

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

**Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria
Effective Date July 1, 2026**

Section 1. Introduction

The primary unit criteria outlined in this document establish the standards for evaluating candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) within the College of Business (COB) at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs (UCCS). These criteria reflect current professional performance standards across the COB and align with the broader university standards and processes for RPT, as defined in Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These standards are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements, including APS 1022, as well as campus-specific policies, such as UCCS Policy #200-001 and UCCS Policy #200-016.

Each candidate's case will be assessed on its individual merits and circumstances. The COB is committed to fostering excellence in teaching and scholarship, as well as leadership and service to the college, the campus, and the university system, the broader community, and the academic discipline. The evaluation process assumes: (i) possession of an appropriate terminal degree, and competent education and training in the discipline; (ii) conduct that reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and (iii) an appreciation of, and respect for, the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

This document continues by outlining the committees and processes, as well as the primary unit criteria, for all levels of RPT review in the COB.

Section 2. COB RPT Committees and Processes

Within the COB, two levels of RPT review occur before the dean's evaluation. The first-level, the primary unit review, is conducted by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC). The second-level review is conducted by the Dean's Review Committee (DRC).

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

The primary unit review is conducted by the COB PUEC, with its meetings and activities coordinated by the PUEC chair. The PUEC chair is appointed by the dean of the COB on an annual basis. The PUEC is responsible for the initial evaluation of a candidate's qualifications and has the authority to make recommendations to the dean regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Because the COB is organized into informal academic teams rather than formal departments, the PUEC includes all tenured faculty members in the college, excluding those serving on the DRC or participating in external reviews, such as the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC). For promotion to full professor reviews, the PUEC encompasses only full professors in the COB. The PUEC chair should be available to candidates to discuss the criteria, processes, policies, and timelines associated with reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The PUEC shall keep records regarding its activities, including the date, time, duration, and location of each meeting; a list of attendees; copies of all correspondence, and documentation of comments and voting outcomes from each meeting.

The Dean's Review Committee

The DRC comprises five members: one representative from each academic team within the COB, plus the appointed DRC chair. All DRC members must hold the rank of full or associate professor in the COB. Only full professors may vote on promotion to full professor reviews. The dean appoints the chair

and the committee members on an annual basis. If a DRC member is undergoing a post-tenure review, the dean will appoint an alternate member to serve for a one-year term. The DRC, without the dean present, reviews the candidate's dossier and the recommendations of the PUEC and submits its recommendation to the dean. Following the DRC's review, the dean conducts an independent evaluation of the candidate.

The Review Process for Initial, Comprehensive, Tenure and/or Promotion, and Promotion to Full Professor Reviews

All candidates must upload their digital dossiers to the designated UCCS portal by the deadline established by the college or as specified in any approved tenure probationary period extension agreement (i.e. a tenure clock stop). A candidate who does not submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time as established by the college (or within an alternate agreed-upon timeline) is deemed not to have applied for reappointment or tenure. In such cases, unless a tenure probationary period extension agreement has been approved, the candidate's appointment will terminate at the end of the existing contract. There is no terminal year beyond the end of the employment period specified in the Letter of Offer (UCCS Policy #200-001, Section 6).

All tenure probationary period extension requests must be processed in accordance with UCCS Policy #200-001. In addition, pursuant to Regent Policy 5.D.1.C, *"[i]n extraordinary circumstances, the president may empower the chancellors to approve tenure clock extensions that are independent of leave. Any such empowerments shall be reported to the Board of Regents."*

It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate how they have met the standards outlined in the primary unit criteria. Candidates should prepare and submit a dossier in accordance with UCCS Policy #200-001, ensuring that it directly addresses the primary unit criteria. The dossier is available only in digital format through the designated UCCS platform. During the primary review, it is accessible to members of the PUEC, and subsequently to members of the DRC following the conclusion of the PUEC's review.

The candidate's dossier should include: (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (ii) an executive summary of the candidate's entire record, (iii) a teaching portfolio that includes a teaching summary, FCQ summaries and official FCQ records, documentation addressing the self-evaluation of the continuous improvement of teaching, and internal and external peer evaluations, (iv) a research portfolio that includes a research summary together with evidence of all scholarly activity at UCCS (and other institutions, as appropriate), and (v) a leadership and service portfolio with a leadership and service summary and evidence demonstrating contributions to the college, the campus/university system, the community, and/or the candidate's discipline. Candidates being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, or for promotion to professor, must also include a detailed five-year professional plan in their dossier.

Additionally, candidates must sign and upload their RPT criteria choice document for all reviews—except promotion to full professor—to indicate which policy criteria they wish to be evaluated under. If campus or department criteria are revised during a faculty member's pre-tenure period, pre-tenured faculty may elect to be evaluated under the criteria in effect at the time of hire or under the revised

criteria. Faculty being reviewed for promotion to full professor will be evaluated under the most current criteria.

For reviews that require external letters, candidates must upload an initial dossier by July 1. The initial dossier includes (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (ii) an executive summary of the candidate's entire record, (iii) a teaching summary, (iv) a research summary, and (v) a leadership and service summary. The PUEC chair sends the initial dossier to all external reviewers to provide sufficient time for them to evaluate the candidate's record against the primary unit criteria before submitting their letters when the final dossier is due. External reviewers are also sent a copy of the appropriate COB RPT policy document and a copy of the COB publications policy.

The material included in the initial dossier should not be changed when the candidate uploads their full dossier in September, unless the candidate wishes to submit any updated material or information that they believe will be helpful in evaluating their case. At any stage in the review process, a candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information that they believe will be helpful in evaluating their case. Materials provided at a higher level of the review shall also be provided to all other bodies reviewing the candidate, and they may respond as they deem appropriate (APS 1022, Section VII.D.1).

External letters are not required for the initial reappointment review, but candidates do have the option of requesting external letters for the comprehensive reviews. If external reviewers are requested for the comprehensive review, a minimum of three reviewers is required. External letters are required for promotion and/or tenure reviews, and there must be at least four external letters. When a review requires external letters, the candidate must submit a list of potential external reviewers to their team lead and the dean of the COB for approval. The process of approving the external review list must be completed by July 1 to give time for reviewers to be contacted and confirm availability for external review.

External reviewers should be selected based on their expertise in the candidate's area of research and must clearly be at "arm's length" to ensure an impartial review. Candidates should refrain from contacting or communicating with external reviewers regarding the review. Former advisors and individuals who have served in a structured mentoring relationship (e.g., research mentor through a professional society) are excluded from serving as external reviewers. While candidates may include collaborators, the majority of reviewers should be at arm's length, meaning they have no personal relationship with the candidate and have not collaborated with them. External reviewers' letters will not be made available to the candidate, nor will the candidate be informed of the reviewers' identities. At the COB level, a summary of and/or direct quotes from the external reviewers' comments will be provided in the PUEC, DRC, and the dean's letter with any identifying information removed.

The list of external reviewers should include each reviewer's contact information (address, phone number, and email), a brief biography of each reviewer, and a statement describing any prior interactions with the reviewer. The team lead and dean may add to this list; however, the candidate may request that specific individuals be excluded. Once finalized and approved by the dean and team lead, the list should be sent to the PUEC chair, who is responsible for soliciting the required number of reviews from the

approved external reviewer list. Once candidates have uploaded their dossiers, the college notifies PUEC members to begin their review.

The PUEC chair is responsible for coordinating the committee's meeting. To establish a quorum, at least 70 percent of eligible PUEC members must be present. Prior to the meeting, PUEC members should complete their individual evaluations of the candidates. During the meeting, PUEC members will discuss the candidate's overall dossier.

For the initial, comprehensive, tenure and/or promotion, and promotion to full professor reviews, the candidate should request a person suitably qualified to present a summary of their dossier to the PUEC. If the presenter is not a member of the PUEC, they must leave the meeting before any discussion begins. Following the presenter's summary, the PUEC will discuss the candidate's record in relation to the primary unit criteria. The meeting concludes with a confidential vote of all PUEC members in attendance.

Once a majority vote has been reached, the PUEC chair will prepare a letter to the dean detailing the composition of the committee, the vote tally, and the committee's rationale for the vote, and any minority views, as available. The letter will state whether the committee believes the candidate is on track/not on track or meets the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, as appropriate. All PUEC members who attended the meeting must sign the letter before it is submitted to the dean.

The PUEC chair will provide verbal or written feedback to the candidate (including the vote tallies) within 48 hours of the conclusion of the PUEC meeting. Vote tallies for all reviews will become part of the committee's records. External reviewer letters and specific committee deliberations will remain confidential. Once the PUEC has concluded its review, the candidate's dossier and the PUEC's recommendations will be forwarded to the DRC.

The DRC chair is responsible for organizing the DRC meeting(s). The DRC reviews the candidate's record in relation to the primary unit criteria. The DRC meeting concludes with a confidential vote of all DRC members in attendance. Once a majority decision has been reached, the DRC chair will prepare a letter to the dean that includes the composition of the committee, the vote tally, the committee's rationale for the vote, and any minority views, as available.

The DRC's letter will state whether the committee believes the candidate is on track/not on track or meets the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, as appropriate. All DRC members who attended the meeting must sign the letter before it is submitted to the dean. The DRC chair will provide verbal or written feedback to the candidate (including the vote tallies) within 48 hours of the conclusion of the DRC meeting.

If the DRC or the COB dean disagrees with the PUEC's recommendation, the dean shall communicate the nature of the disagreement in writing to the PUEC chair. The PUEC will then reconvene and return a reconsidered judgment, including any vote tallies, to the dean. If necessary, the dean will request that the DRC reconvene and provide its reconsidered judgment. The dean's recommendation, the results of all

votes of the PUEC and the DRC, and the candidate's dossier shall be forwarded together to the provost. The candidate is sent a copy of the PUEC letter, DRC letter, and Dean's letter once their dossier is submitted to the provost's office.

Where differences of opinion between the PUEC, the DRC, and/or the dean remain unresolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation.

As established in APS 1022 and UCCS Policy #200-001, at any stage in the review process, a candidate may submit material or information that they believe will be helpful in evaluating their case. Materials provided at a higher level of review shall also be shared with all other reviewing bodies, which may respond as they deem appropriate.

Appeals and Grievances

Within 10 business days of the candidate receiving written notification that they have been denied tenure by the chancellor, the candidate may request a third-level review by the president. The grounds for a presidential review are limited to those outlined in APS 1022, Section VIII.B, including: (i) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (ii) factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (iii) a material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy; or (iv) a combination of these grounds. Additional details on the presidential review process are provided in APS 1022, Section VIII.A.1-3.

If a candidate is denied reappointment, promotion, or tenure and believes that serious procedural or factual errors occurred, or that the denial resulted from a material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy, the candidate may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee (FSGC). A grievance may be filed only after all available administrative appeals have been exhausted. Grievances must be submitted to the FSGC chair within 40 business days of receiving written notification from the chancellor or final administrative authority over the matter at issue. Additional details on the grievance process are provided in APS 1022, Section VIII.B.1-4.

The Process for Post-Tenure Reviews

The DRC functions as the post-tenure review committee (PTRC) in the COB. