demonstrated achievement in their dossier. Below is a partial but not exhaustive list of examples faculty can use to demonstrate excellence. Additional examples can be found in Appendix B.

- Presenting at workshops and/or conferences at UCCS, the System level, or other universities
- Publishing in pedagogical journals
- External peer reviews from peers outside the COB
- External peer reviewer of courses outside the COB
- Writing cases or teaching materials that are used outside COB
- Online engagement that may include a variety of forms such as:
    - Webinars
    - Instructional videos and tutorials
    - Games and gamification
    - Blog posts (including guest posts in the popular business press, e.g. Fortune, Bloomberg, etc. on topics that relate to business instruction/expertise)
    - Ways of demonstrating online engagement may include on-site web analytics, likes, downloads, shares, re-posts, views, etc.

3. Leadership and Service Standard:

To be considered **meritorious** in leadership and service, a faculty member must demonstrate a record of active and consistent service to:

- The COB, and
- The university or the community, or
- His/her discipline

B. Primary Unit Criteria for Promotion to Professor

"To be promoted to the rank of Professor (also referred to as "Full Professor"), an individual should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and:

1. *A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; and*

2. *A record of significant contribution to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and*

3. *A record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service. (Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.D.3 (C) 2018)*

Evaluating the "Record as a Whole"

When making a decision for promotion to Professor, the candidate's record as a whole shall be considered. Candidates must achieve the established standards for the record to be judged excellent. The candidate must show continued accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service since being employed at UCCS. For those on a differentiated workload, it may require additional time to meet these standards. In addition to the criteria below, the COB requires external letters for promotion. Refer to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, section II.C below.

1. Scholarly/Creative Work Standard:

Promotion to Professor requires that the candidate have a substantial enough stream of published research that he/she has achieved a degree of national recognition within the discipline of management or one of the sub-disciplines (e.g., finance, marketing). The minimum publication expectation is an addition of four to eight peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or book chapters since promotion to associate professor. These articles may include publications in journals or other outlets that employ a comparable review process in which the work has undergone a rigorous review by experts in the relevant content area. It is the quality and prestige of the journal or book that determines the number of publications required to meet the standard for promotion to professor. Latitude is suggested here, as a concentration of higher-quality publications would clearly demonstrate exceptional performance and reduce the expectation of publication quantity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to establish the case of excellence in their dossier. Examples of impact and quality indicators are found in Appendix A. The committees judge the overall record based on the dossier and the primary unit criteria.

2. Teaching Standard:

The COB realizes that a candidate's performance in teaching is multi-dimensional. Therefore, evaluation of teaching uses three measures of teaching effectiveness, weighted as follows:

- Student FCQs – Class Factor and Student Comments, weighted at 40%
- Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching, weighted at 40%
- Peer Evaluations, weighted at 20%

The COB recommends that for each measure, trends over time in teaching effectiveness be examined, rather than focus on an individual course, semester, or year in isolation. In addition, the COB recognizes that teaching effectiveness may differ between undergraduate and graduate courses and/or between

online and on campus courses. Candidates are required to discuss each of these measures in their teaching statement.

There is no separate requirement for "demonstrating achievement … beyond one's immediate instructional setting" (as stated in Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.D.2.(B), 2018) for a rating of excellent in teaching for promotion to Professor. Although there are criteria listed for excellence in three measures of teaching, a candidate may have a teaching "record as a whole" that can be deemed excellent without excellence in all three.

Appendix B provides some illustrative examples but does not provide an exhaustive list of measures of teaching effectiveness. Details for the three measures are included below.

a. Student FCQs – Class Factor and Student Comments

Student evaluations, which include both numeric and student comments, serve as one indicator of durable performance.

In the COB, a composite Class Factor score is computed from the student evaluation scores. The COB recognizes that FCQs with low response rates may not be a representative evaluation and that teaching modality and course level may impact FCQ scores. Candidates shall report their individual course Class Factors over time and provide an analysis of their scores that reports scores separately for undergraduate and graduate courses and/or for online and campus courses.

