

Department of Mathematics
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
**POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

APPROVED March 10, 2009
APPROVED BY THE PROVOST MAY 21, 2009

1.0 Introduction:

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A 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 # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are to be used throughout the review process.

In the event that a department policy is judged to be in conflict with the Regents Laws or Regents Policies (<http://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/>), the latter shall apply.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Mathematics at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process is based on several assumptions: (i) possession of an appropriate terminal degree, (ii) competent education and training in the discipline(s), (iii) conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge, and (iv) an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

In addition to establishing departmental criteria, this document is meant to help individual faculty members become conscious of the factors which influence and direct the department in its decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. Each faculty member should utilize the department chair or other campus resources for clarification on issues or procedures that may not have been fully addressed in this document.

The Mathematics Department does not require a Faculty Responsibility Statement.

2.0 Department Roles and Responsibilities

2.1 Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

Consistent with Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents, the Department of Mathematics shall form a Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) from among its faculty members for the purpose of making recommendations on

reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review for each candidate during an academic year.

- 2.1.1 The PUEC will be formed in the spring semester to consider all reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review actions for the following academic year. The committee will consist of all tenured faculty members of the Mathematics Department; under circumstances requiring a deviation from this PUEC membership rule, approval by the dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (LAS) and the Provost of the university must be secured.
- 2.1.2 The PUEC will be responsible for obtaining the requisite materials for the year's reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure reviews, and for adding these materials to each candidate's dossier. These materials should include but are not limited to the following:
- Department Policies, Procedures and Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (this document).
 - Copies of all previous reappointment, promotion and tenure evaluations, votes and recommendations as outlined in the campus policy, if the candidate has previously undergone a personnel action. The Dean and/or the department Chair is responsible to provide these documents to the PUEC.
 - External Reviewers' evaluation letters (not required in post-tenure reviews).
 - Student evaluation letters (if applicable).
 - PUEC recommendation letter and report of the vote of the eligible members of the Mathematics Department on the candidate's personnel action.

Note that the materials listed above are in addition to those provided by the candidate. Materials that the candidate is required to provide in his/her dossier are listed in the campus policy. The committee will review and evaluate each candidate's dossier according to the department, college and university policies consistent with the guidelines provided in the Standards, Processes and Procedures document (Appendix A, Laws of the Regents); and will provide a summary of its evaluation and recommended action to the Department of Mathematics. Additional procedural matters are described in Section 2.2.

The PUEC will provide the external reviewers with a copy of this document (or relevant portions thereof). External reviewers will be asked to address both the General Criteria for Standards and Quality as well as the Explicit Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. These are described below.

2.1.3 The PUEC will elect a Chair from among its members in the Spring. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the PUEC to ensure that the candidate's dossier is reviewed and forwarded to the Dean's office in a timely fashion. The PUEC Chair is also responsible for providing the candidate with a copy of the committee's recommendation letter. However, there must be no identification of the external reviewers in this or any other communication with the candidate. A copy of the recommendation letter is forwarded to the Dean's Level Review Committee as part of the candidate's dossier.

2.2 Voting on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

All tenured faculty members of the Department of Mathematics, including those on leave or sabbatical assignment, will be members of the PUEC. Votes of the PUEC are held for cases involving reappointment, comprehensive pre-tenure review, appointment to continuous tenure, promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, and promotion to Senior Instructor.

For post-tenure reviews, the PUEC will perform the evaluation in accordance with the system wide Post-tenure Review Policy (dated July 1, 1998) and Article 5.B.6 (B), Laws of the Regents. No faculty vote is necessary in this case.

If the subject of the personnel action is a PUEC member, that member should not be present during the discussion and vote on the action, and will not vote in this case. Faculty members serving in the Dean's or Vice Chancellor's Review committees should note that they cannot vote, comment, or attend meetings on a particular personnel action at the department level if they opt to vote on the case at one of the other review committees.

The PUEC will be convened to vote on each of the personnel actions mentioned above, except post-tenure reviews. The vote will be recorded, and the record must specify the number of faculty members eligible to vote for each personnel action as well as the actual vote. Split votes must be addressed by including an explanation of the reasons for the minority votes. Those voting in the minority may write a separate report describing their evaluation of the candidate's dossier and points of disagreement with the majority.

The PUEC will report its votes and recommendations (including any explanations of the minority vote) in its recommendation letter. A copy of the PUEC recommendation letter will be forwarded to the Dean's Level Review Committee as part of the candidate's dossier. The chair of the PUEC will promptly notify the candidate of the committee's recommendation including the vote, and provide the candidate with a copy of the PUEC recommendation letter. However, there must be no identification of the external reviewers in this or any other communication with the candidate.

2.3 Role of the Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for providing each candidate with a copy of this document as well as copies of the college, campus, and system wide policies during the first semester of appointment.

3.0 Standards of Quality for Research, Teaching, and Service

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to clarify, to the greatest extent possible, the factors that will enter into the decision making process of the Department of Mathematics when it considers a faculty member for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. It is incumbent upon all faculty members to become familiar with the content of this document, as well as the guidelines governing reappointment, promotion and tenure matters found in Article 5.B, Laws of Regents and the Administrative Policy Statements titled “Implementation of Regent Policies on Tenure” and “Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenured Faculty”.

3.2. General Criteria

Department recommendations for any personnel action for tenure-track and tenured faculty members will be primarily based on the candidate’s record on each of the following endeavors: teaching, research/creative work, and service. Non-tenure-track faculty, which includes Instructors and Senior Instructors, are not normally expected to have research responsibilities. Therefore, personnel action decisions for non-tenure-track faculty will be primarily based on the candidate’s contribution to the areas of teaching and service. Age shall not be considered a factor.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member’s career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS, including progress since the last review.

3.3 Research

The Mathematics Department considers published professional work to be the most important contribution in the area of research. Other significant contributions to research include the following: obtaining external research funding or other forms of research support, giving talks at conferences, and organizing and participating in professional meetings, workshops and research seminars.

In order to qualify for tenure and/or promotion, a candidate must consistently publish articles in refereed journals, and must have a sustained and active commitment to publication. Usually papers in refereed journals are preferred over papers in conference proceedings. Survey articles will be classified to a large degree as “service to the profession”. On the other hand, research monographs may represent substantial contributions in any or all of the categories of research, teaching, or service, depending on the nature of the work. Contributed and invited talks at conferences on mathematics and related fields are recognized research endeavors.

Several experts in the candidate’s specific research area will be asked to write confidential letters assessing the quality and direction of the candidate’s research at the time of reappointment or comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion. It is helpful for the candidate to communicate regularly with leading researchers in his or her field.

A faculty member’s research record is considered excellent when he/she has steadily maintained a productive research agenda including high quality publications in refereed journals. Other indicators of excellence include external grants funded, major invited talks given, or research awards or recognition received. Research performance is considered meritorious when the faculty member has a substantial publication record in refereed journals, and he/she continues to engage in other research activities such as conference talks or submissions of externally funded research proposals.

3.4 Teaching

The Department of Mathematics considers the quality and effectiveness of teaching to be the most important factor in the category of teaching. Significant aspects of the teaching effort include: developing or updating courses, use of technology and other innovative efforts to improve the quality of mathematics instruction, willingness to teach new, different, or various courses in order to improve the overall offerings of the department, and publishing of quality materials and/or textbooks related to teaching in mathematics. The annual scholarly report is an appropriate vehicle for documenting one’s accomplishments in teaching (c.f. Sections IV & IX of the Scholarly Report). The data generated from the system wide Faculty Course Questionnaires are reviewed in assessing quality of teaching.

For all departmental reviews, the candidate’s teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. More details are provided in the Attachments.

The importance of teaching at this university lies not only with individual efforts in the classroom, but also with group efforts in discussing methods and problems, designing curricula, etc. (Issues related to teaching and curricula are discussed in periodically held meetings of the Department of Mathematics).

A faculty member's performance of teaching is considered excellent when he/she has made strong contributions to the teaching program of the department; demonstrated continued strong commitment to teaching and learning; and his/her teaching has made an extremely strong positive impact on student learning. Teaching performance is considered meritorious when the faculty member has made significant contributions to the teaching program of the department; he/she has shown strong commitment to teaching and learning; and his/her teaching has shown substantial evidence of positive impact on student learning.

3.5 Service

The majority of activities under this category fall under one of the following headings:

- serving as chair of the department, or in another campus administrative role
- serving on department/college/campus/university committees
- refereeing and reviewing for mathematical journals or funding agencies
- writing survey articles about a mathematical field
- serving in mathematical professional organizations
- organizing conferences in mathematics or related fields
- community activities consistent with professional standing

A faculty member's service record is considered excellent when he/she has made important contributions to the department, college, university, mathematics community, or community at large in a professional role; and there exists indication of leadership or positive impact of service. A meritorious service record consists of solid contributions at some level within the department/college/university or the mathematics community.

4.0 Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Reviews

4.1 Annual Merit Evaluation and Performance Rating.

The Annual Merit Evaluation and Performance Rating summary will be used, consistent with the Laws of the Regents and University policy, in the evaluation process for a particular personnel action. However, consistently *outstanding* or *exceeding expectations* annual merit performance shall not be the sole basis for tenure as stated in the Laws of the Regents (Section 11.A.1 (F)). All faculty members are urged to review the Department of Mathematics policy and criteria for Annual Merit Evaluation and performance rating. In case of post-tenure review, candidates with a single *below expectations* annual Performance Rating in

the five-year review cycle are required to plan and implement a Performance Improvement Agreement to remedy their problems. Faculty members who have received two *below expectations* Performance Ratings in their five-year post-tenure review cycle will have to undergo Extensive Review.

4.2 Initial Review

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. At this stage, the candidate is expected to be involved in departmental meetings and activities. External review letters are not required for the first reappointment review.

Specifically, to be considered for initial reappointment, the candidate's record

- i. must be judged as meritorious in research and teaching taken together, and show progress towards meritorious service.
- ii. must exhibit strong potential for growth and accomplishment in each of the areas of teaching, research and service.
- iii. must provide clear evidence of scholarly development since the candidate's initial appointment.

4.3 Comprehensive Review

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment.

The PUEC will request an evaluation of the candidate's work from at least four external referees. The faculty member under review will be asked to submit the names of three or four individuals to serve among these external referees. Normally the external referees selected by the PUEC will include at least two of those suggested by the faculty member under review.

To be considered for reappointment after the comprehensive pre-tenure review, the candidate's record

- i. must be judged as meritorious in the three areas of teaching, research and service taken as a whole, and meritorious in either teaching or research.

ii. must indicate significant and continued growth and accomplishment in teaching, research, and service since the candidate's first reappointment review.

iii. must demonstrate excellent promise in scholarship and strong potential to be granted tenure.

Specific criteria in the areas of teaching, research and service to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, are listed in Attachment II.

4.4 Promotion to Associate Professor and Awarding of Tenure

The review for promotion to Associate Professor should normally take place in conjunction with the tenure review. Only in exceptional circumstances, is a faculty member hired at a rank above Assistant Professor, but without tenure.

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research.

The PUEC will request an evaluation of the candidate's work from at least seven external referees. The faculty member under review will be asked to submit the names of six to eight individuals to serve among these external referees. Normally the external referees selected by the PUEC will include at least four of those suggested by the faculty member under review.

To be considered for tenure, the candidate's performance

i. must be judged as meritorious in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service, and excellent in teaching or research.

ii. must indicate significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, and service since the candidate's comprehensive pre-tenure review.

iii. must demonstrate excellent promise and, in particular, the likelihood of promotion to Professor in due course if granted tenure.

Specific criteria in the areas of teaching, research and service to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, are listed in Attachment II.

4.5 Promotion to Full Professor

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion 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."

Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through such activities as development of new and revised curricula, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with students outside the classroom and other areas of teaching such as those in the Attachment I.A.

Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants and other areas of research such as those in the appendix. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less.

The PUEC will request an evaluation of the candidate's work from at least seven external referees. The faculty member under review will be asked to submit the names of six to eight individuals to serve among these external referees. Normally the external referees selected by the PUEC will include at least four of those suggested by the faculty member under review.

To be considered for promotion, the candidate's record

- i. must be judged to be excellent in research, teaching and service, taken as a whole.
- ii. must demonstrate that the candidate has established a distinguished reputation as an expert or scholar in his/her discipline.
- iii. must indicate substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, and service since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Specific criteria in the areas of teaching, research and service to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion, are listed in Attachment I.

4.6 Post-tenure Review

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having accomplishments consistent with the goals of the faculty member’s current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards. External review letters are not required for post-tenure review.

4.7 Promotion to Senior Instructor

The PUEC will request an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching from at least four individuals. The faculty member under review will be asked to submit the names of three or four individuals to provide references. Normally the individuals selected by the PUEC will include at least two of those suggested by the faculty member under review.

According to the Laws of the Regents (Appendix A), the rank of Senior Instructor is awarded to those non-tenured faculty members who do not have the prerequisites for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, but who have special abilities, usually in teaching. Specific criteria in the areas of teaching and service to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion to Senior Instructor are listed in Attachment III.

To be considered for promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor, the candidate's record, taken as a whole,

- i. must be judged as meritorious, and excellent in teaching.
- ii. must demonstrate substantial and significant teaching accomplishment at the undergraduate level.
- iii. must indicate the potential for continued excellence and innovations in teaching, and meritorious service consistent with the individual's professional capacity.

5. Differentiated Workloads

Utilization of annual differentiated workloads in no way compromises standards governing the award of tenure and promotion. Therefore, faculty members should give careful considerations to their annual workload assignments in the years prior to tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. Guidelines for differentiated workload are documented in the Department of Mathematics Annual Differentiated Workload Policy and the university policy statement on Differentiated Workloads (dated July 1, 1989).

6.0. Faculty Rights and Privileges

A candidate for reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure reviews is entitled to specific rights and privileges in the review process. These are described in the Standards, Processes and Procedures document (Appendix A, Laws of the Regents) and Principles and Policies Related to Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure section of the Faculty Handbook (www.cusys.edu/faculty/fac_handbook/index.html).

ATTACHMENT I

Specific Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

- A. Teaching
- i. Effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This includes adopting efficient teaching styles appropriate to each classroom environment, motivating the students, and reacting with sensitivity to the students' responses.
 - ii. Continued awareness of current developments in his/her field, and applying these to teaching through timely development of new courses and modernization of existing courses.
 - iii. Active interest in student affairs and welfare, as well as effectiveness in advising, guiding, and counseling students, both on the undergraduate and the graduate levels.
 - iv. Publications related to teaching, including textbooks, new teaching methods and aids.
 - v. Initiative and effort in grant writing for teaching innovation and curricular development.

- B. Research
 - i. Quality and quantity of his/her research contributions, as evidenced by the record of high caliber, peer-reviewed publications.
 - ii. Evaluation by recognized authorities outside the University of the candidate's national or international ranking in scholarly accomplishment.
 - iii. Candidate's record in attracting undergraduate and graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis research.
 - iv. Ability to initiate, develop and direct significant research projects.
 - v. Initiative and success in attracting research funding.

- C. Service
 - i. Professional recognition outside the university community as evidenced by membership on significant professional and scientific committees, councils, boards, and review panels.
 - ii. Development of major College facilities that contribute to research and teaching activities.
 - iii. Participation and leadership in important faculty assignments and committees within the Department, College or University.
 - iv. Outside industrial, governmental experience or K-12 activities to the extent that it contributes to the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty member.

It is not expected that an individual would rate highly on every point in each of these categories, given the spectrum of differences individual abilities, attitudes and preferences. However, the quality of the candidate's performance in regard to the listed items should make for reasonable uniformity of judgment in considering promotion.

ATTACHMENT II

Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Comprehensive Pre-tenure Review OR Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

- A. Teaching
 - i. Thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses taught by the candidate.
 - ii. Keep courses up-to-date by incorporating new materials or by introducing new methods/approaches/technology.
 - iii. Demonstrated ability to develop new courses at the undergraduate and/or the graduate level, or to make substantial revisions in old ones.
 - iv. Enthusiastic teacher, accessible and willing to spend adequate time with students outside the classroom.
 - v. Considered an effective teacher by students and/or peers.
 - vi. Effectiveness in advising and counseling of both undergraduate and graduate students.

- B. Research
- i. Vigorous research program.
 - ii. Selection of research problems that are recognized as significant by experts in that field.
 - iii. Publication of significant papers in the candidate's research area.
 - iv. Research record of the candidate, in previous positions (e.g. postdoctoral) at other universities, if applicable.
 - v. Candidate's scholarly reputation at other universities or industry.
 - vi. Ability to develop new areas of research and show competence in them.
 - vii. Candidate's record in seeking and attracting external funding for his/her research program.
 - viii. In case of group or collaborative research, candidate's contribution toward the initiation and development of research projects.
 - ix. Whether the candidate's areas of interest are consistent with the department's objectives.
 - x. Candidate's record in attracting graduate students and directing their research work.
- C. Service
- i. Willingness to cooperate with department colleagues in teaching, research, curricular development, and other academic activities.
 - ii. Active participation in department, college or university activities intended to improve the quality of the university's program.
 - iii. Participation in professional and outside activities intended to promote the development of the candidate's area of specialization, if the outside professional activities enable the candidate to keep up-to-date with the current developments in his or her area of specialization.

It is not expected that an individual would rate highly on every point in each of these categories, given the spectrum of differences individual abilities, attitudes and preferences. However, the quality of the candidate's performance in regard to the listed items should make for reasonable uniformity of judgment in considering reappointment OR tenure and promotion.

ATTACHMENT III

Specific Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor

- A. Teaching
- i. Effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, at the undergraduate level. This includes adopting efficient reaching styles appropriate to each classroom environment, motivating the students, and reacting with sensitivity to the students' responses.
 - ii. Keeping his/her courses up-to-date by incorporating new materials or by introducing new methods/approaches/technology.
 - iii. Demonstrated ability to develop new undergraduate courses and revision of existing courses.

- iv. Enthusiastic teacher, accessible to students, willing to spend adequate time to help students outside the classroom.
 - v. Considered an effective teacher by students and/or peers.
 - vi. Publications related to teaching, including textbooks, new teaching methods and aids.
 - vii. Active interest in student affairs and welfare and effectiveness as a student advisor at the undergraduate level.
- B. Service
- i. Active participation with his/her colleagues in curricular development and other pedagogical activities.
 - ii. Development of facilities within the Department or College that contribute to teaching activities.
 - iii. Participation in professional training and career development activities both inside and outside of the University.
 - iv. Outside (e.g. K-12) activities to the extent that it contributes to the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty member.

It is not expected that an individual would rate highly on every point in each of these categories, given the spectrum of differences individual abilities, attitudes and preferences. However, the quality of the candidate's performance in regard to the listed items should make for reasonable uniformity of judgment in considering promotion.