

**University of Colorado Colorado Springs  
College of Business and Administration**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**

April 26, 2017  
Reaffirmed June 9, 2017

# I. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

## A. Guidelines 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, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research or creative work.” (Regent Laws 5.B.4-B)*

The College of Business (COB) considers the candidate’s total record when making a tenure decision. However, the candidate must show continued accomplishment in teaching, research, and service since being employed at UCCS.

### Intellectual Contribution (IC) Standard:

The College of Business 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<sup>1</sup> 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 intellectual contributions being from peer-reviewed journal articles.

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. These articles may be in discipline-based, pedagogical, or practice-based outlets. The College values coauthored articles as equal to singly-authored papers.

The standard of six to eight peer-reviewed journal articles is set in recognition that some journals are regarded as more prestigious than others by the College and are typically more challenging to the authors. Thus a junior faculty member with one or papers in higher quality journals might 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.

Excellence is defined as exceeding the standard for meritorious by quantity, quality, or a combination thereof. External grants, peer-reviewed proceedings, and conference presentations contribute positively to the research record of the candidate. These standards apply equally to tenure and promotion, whether made together or separately.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The College of Business has adopted the following definition of peer-review from the AACSB: “Peer review is defined as a process of independent review prior to publication of a faculty member’s work by an editorial board/committee widely acknowledged as possessing expertise in the field. The peer review should be independent; provide for critical but constructive feedback; demonstrate a mastery and expertise of the subject matter; and be undertaken through a transparent process notwithstanding that the individuals involved may be anonymous.”

### Teaching Standard:

With regard to teaching, student evaluations serve as indicators of durable performance. In the College of Business, evaluation scores are compressed into a composite score to determine a Class Factor score.

Minimum standards for meritorious and excellence ratings in teaching are as follows: For a meritorious rating in instruction, we expect the candidate to have average class factor scores greater than or equal to 3.6 in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year. As required by the Regents, candidates must support their teaching record with at least two other indicators of meritorious teaching performance (see examples of possible indicators in Appendix A). For an excellent rating in instruction, 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. In addition, candidates must support their teaching record with at least two other indicators of teaching excellence. Candidates may request that these FCQ standards be revised downward depending on the quality of teaching as demonstrated by the other indicators. The case for deviations must be documented by the candidate. These standards apply equally to tenure and promotion decisions, whether made together or separately.

### Service Standard:

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

- (1) The College of Business, and
- (2) The university or the community or his/her discipline.

These standards apply equally to tenure and promotion decisions, whether made together or separately.

## **B. Guidelines for Promotion to Professor**

*“Professor: Under University policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.” (UCCS Policy 200-001, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure, 2008)*

When making a promotion decision, the candidate’s total record will be considered. However, the candidate must show continued accomplishment in teaching, research, and service since being employed at UCCS.

### Intellectual Contribution Standard:

Appointment 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. The primary committee must judge the overall record based on the dossier and the primary unit criteria.

### Teaching Standard:

With regard to teaching, student evaluations serve as indicators of durable performance. In the College of Business, evaluation scores are compressed into a composite score to determine a Class Factor score. For an excellent record in instruction, the College expects the candidate to have average class factors scores greater than or equal to 4.4 in two of the four years prior to candidacy, while having average class factor scores greater than or equal to 3.6 in the other two years. In addition, candidates must support their teaching record with at least two other indicators of teaching performance, as required by the Regents (see Appendix A for examples). An individual who believes his/her student evaluations do not accurately reflect the quality of his/her teaching, may elect to make a case using other indicators. Candidates may request that these FCQ standards be revised downward depending on the quality of teaching as demonstrated by the other indicators. The case for deviations must be documented by the candidate.

### Service Standard:

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

- (1) The College of Business, and
- (2) The university or the community, and
- (3) His/her discipline.

### Evaluating the “Record as a Whole”:

All faculty for promotion to professor must achieve these standards for the record to be judged to be excellent. For those on a differentiated workload, it may require additional time to meet these standards.

## **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 this regular comprehensive evaluation process are: (1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the university and the most effective use of institutional resources; and (2) to ensure professional accountability to the university community, to the Board of Regents, and to the public.” (Laws of the Regents, Article 5, Part B, Paragraph 6B2).*

The post-tenure review process will be conducted in accordance with University of Colorado and campus standards. Criteria considered for evaluation of a faculty member for PTR is based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the college. A faculty member will be evaluated on teaching, research, and service as part of the five-year plan. A differentiated work load is taken into consideration as appropriate. In the PTR, a faculty member will be rated as either “outstanding,” “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations” or “below expectations.”

A critical part of PTR 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 will be updated each year as needed during the annual performance review process.)

To be rated as “meeting expectations” for the PTR 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 Policy at the time of the PTR. 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 PTR cycle, a tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation of “below expectations.” Such reviews will be completed separately from regular five-year reviews by the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the Dean and Associate Dean. Please see APS 200-016 for “triggered reviews” and the Performance Improvement Agreement.

#### ***E. Comprehensive Reappointment Review***

The comprehensive reappointment review process will be scheduled and conducted in accordance with campus and Regental standards. The criteria are based on making satisfactory progress toward achievement of the standards for intellectual contributions, teaching, and service for “Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor” (see Section I. A). With respect to intellectual contributions, the current rate of production (including in-print, work submitted, and work-in-progress) should indicate satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion standards.

## **II. Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

### **A. *Primary Level Committee***

The Primary Unit P&T 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 College of Business, excluding those who will review candidates at later stages of the review process. For promotions to full professor, the committee will consist of only full professors in the college.

The Primary Unit P&T 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.

Normally, the dossier should be kept in the Dean's office and be 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 research or 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 service to the community, profession, and University.
- Gather and evaluate any appropriate additional data.

After completing their individual evaluations, members of the committee will 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 P&T 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 Level P&T Review Committee.

### **B. *Dean's Level P&T Review Committee (DRC)***

This committee is composed of one associate or full professor from each academic team in the College. 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 will appoint 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 P&T Evaluation Committee. The Dean conducts an independent evaluation. If the conclusion reached by either the Dean or his/her review committee is different from the initial recommendation, the Dean explains the disagreement and the Primary Unit P&T Evaluation Committee reconsiders its original recommendation and reports the results of the reconsideration to the Dean and DRC in writing.

The Dean's Level P&T Review Committee presents its final recommendation to the Dean in writing. The Dean is responsible for informing the candidate of the committee's decision. The Dean then forwards the candidate's complete dossier and the written recommendations of the Primary Unit P&T Evaluation Committee, the Dean, and the Dean's Level P&T Review Committee to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If the recommendations are not in agreement, an explanation of the factors leading to different conclusions must be included.

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. Dossier**

Candidates should prepare a dossier that will enable the Primary Unit P&T Evaluation Committee and subsequent reviewers to judge the candidate's performance in the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, as described above. The dossier should be prepared in accordance with university and college policy and standards.

The dossier must include the following sections:

- Provided by the Candidate
  - Executive Summary Statement
  - Professional Plan
  - Current Vita (using the specific format required by UCCS Policy 200-001)
  - Teaching
    - A statement of past teaching results and future teaching goals, including a list of all courses taught, and a summary of all FCQ's.
    - Copies of all FCQ's (in a separate binder).
    - Other evaluative data (e.g., peer reviews, student letters, any other material deemed appropriate by the faculty candidate) (in a separate binder).
  - Intellectual Contributions (IC)
    - A statement of past IC results and future IC plans, including a complete list of all publications, organized in a manner that clearly differentiates among the types of publications. The publication list must be organized as follows:
      - Peer-Reviewed Publications
        - Journals Papers
        - Conference Papers (with full paper included in proceedings)

- Conference Papers (with abstract only included in proceedings)
  - Conference Papers (with no proceedings)
  - Other Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications
  - Other Journals Papers
  - Other Conference Papers
  - Technical Reports
  - Other Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Papers Submitted
- Books
  - Authored
  - Edited
- Book Chapters
- Other Presentations (do *not* include presentations that were already included as conference papers in the above categories)
- Grants
- Other Intellectual Contributions
  - Copies of selected publications (in a separate binder).
- Service
  - A statement of past service and future service plans, including a complete list of all service performed, organized as follows:
    - Department, College, Campus, and University
    - State and National Agencies
    - Committees of Professional Societies/Associations
    - Editorial and Reviewer Roles
    - Consulting
    - Other Service
  - Supporting Material (in a separate binder).
- Provided by the College
  - The appropriate number of letters (3 for comprehensive reviews; 4 for all other cases) of external evaluation. 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 P&T Evaluation Committee chair and/or Dean as part of the process, must be included in the dossier.
  - Copy of the COB “Promotion and Tenure Policy.”
  - Previous RPT and Personnel Action Letters.
  - Letter from the COB Primary Unit P&T Evaluation Committee, including explanation of faculty vote (optional minority position letter may be included)
  - Letter from the COB Dean’s Level P&T Review Committee, including explanation of faculty vote (optional minority position letter may be included)
  - Letter from the COB Dean
  - UCDF-7 Form signed by the Dean



- Provided by UCCS EVCAA/Provost and Chancellor
  - Letter from the EVCAA “Second Level” P&T Review Committee, including explanation of faculty vote (optional minority position letter may be included)
  - UCDF-7 signatures from EVCAA/Provost and Chancellor.
  - Recommendation Sheet

### **III. Post-Tenure Review Procedures**

#### **A. Dean's Level P&T Review Committee (DRC)**

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

- A. The PTRC will review the professional plan(s) developed by the faculty member at the time of tenure or at the last PTR to ascertain whether the faculty member has been meeting the self-set goals and performance objectives of the plan.
- B. The PTRC will review 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 college.
- C. Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the PTR process may be subject to sanctions for insubordination or dereliction of duty. These sanctions will be decided by the Dean of the college, subject to EVCAA review and approval and existing college grievance procedures.” [page 2 and 3, Campus Policy number 200-016, UCCS, March 3, 2008]
- D. The PTRC will provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as either “outstanding,” “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations” or “below expectations” in teaching, research and service and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation. A summary of the report is given to the faculty member. If the PTR committee determines the faculty member is “below expectations,” the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). See APS 200-016 section E for information on the PIA.
- E. The PTRC will complete all regular five-year reviews by the end of the fall semester.

#### **B. Process**

Faculty required to undergo a PTR will be notified by the college’s HR Professional in the spring of the review year. The faculty member will submit the following material 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 will be submitted in one binder:

1. A copy of the individual's current curriculum vitae.
2. A two to three-page self-evaluation and executive summary highlighting teaching, research 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 PTR a faculty who intends to continue employment will 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 PTR

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

## **Appendix A**

### Examples of Evidence of Teaching Quality

(Adapted from Laws of the Regents, Appendix A, Attachment 1)

Student evaluation of teaching

Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction

Peer evaluation of teaching

Alumni evaluation

Student advising

Innovations in teaching

Participation in teaching development or mentoring

Effectiveness of students in succeeding courses

Student performance on standard professional examinations

Preparation of course materials

Integration of diversity into the classroom including contributions to UCCS diversity strategies

Evidence of continuous improvement or development

Contributions to the College's assessment/assurance of student learning efforts

**College of Business and Administration**  
**PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**  
**Version History**

**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