FCQ questions and scales have changed over previous years and the formula for computing Class Factor has had different components. Therefore, the COB uses different criteria for meritorious and Excellent based on the FCQs administered at the time. The class factor calculations and the numeric score for the ratings of meritorious and excellent are detailed in the Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Teaching Standard section.

- For an **excellent** record in instruction, the COB expects the candidate to have average class factors scores greater than or equal to the excellent standard for tenure in two of the four years prior to candidacy, while having average class factor scores greater than or equal to the meritorious standard in the other two years.

The COB recognizes that Class Factor scores may be influenced by other factors. The candidate's teaching statement shall provide context for the evaluation of class factor scores. This may include, but is not limited to new course development, changes in text, software or teaching platforms, class size, response rates, variability in responses, or other unforeseen circumstances. In addition to the numeric scores, the candidate's teaching statement shall provide analysis and discussion of student comments.

b. Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching

The purpose of this self-evaluation is for faculty to demonstrate how they have engaged in continuous improvement of their teaching using a variety of measures of teaching effectiveness. Appendix B provides some illustrative examples but does not provide an exhaustive list of measures of teaching effectiveness.

While Teaching Philosophy should be included in the candidate's teaching statement, this assessment should link philosophy and classroom implementation. For example, if you strive for practical application, you should be developing, monitoring, and assessing practical applications, and you should describe how these have developed and been improved over time. If you emphasize critical thinking, explain how you have improved your course materials over time in support of this goal. Supplemental documents in the dossier should be provided as supporting evidence.

In order to achieve a rating of excellent in teaching, this evaluation shall include a discussion of significant accomplishments which further the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning.

c. Peer Evaluations

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes. The candidate is required to describe the results of the peer evaluations, identify course changes resulting from the peer evaluations, and discuss the outcome of the changes. The COB recognizes that all teaching improvements may not be successful, however, it is the practice of improvement that should be the goal.

Representative courses should reflect the candidate's mix of courses during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and online course. If the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course. The candidate is required to discuss the logic of selecting the courses for review.

Peer evaluations can consider either teaching techniques or content, with feedback provided to the instructor. Peer evaluators can review teaching styles or techniques in several ways. Some examples include attending class session(s); reviewing recorded materials; reviewing Learning Management System (LMS) discussions; and reviewing methods of student engagement, activities, and assignments. For content review, peer evaluators review representative course materials, such as syllabi, examinations, sample activities, cases, assignments, and LMS organization, etc.

- The candidate must submit a minimum of 3 peer evaluations
- At least 1 external peer evaluation must be included in the dossier.

To be considered an external review, the peer reviewer must be outside the COB. The UCCS Faculty Resource Center is considered an external reviewer. For external teaching reviews, a peer evaluator is required to have appropriate qualifications for evaluation. Candidates shall submit a vita and justification for the evaluator selected. For external content reviews, a peer evaluator is required to be a faculty member in a related discipline who has taught a similar or related course within the past 5 years at an AACSB accredited university or university with similar qualification.

3. Leadership and Service Standard:

A faculty member must demonstrate a record of significant, meaningful, and consistent leadership and service to:

- The COB, and
- The university or the community, and
- His/her discipline

C. Post-Tenure Review

"After award of tenure, a comprehensive performance evaluation that emphasizes performance-based measurements shall be completed every five years. The purposes of the post-tenure review process are to facilitate continued faculty development, and to ensure professional accountability to the university community, the Board of Regents, and the public. (Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.C.2 (H), 2018)

The post-tenure review process is conducted in accordance with System and Campus standards. Criteria considered for evaluation of a faculty member for post-tenure review is based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the COB. A faculty member is evaluated on teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as part of the five-year plan. A differentiated workload is taken into consideration as appropriate. In the post-tenure review, a faculty member is rated as either "outstanding," "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "below expectations."

A critical part of post-tenure review is the professional plan. After the continuous award of tenure, a faculty member is required to develop a five-year professional plan. This plan must be developed within twelve months of the award of tenure. A new professional plan is developed as part of each post-tenure review. (The five-year professional plan is updated each year as needed during the annual evaluation process.)

To be rated as "meeting expectations" for the post-tenure review period, a faculty member must demonstrate they have met the commitments of their professional plan, and they must meet the COB required qualifications per the AACSB Faculty Qualification and Sufficiency Policy at the time of the post-tenure review. A rating of "exceeding expectations" or "outstanding" will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

D. Triggered Reviews

A Triggered Review takes place when, during the five-year post-tenure review cycle, a tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation of "below expectations." Such reviews are completed separately from regular five-year reviews by the Dean's Review Committee in consultation with the Dean and Associate Dean. Please see UCCS Policy 200-016 for "triggered reviews" and APS 5008 for the "performance improvement agreement".

E. Initial Reappointment Review

The Initial Reappointment Review process is scheduled and conducted in accordance with UCCS Policy 200-001.

A candidate's total record, including teaching, scholarly and creative work, and leadership and service, will be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential for future success to justify reappointment. A vote will be taken that either recommends or does not recommend reappointment. The review may also consider mitigating circumstances having material bearing on the candidate's case, such as additional responsibilities or duties required of the candidate in support of the strategic goals of the department, college and/or campus.

F. Comprehensive Reappointment Review

"Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the tenure probationary period apart from the review for award of tenure. The comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service. The comprehensive review results in one of two outcomes:

(1) the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or

(2) the faculty member is informed that they will be given a one-year terminal appointment and the tenure-track appointment will not be continued.

The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the comprehensive review." (Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.D.1 (B), 2018)

"Candidates will be evaluated as on track for tenure, not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections, or not on track for tenure." (APS 1022 VII.C, 2020)

The comprehensive reappointment review process is scheduled and conducted in accordance with Regent Law, APS 1022, and Campus policy. The criteria are based on making satisfactory progress toward achievement of the standards for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor for teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. In addition to the criteria, the COB requires external letters for the comprehensive reappointment review. Refer to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, section II.C below. With respect to scholarly/creative work, the current rate of production (including in-print, work submitted, and work-in-progress) should indicate satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion standards.

II. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures

A. Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee is responsible for the initial review of the qualifications of candidates and has the authority to make recommendations to the Dean concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure. This committee is composed of all tenured faculty members of the COB, excluding those who will review candidates at later stages of the review process. For promotions to Professor, the committee consists of only Full Professors in the COB.

Since the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee is the COB and all tenured faculty members of the COB vote at some level of review, no additional vote at the Primary Unit is required.

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall keep records regarding its activities, including the date, time, duration, and location of each meeting, attendees at each meeting, copies of all correspondence, and information concerning significant actions taken at each meeting.

The dossier is available electronically and is accessible only to committee members. The committee should:

- Evaluate the candidate's teaching through a review of the teaching portfolio; members of the committee may also observe classes conducted by the candidate.
- Evaluate the candidate's scholarly/creative work, considering both quality and quantity; this should include evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by outside evaluators with expertise in the field.
- Evaluate the candidate's performance of leadership and service to the community, profession, and University.
- Gather and evaluate any appropriate additional data.

After completing their individual evaluations, members of the committee meet to discuss the candidate and vote on whether or not to recommend reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The tallies of votes taken for recommendations on tenure shall become part of the committee's records.

After a decision has been made by majority vote of those in attendance, the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall provide its written recommendation to the Dean, with minority views, if any, explained. Members voting in the minority may also submit a separate report to the Dean in writing. The chair of the committee shall provide a copy of these letters to the candidate. External letters of recommendation and committee deliberations shall remain confidential. The candidate's dossier and the recommendation are then forwarded to the Dean's Review Committee.

B. Dean's Review Committee (DRC)

This committee is composed of one associate or full professor from each academic team in the COB. Members are nominated by the tenure-track faculty in each academic team and, from those nominations, the Dean appoints the DRC. In compliance with UCCS Policy 200-016, the Dean appoints an alternate member to serve on the DRC for a temporary one-year basis when a member of the DRC is undergoing a Post-Tenure Review. Members on the DRC serve terms of three years and may serve unlimited consecutive terms.

The DRC, without the Dean present, reviews the candidate's dossier and recommendation of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee. The Dean conducts an independent evaluation.

"Should either the DRC or the dean disagree with the tenure recommendation of the primary unit (based on the faculty vote), the dean shall communicate in writing the nature of this disagreement with the head of the primary unit.

i. The primary unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its reconsidered judgment, including the results of any additional votes, to the dean. The dean may then ask the DRC to reconsider its original recommendation and cast a new vote.

ii. The recommendation of the dean, the results of all votes of the primary unit and the DRC, and the candidate dossier shall be forwarded together to the provost.

iii. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the DRC, 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 in that context." (APS 1022, VII.C.1.e, 2020)

The DRC shall inform the Dean and the chair of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee concerning any failures in conforming to personnel procedures and/or policies and shall recommend changes when appropriate.

C. External Letters

The COB requires at least 3 external letters for the comprehensive reappointment review and at least 4 for promotion or tenure. As specified in UCCS Policy 200-001, *all* letters received by the College on behalf of this faculty member and solicited by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee chair and/or Dean as part of the process, must be included in the dossier.

D. Dossier

Candidates shall prepare a dossier consistent with UCCS Policy 200-001.

III. Post-Tenure Review Procedures

A. Dean's Review Committee (DRC)

The DRC serves as the Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) in the COB. Members of the committee read and review all submitted material in order to evaluate individuals undergoing a Post-Tenure Review. The evaluation should take place in October or November during the period when the COB reviews and evaluates all other actions.

A. As detailed in UCCS 200-016, the PTRC evaluates the professional plan and the documents required by the type of review: a regular five-year review, a triggered review, or an extensive review.

B. The PTRC reviews the faculty member's plan for the next five years to ascertain that the plan includes faculty development consistent with policies and needs of the COB.

C. "*Sanctions.*

a. Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the PTR process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for insubordination and dereliction of duty.

b. In cases where the Development Plan has not produced the desired results, the faculty member will be subject to sanctions in accordance with APS 5008 – Performance Ratings for Faculty. The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee shall recommend sanctions in these circumstances." (UCCS 200-016, II.8, 2017)

D. *"The PTR committee shall provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations or fails to meet expectations based on an overall consideration of teaching, research/creative work, professional practice (if applicable) and leadership/service, and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation."* (200-016, II.A.3.c,2017). The committee report requirements are detailed in 200-016, II A.3.d, 2017.

E. The PTRC shall complete all regular five-year reviews by the end of the fall semester.

B. Process

Faculty required to undergo a Post-Tenure Review will be notified by the COB's HR Professional in the spring of the review year. The faculty member shall submit the dossier no later than September 15 of the year of the review. The HR Professional will inform faculty as to which of these materials are supplied by that office.

C. Dossier

The following materials are required to be submitted in the dossier:

1. A copy of the individual's current curriculum vitae.
2. A two to three-page self-evaluation and executive summary highlighting teaching, scholarly/creative work and leadership and service activity during the past five years.
3. A copy of each of the past five years Student Evaluation summary sheets (front and back), as well as a graph showing your aggregate semester averages of Instructor Overall rating from the FCQs over the past five years.
4. A copy of your previous five-year professional plan, also referred to as the Faculty Responsibility Statement or FRS, developed during your last review (tenure or post-tenure).
5. A new five-year professional plan.
    a. In the year of Post-Tenure Review a faculty member who intends to continue employment shall prepare and submit a new five-year professional plan to cover the next five years of employment at the University.
6. Annual Performance Ratings for previous five years
7. Scholarly Reports for each of the last five years from the relevant Annual Faculty Activity Reporting system (Digital Measures, FRPA)

8. Post-Sabbatical Report if a sabbatical was taken in the past five years or a statement indicating that no sabbatical was taken in the past five years
9. Post-Tenure Review Committee report (due by end of November)
10. Dean's summary report to Provost on the on the results of the Post-Tenure Review

All completed dossiers must be sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by February 1 of the review cycle.

APPENDIX A

Impact and Quality Indicators of Scholarly Work

This is an illustrative but not exhaustive list.

The COB is required to develop criteria that define the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service expectations for faculty. The criteria must provide a description of the types of evidence that are used to evaluate the candidate against the performance standards. A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work must include evidence of impact "beyond the institution." The following provide guidance about the types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate impact beyond the COB.

