



UCCS College of Education
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO COLORADO SPRINGS

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria

Equity
Inquiry
Innovation

OUR COMMITMENT TO THE
FUTURE >>
STUDENT IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

July 1, 2020



College of Education

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Teaching and Learning**

Departmental Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

As a comprehensive college and a professional school, the College of Education (COE) at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS) assesses the influence of the teaching, scholarship, and service of its faculty on the profession and its constituents. Such influence will be validated by both practitioners and scholars within the field who translate research into practice. The following criteria were developed and adopted by COE faculty and are reviewed periodically as needed. Examples under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Faculty members are expected to achieve a balance among the categories of evidence with emphasis on teaching and scholarship. A common expectation for distribution of effort for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the College of Education is 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service.

Various levels of review use these criteria as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record within the policies of the Regents of the University of Colorado. These criteria are implemented in all faculty evaluation processes such as annual evaluations, awarding of merit raises, decisions about reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

These criteria referred to as "Quality Indicators" for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the disciplines represented in the college. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the broader Education profession. The items listed here as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. The quality indicators contain a series of examples of evidence. Examples of evidence within each category of quality indicators do not constitute an exhaustive list and are not rank ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review in the Department of Counseling and Human Services, the Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations and the Department of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Tenure-track faculty members within the College of Education may choose to use these criteria or those under which they were hired. Individuals under consideration for full professor will use the most recent criteria.

Each department within the College is committed to providing quality teaching, strong scholarship/creative work, and effective service/leadership to department, college, the university, the profession, and the community. The College of Education recognizes the impact of teaching beyond the classroom. Such impact can be demonstrated in the areas of Scholarship/Creative work, Teaching, and Leadership/Service. The College of Education recognizes the inextricable link between teaching and scholarship/creative work. As such, quality indicators of teaching that have impact beyond the classroom may also be counted as indicators of scholarly/creative activity.

These criteria have been developed according to the standards as outlined in the *Rules of the Regents*.

Teaching Quality Indicators

Regents' policy requires that each unit use at least three measures for teaching evaluations for RPT decisions. FCQs must be used as one of these. In order to maintain a sense of balance amongst different quality indicators, the ratings of Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) should consist of no more than a third of a Faculty Member's rating.

1. Student perceptions of the usefulness of course content. Examples of evidence include:
 - course evaluations
 - student letters
 - student surveys
 - follow-up studies of graduates

2. Influence of the course content/program on students' learning. Examples of evidence include:
 - student projects
 - pre- and post-tests
 - course evaluations
 - comprehensive examinations
 - course syllabi
 - student portfolios
 - student surveys

3. Influence of instructor's teaching practice on student learning. Examples of evidence include:
 - course evaluations
 - peer evaluations
 - student portfolios
 - student letters
 - practicum evaluations
 - follow-up studies
 - student surveys

4. Influence of the course/program content on students' practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - supervisor evaluations
 - students' self-evaluations
 - course evaluations
 - video recordings
 - student portfolios
 - student initiation of new models
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site
 - employer surveys

5. Advising and/or mentoring relationships with students developed over time to improve professional practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - master's or doctoral thesis supervision
 - master's research project supervision
 - undergraduate research
 - independent studies
 - student letters
 - student portfolios
 - supervision of internship experience
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site

6. Successful demonstration of efforts by the faculty member to assess and improve the quality of his/her teaching. Examples of evidence include:
 - implementation of alternative assessment strategies
 - changes in teaching practice
 - course evaluations
 - peer observations
 - implementation of technological instructional strategies
 - course or program development or revision

7. Professional reputation in teaching with constituents at local, regional, state, or national levels who translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence include:
 - external reviews
 - status on local, regional, state, and national committees
 - letters from colleagues
 - invited presentations or speeches

8. Successful collaboration with faculty colleagues that results in program success in meeting and exceeding state and national standards within the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence 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 and/or participation in the development of folios for learned society recognition
 - leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state reauthorization and national accreditation
 - serving as a site professor at a P-12 school or community site

9. 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 observations

10. The work of any faculty member serving in an administrative capacity, who works on curriculum reform, development, or accreditation or otherwise assists other faculty or faculty groups with any items listed above, may count in the category of Teaching Quality Indicators.

11. Influence of teaching practice impact beyond the classroom. Examples include:
 - Presentations regarding teaching strategies, practices, and/or teaching technologies and their implementation to the department, college, or campus
 - Presentations regarding teaching strategies, practices, and/or teaching technologies and their implementation to local, regional, national or international conferences
 - Examples of how others have adopted or implemented teaching strategies or practices promoted by the faculty member at the local, regional, national or international level
 - Citations in publications or reported in the media regarding implementation or attempts to implement practices and or teaching technologies promoted by the faculty member at the local, regional, national or international level
 - Evidence provided by alumni or employers of the success of graduates of the faculty member's students
 - Success of graduates in performance on credentialing exams or exit exams
 - Activities such as coaching, mentoring, and supervising other faculty, instructors, or teachers or students
 - Scholarly research and publication on teaching, learning, or supervision
 - Honors, awards, and recognitions related teaching, learning, or supervision
 - Grants in support of teaching, learning, or supervision
 - Invitations to consult, give workshops, or advise in relation to teaching, learning, or supervision
 - Serving as a visiting or invited scholar at another institution
 - Collaborative work with practitioners in the field to translate research into practice, such as curriculum development (including curriculum implementation), or efforts to link local practice with national or state trends or standards in education

Scholarly/Creative Work Quality Indicators

In the College of Education, teaching and scholarship are of equal importance. The following quality indicators contain a series of examples of evidence. Examples of evidence within each category of the scholarly/creative work quality indicator are not rank ordered. However, more emphasis may be placed on scholarly/creative work quality indicator category 1 (*peer-reviewed scholarship*) than scholarly/creative work quality indicator category 2.

1. Professional publications that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners or the profession and may be published or accepted for publication. 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 and/or invited presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice
 - peer-reviewed online publications
 - circulation rates of publications
 - citation rates for one's publications
 - other indicators of professional impact

2. Professional publications that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge, or perspectives which influence peers, practitioners, or other targeted audiences. These may be published, accepted for publication, or submitted for review. 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
 - technical reports
 - policy related materials

3. Competency in grant procurement for research or programs that translate research or improve service through dissemination of innovative practice. Examples of evidence include:
 - Serving as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI)
 - Seeking and/or obtaining funding through research proposals for single and/or multidisciplinary work in the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and/or teaching and learning
 - Seeking and/or obtaining funding and research opportunities for students
 - participation on grant-writing teams

4. Regional, state, national, or international prominence as a professional researcher or educator. Examples of evidence include:
 - editorship of a professional journal
 - service as a referee for articles or papers in conference proceedings
 - service as a referee for journals that have substantial influence on the constituents of the faculty member's field
 - creative work that translates research into practice such as media presentations, workshops, or staff development
 - collaborative work with practitioners in the field to translate research into practice, such as curriculum development (including curriculum implementation), or efforts to link local practice with national or state trends or standards in education
 - 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

5. Professional reputation with constituents at local, state, national, or international levels which translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's field. Examples of evidence include:
 - reviews of 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 field

6. The work of any faculty member serving in an administrative capacity, who works on grant development for the College or otherwise assists faculty or faculty groups with any items listed above, may be considered in the category of Scholarly/Creative Work Quality Indicators.

Leadership and Service Quality Indicators

Leadership and service to the department and college. Leadership and service in category one is expected to continue as faculty take on additional leadership and service responsibilities in other categories.

1. Examples of evidence of leadership and service to the department and college include:

- college committee leadership
- college committee membership
- college search committee chair or member
- college committee member or chair for faculty evaluation
- service as department chair, program coordinator, director, or associate dean contributing to the work of the department and college (e.g., attending department meetings, summits, open forums, college faculty and staff meetings)
- serving as a member of department committees, college standing committees, ad-hoc task forces, search committees, etc., including serving as a member of the primary unit committee or dean's review committee for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion in the College of Education
- providing leadership to department committees, college standing committees, ad-hoc task forces, search committees, etc., including chairing the primary unit committee or dean's review committee for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion in the College of Education
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state reauthorization and national accreditation
- serving in an administrative capacity while working on curriculum reform, development, or accreditation, or otherwise assisting other faculty or faculty groups with assessment and accreditation efforts
- service in college leadership as program coordinator, director, department chair, assistant or associate dean
- initiating and executing external partnerships (e.g. contracts, agreements, MOU's with external partners)

2. Professional leadership and service to the university campus. Where appropriate, faculty are encouraged to share relevant issues with members of their department and college. Examples of evidence include:

- leadership in faculty governance, such as serving as an elected member on Faculty Assembly
- participation in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
- campus committee or task force leadership
- campus committee or task force membership
- service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

3. Professional leadership and service to the university system. Where appropriate, faculty are encouraged to share relevant issues with members of their department and college. Examples of evidence include:
 - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
 - participation in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
 - leadership in faculty governance, such as chairing or co-chairing a committee/subcommittee or as a member of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council
 - university committee or task force leadership
 - university committee or task force membership
 - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position
 - leadership in faculty governance, such as chairing or co-chairing a committee/subcommittee or as a member of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council
4. Professional community, regional, or national leadership and service. Examples of evidence include:
 - professional service related to the University or College of Education mission, such as board membership, community service projects, and presentations
 - professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership, task force membership
 - professional practice related to the University or College of Education mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
5. Professional leadership and service to community, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Examples of evidence include:
 - professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership, task force membership, or conference committees
 - professional practice related to the University or College of Education mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
 - professional service and leadership in the governance of community, regional, national and/or international professional organizations
6. Generally, leadership roles in service activities are considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.
7. Demonstration of impact beyond the classroom by service activities or committees related to sharing teaching practices or technology skills with groups internally or externally to the university.

The items listed here as the *College of Education's Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work and Service Quality Indicators* are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required.

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Teaching and Learning**

Committee Structure for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Primary Unit Committee

The Primary Unit Committee (PUC) consists of tenured faculty members in the department who are not serving on the Dean's Review Committee (DRC) or the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC). The PUC should consist of at least four members recommended by the department chair and approved by the Dean of the College of Education annually for faculty reviews, including:

- Two tenured faculty members, where possible, from the department including one who chairs the committee
- One tenured faculty member from another COE department
- One tenured faculty member from another college

Department chairs will consider input from the faculty members being reviewed and may consult with other college faculty regarding the external members of the PUC. The dean has final approval of the composition of the Primary Unit Committee.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Dean's Review Committee

The Dean's Review Committee (DRC) should consist of at least four members appointed by the Dean of the College annually for faculty reviews. The Dean will consider input from the faculty regarding the composition of members of the DRC, including:

- Three tenured faculty members (*full professors when possible*), one of whom chairs the committee, from the College of Education not on a Primary Unit Committee or on the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC).
- One tenured faculty member from another college (*full professor when possible*)

Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC)

A full professor recommended by the Dean with input from the faculty and approved by the Provost for a three-year term.

**Department of Counseling and Human Services
Department of Leadership, Research and Foundations
Department of Teaching and Learning**

Standards for Successful Reviews

Initial Reappointment Review

The first step in the tenure process at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs is the Initial Reappointment Review. Tenure-track faculty members will work with their department chairs to develop a Faculty Professional Plan that will lead toward a successful Initial Reappointment Review. The Initial Reappointment Review typically takes place in the second year.

At the initial reappointment review level, candidates will be given a rating of:

- 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

The committee members will conduct a recorded vote that reflects the overall opinion regarding initial reappointment review in each of the three categories.

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Tenure-track faculty members in the College of Education should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, faculty members will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration. Beyond the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs), tenure-track faculty members are required to present documentation of at least two additional means of teaching evaluation. See the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators for examples.

Scholarly/Creative Work

Tenure-track faculty members in the College of Education will present evidence of scholarly/creative work potential and progress toward publication. This might include copies of drafts of work in progress or submitted for publication, and/or contributions to grant proposals.

Leadership and Service

Tenure-track faculty members will contribute to leadership and service upon joining the faculty at UCCS. The faculty member should strive to prioritize service contributions within the department and college and may choose to engage in service beyond the college level.

Criteria for Initial Reappointment Review

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of tenure-track faculty toward reappointment. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the disciplines represented in the College of Education. Each faculty member's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the faculty member's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the faculty member's expertise and current practice of the Education profession broadly defined. The items listed in this document as the Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. The quality indicators contain a series of examples of evidence within each category and are not rank ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

The second step in the tenure process at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs is the Comprehensive Reappointment Review. Tenure-track faculty members should work with their department chairs to develop a Faculty Professional Plan that will lead toward a successful Comprehensive Reappointment Review. The Comprehensive Reappointment Review typically takes place in the fourth year.

At the comprehensive reappointment review level, candidates will be given a rating of:

- 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.

The committee members will conduct a recorded vote that reflects the overall opinion regarding comprehensive reappointment review in each of the three categories.

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Tenure-track faculty should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education.

Furthermore, tenure-track faculty will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a rating of *on track for tenure*, faculty members must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress toward a rating of *meritorious* at the time of tenure in teaching as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. In cases in which the faculty member receives a rating of *not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections*, the committee will provide the faculty member with actionable steps for correction. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of not on track for tenure, the committee will provide with a rationale for the decision.

For a rating of *on track for tenure*, candidates with stronger teaching records may additionally show that they are making reasonable progress toward *excellence* at the time of tenure in terms of effective teaching as indicated by FCQs and multiple examples of other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarly/Creative Work

For a rating of on track for tenure, faculty members must demonstrate that they are presenting a balance of scholarly/creative work that indicates a greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels as delineated in the College of Education's Scholarly/Creative Work Quality Indicators.

Faculty members must demonstrate that they are making reasonable progress toward merit in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities, compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarly/Creative Work Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels, such that the faculty member appears to be making reasonable progress toward tenure.

For a rating of *not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections*, the committee will provide the candidate with actionable steps for correction.

For a rating of *not on track for tenure*, the committee will provide with a rationale for the decision.

Leadership and Service

For a rating of *on track for tenure*, candidates are expected to have begun initial efforts in appropriate types and levels of leadership and service contribution as listed in the College of Education's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators. Faculty members must have met their growing commitment and obligations to the department, and college, and provide evidence that they have begun to contribute to service and leadership to the university, community, or profession.

For a rating of *not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections*, the committee will provide the tenure-track faculty with actionable steps for correction.

For a rating of *not on track for tenure*, the committee will provide a rationale for the decision.

A rating of *on track for tenure* requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession.

Criteria for Comprehensive Reappointment Review

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of tenure-track faculty toward comprehensive reappointment review. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each tenure-track faculty's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The Quality Indicators identified in this document should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the tenure-track faculty's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the tenure-track faculty's expertise and current practice of the Education profession, broadly defined to include all departments represented in the College of Education. The items listed in this document as Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to just quantitative counting but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the entire primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor Review

The third step in the tenure process at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs is the Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor Review. Typically, tenure and promotion to associate professor happen concurrently. Typically, this takes place during the seventh year.

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Tenure-track faculty should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, tenure-track faculty will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a *meritorious* rating, tenure-track faculty must demonstrate effective teaching performance as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) judged to meet or exceed the average range for the University and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the tenure-track faculty will generally present greater emphasis on multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting.

Scholarly/Creative Work

For a *meritorious* rating, the tenure-track faculty must demonstrate merit in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarship Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, the tenure-track faculty will present a balance of scholarly activities indicated in the rating of *meritorious* with greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

Leadership and Service

For a *meritorious* rating, in addition to meeting their primary obligations to department, university, and/or community leadership and service, tenure-track faculty should also have contributed leadership and service to the profession as listed in the College of Education's Service Quality Indicators.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession. In evaluating leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Guidelines for Committee Consideration

Tenure-track faculty must demonstrate *meritorious* performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and leadership and service, and demonstrated *excellence* in either teaching or scholarship.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward promotion. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. Quality Indicators presented in this document should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed as Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to quantitative counting but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Promotion to Full Professor Review

Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. The faculty member should demonstrate that their courses reflect current practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of education. Furthermore, the faculty member will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

For a *meritorious* rating the faculty member must demonstrate continued growth in effective teaching as measured by the required Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) judged to meet or exceed the university average range and at least two other indicators from those listed in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member must additionally demonstrate continuing above-average performance in teaching and other evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the College of Education's Teaching Quality Indicators.

Scholarly/Creative Work

For a *meritorious* rating, the faculty member must demonstrate continuing productivity in scholarship by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the College of Education's Scholarship Quality Indicators. These activities should include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member will continue to present a balance of scholarly activities indicated in the rating of *meritorious* with greater emphasis on items which are peer reviewed, edited, or are deemed to have a greater impact at the regional, national, or international levels.

Leadership and Service

For a rating of *meritorious* the faculty member must provide evidence of continued contributions in the areas of professional, university, or public service as delineated in the College of Education's Faculty Leadership and Service Quality Indicators.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department, college, university, community, or profession. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of contributions will be considered.

Guidelines for Committee Consideration of the Record as a Whole

The College of Education evaluates the faculty member's record as a whole. The record must demonstrate "substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service". The evaluation of the faculty member's record must demonstrate at least one rating of *excellent* in any one of the three categories: *Teaching, Scholarship, or Leadership and Service*, and ratings of at least *meritorious* in the other two categories. Consideration and weighting of ratings in all categories should be given, in terms of productivity for any official responsibilities such as differentiated workloads, administrative positions, and faculty governance offices held since the time of the award of tenure (*if applicable*).

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Post-Tenure Review

Quality Indicators for Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are to be considered guidelines for the evaluation of a faculty member's application for post-tenure review. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the discipline. Each faculty member's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. These Quality Indicators should be used as a guide and framework to make a professional judgment about the faculty member's record consistent with respect to the specific field of the candidate's expertise and current practice of the Education profession. The items listed in this document as Quality Indicators of Teaching, Scholarship, and Leadership and Service are a list of suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples given under each criterion are not rank ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole should not be reduced to quantitative counting but should reflect professional judgments of the quality of the works presented.

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Departments of Counseling and Human Services, Leadership Research and Foundations, and Teaching and Learning in the College of Education have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

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.

Processes for Post-Tenure Review

1. As the Primary Unit, the College of Education faculty will be responsible for the primary review of all faculty at post-tenure review.
2. The Dean of the College of Education will inform each faculty who is required to have a post-tenure review of the review procedures and timeline for review.
3. The Dean of the College of Education will be empowered by the faculty to select a committee that is appropriate to perform the post-tenure review of all candidates who are to be reviewed in a given year. Reviewed faculty will be consulted on potential committee members. Post-tenure review committees will consist of tenured faculty. If there are many faculty undergoing post-tenure review in a given year, multiple committees may be constituted. A post-tenure review committee will have at least three members. The committee will have the majority of its members from the College of Education; however, members from other academic units may be selected when their area

of expertise allows for sound judgment of the candidate's record or when an insufficient number of tenured faculty are present in the College of Education. Post-tenure review members cannot review faculty who have provided a post-tenure review for the committee member in the same year.

4. The chair of the post-tenure review committee is responsible for conducting the review, writing the report, and providing feedback to the reviewed faculty member. A copy of the written performance evaluation will be made available in a timely manner to the candidate.
5. The following materials, submitted in one dossier, will be examined by the post-tenure review committee:
 - annual performance evaluations for the previous 5 years
 - current curriculum vita
 - professional plan(s) from the current post-tenure review cycle
 - a new, updated professional plan
 - a copy of any differentiated workload agreements for the five-year period as appropriate.
 - FCQ summary sheets
 - post-sabbatical report (if taken during the review period)
 - additional materials selected by the faculty member which are appropriate evidence for demonstrating meeting the departmental criteria
6. The post-tenure review committee will review submitted materials and provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and leadership and service. The committee will provide an evaluation of the faculty as *outstanding, excellent, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations or below expectations*. The report will summarize the committee's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous professional plan(s); meeting the department's standards; conclusions about the faculty member's productivity and contributions to the university in teaching, research/scholarship, and service; and will remark on the feasibility of the new professional plan for allowing the faculty member to meet the departmental standards at the next review. All committee members will be given an opportunity to see the report summarizing their deliberations and decision prior to submission to the reviewed faculty member and the department chair.
7. If the reviewed faculty member disagrees with the post-tenure review committee's rating, the faculty member will file a grievance with the department chair. The faculty member will explain in writing the areas of disagreement. The department chair will constitute a faculty committee with three tenured College of Education faculty members to review the grievance. The committee will review the grievance and the candidate's materials. If the committee agrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was not conducted properly, the committee will conduct a new review and will write a new evaluation letter. If the committee disagrees with the grievant and rules that the original review was

conducted properly, the evaluation from the original committee will be submitted to the department chair.

8. A copy of the report will be given to the department chair, who will review the materials and will approve the new professional plan. The chair will submit the post-tenure review report to the dean. If the department chair or the post-tenure review committee does not approve of the new professional plan, the faculty member will be asked to revise the plan before submission to the dean. Typically, the department chair would not write an additional letter for the post-tenure review.
9. In the event that the Dean disagrees with the decision of the post-tenure review committee, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the department chair. The chair will then call a meeting of the post-tenure review committee to reconsider the decision. The chair will write a letter summarizing the results of the faculty's reconsideration.
10. Following Regents' policy, there are three types of post-tenure review:
 - A **regular five-year review** occurs if the candidate has received annual review ratings of *meeting expectations* or better since the last post-tenure review (or since receiving tenure if this is their first post-tenure review).
 - A **triggered review** occurs when a faculty member receives two annual summary reviews of *below expectations* within a five-year period or when a primary unit committee has given a *below expectations* rating at a regular five-year post-tenure review.
 - An **extensive review** occurs when a faculty member has received two *below expectations* ratings within the previous five years or when a faculty member who has undertaken a Performance Improvement Agreement did not achieve an evaluation of *meeting expectations* or better by the end of the agreement.
11. If the faculty member is found to be *below expectations* on a post-tenure review, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. The faculty member and the department chair will work together with input from the post-tenure review committee to develop a Performance Improvement Agreement following procedures outlined in the post-tenure review policies (Regents, UCCS, and the College of Education).
12. If a triggered review follows two *below expectations* rating, attempts will be made to include the same members on the post-tenure review committee who made the initial rating and who will evaluate whether the faculty member has met the conditions of the Performance Improvement Agreement.

13. A department post-tenure review committee will complete a triggered review or an extensive review following procedures outlined in system and campus policies and consistent with the procedures for doing a regular review.
14. If criteria are revised, faculty will be evaluated under the criteria in place when they submitted their most recent professional plan. A faculty member may elect to be evaluated under new criteria.
15. Administrative Policy statements.¹

¹ Any processes not directly addressed will use the campus and university processes and guidelines as outlined in the appropriate Regents Laws and Policies, and CU.

College of Education RPT Criteria Version History

Approved by COE tenured/TT faculty, 5/13/2020

Approved by Dean Martin Conley, 6/29/2020

Approved by Provost Christensen, 7/1/2020

Effective date, 7/1/2020