EVIDENCE OF IMPACT FOR SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORKS

Journal Quality and Article Impact

The current list of Tier 1 and Tier 2 journals is available through the COB. Tier 3 journals include all remaining peer-reviewed, business-related journals from legitimate publishers. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence that their publication qualifies as a Tier 3 journal article. The tier level applied to a journal article by a candidate may be based either on tier level in place on the submission date or on the publication date as determined through the annual evaluation process.

There are other resources developed outside the COB to help substantiate journal quality. The Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal List, the Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS) Journal Guide, and the Financial Times Top 50 are all examples of externally validated journal rankings. The quality of the publisher and review board and association with a national organization may also be useful to provide evidence of journal quality. Finally, Scimago Journal Rank and CiteScore are two resources that provide citation-based evidence of journal impact.

At times, it is possible that journal quality or impact is not representative of article impact. Various resources are available to help substantiate article impact. Sites such as Google Scholar provide citation-based evidence about the impact of individual journal articles. Journal websites may also provide data on the number of reads, downloads, views, and citation metrics that may be useful to explain article impact. Journal websites may also list the "most read" or "most cited" articles that may also be useful to provide evidence of impact.

Authorship

There may be cases in which authorship order does not adequately reflect a candidate's contribution level to a journal article. It is appropriate for a candidate to address order of authorship in order to specify one's contribution, especially if a large number of authors are listed. Candidates should consider providing additional information about their level of contribution. Additional information may consist of explaining that the bulk of the article drew from a Ph.D. dissertation or that 70-90% of the manuscript was written by an individual. In business disciplines or journals (accounting, finance) where authorship order is alphabetical, the candidate should detail their level of contribution.

Other Evidence of Impact

Peer-reviewed journal articles are the primary criterion used in the COB to evaluate candidates. However, candidates are likely to have other types of scholarly/creative works that provide evidence of impact beyond the

COB. A list of these is provided below. This is by no means an exhaustive list but is meant to give examples of other types scholarly/creative work.

- Conference Proceedings
- Conference Presentations
- Conference Panels
- Research Note, Commentary, or Column
- Grant Proposals

In addition, candidates are likely to have scholarly/creative works-related leadership and service that provides evidence of impact beyond the COB. A list of these is provided below. Once again, this is by no means an exhaustive list, but is meant to give examples of scholarly/creative works-related service.

- Editor/Associate Editor/Guest Editor
- Book/Book Review Editor
- Officer –Association
- Chair –Conference/Track
- Reviewer – Journal/Book/Grant
- Committee Member –Conference
- Reviewer/Discussant/Moderator –Conference
- Visiting Scholar – Research Appointment
- Administration - External Grant
- Media "Hit"

Book and Book Chapter Impact and Quality

- It is highly recommended that untenured faculty concentrate their scholarly efforts on peer-reviewed journals rather than books or book chapters. There are times however, when the opportunity or discipline relies on book or book chapter publications. The following outlines how to explain the value of the book or book chapter.
- The quality and impact of books and book chapters may be discussed using the following criteria to outline the impact and/or quality of the book/chapter. To ensure the quality of the book/chapter is fully understood, it is important to explain in detail how the book aligns with these criteria.
- Stature of the publisher (national or international), is not self-published and author has no equity in publisher
- Peer-reviewed book proposal and/or manuscript (pertains also to book chapters)
- Publisher has multiple current and previous academic authors
- Publication is edited, produced, and marketed at publisher expense
- Academic and non-academic distribution of book (libraries, university bookstores, retail bookstores, etc.)
- Author is paid for work (up front or royalties)
- Book is cited by academic authors in academic publications
- Book reviewed by academics in academic or in non-academic publications
- Book reviewed in non-academic publications (e.g., NY Times book review)
- Book is widely adopted by academic programs
- Publication is listed as a "best seller" by major 3rd Party publication

Faculty who have questions or concerns regarding the impact and quality of a particular publisher or proposal should seek advice.

Appendix B

Examples of Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

(adapted from CU System EPUS Committee suggestions)

The following is a wide-ranging but non-exhaustive list of items for assessing teaching both within and beyond the immediate instructional setting.

- Student evaluations
  - Student mid-term evaluations (including steps taken in response to feedback)
  - Student focus groups, interviews, or surveys
- Instructional materials
- Course syllabi and examinations
- Curriculum development efforts
- Course improvement efforts
  - Evidence of continuous improvement in teaching and learning
  - Department and curricular work, including participation in curriculum revision, departmental efforts to focus on teaching
- Effectiveness of students in succeeding courses
- Student performance on standard professional examinations
- Professional development and innovations relating to teaching.
  - Participation in training in teaching effectiveness and new education-related technology
  - Evidence of effective utilization of contemporary teaching modalities, e.g. enhanced student learning
  - Engagement in peer assessment processes
- Professional awards related to the education process or other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Receipt of grants for teaching and education improvements
- Alumni evaluation, surveys, or opinions of teaching
- Philosophy and self-assessment of teaching
- Oversight of independent studies, e.g., honors theses, prelims, dissertations
- Advising and mentoring, e.g., graduate students (as primary advisor or committee member)
- Video recordings of teaching
- Contributions to the COB's assessment/assurance of student learning efforts
- Documentation of efforts to create inclusive and equitable educational experiences for students
- Scholarly research and presentation or publication on teaching and learning
- Mentoring students beyond the immediate instructional setting, e.g. supervision of doctoral or medical students, presenting teaching seminars to graduate students
- Mentoring faculty members in their education enterprises
- Authoring or co-authoring textbooks adopted by other higher education institutions

College of Business and Administration Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy

Version History

Version 6: Revision to Incorporate Changes in Regent Law

- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Faculty, 5/26/2020
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Eric Olson, Interim Dean, College of Business, 5/27/2020
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Tom Christensen, Provost, 5/27/2020
- ✓ Sent back to College for revisions, 7/1/2020
- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Faculty, 8/31/2020
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Karen Markel, Dean, College of Business, 9/1/2020
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Tom Christensen, Provost, 9/14/2020
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Tom Christensen, Provost, 9/15/2020
- ✓ Effective date, 7/1/2020

Version 5

- ✓ Reviewed by the College of Business Faculty, 4/17/2017
- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Strategy Team, 3/16/2017
- ✓ Approved by Dr. M. Cathy Claiborne, Interim Dean, College of Business, 4/18/2017
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Teresa P. Schwartz, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 4/26/2017
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Teresa P. Schwartz, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 4/26/2017
- ✓ Reaffirmed by the College of Business Faculty 6/9/2017

Version 4: Amendment 1

- ✓ Reviewed by the College of Business Faculty, 6/27/2016
- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Strategy Team, 6/6/2016
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Venkat Reddy, Dean, College of Business, 6/6/2016
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Teresa P. Schwartz, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 8/5/2016
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Teresa P. Schwartz, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 8/5/2016

Version 4: Clarification of Intellectual Contribution Standard

- ✓ Reviewed by the College of Business Faculty, Nov. 2011
- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Strategy Team, 11/3/2011
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Venkat Reddy, Dean, College of Business, 11/3/2011
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Peg Bacon, Provost, 11/7/2011
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Peg Bacon, Provost, 11/28/2011

Version 3: UCCS Required Clarifications

- ✓ Reviewed by the College of Business Faculty, Nov. 2008, Mar. 2009
- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Strategy Team, 3/5/2009
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Venkat Reddy, Dean, College of Business, 3/17/2009
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Peg Bacon, Provost, 3/18/2009
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Peg Bacon, Provost, 4/22/2009

Version 2: Editorial Changes

- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Strategy Team, 10/4/2007
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Venkat Reddy, Dean, College of Business, 10/4/2007
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Peg Bacon, Interim Provost, 10/12/2007
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Peg Bacon, Interim Provost, 12/3/2007

Version 1: Initial Version

- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Faculty, 4/30/2004
- ✓ Endorsed by the Strategy Team and Dean, 5/4/2004
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Rogers Redding, VCAA for approval, 5/5/2004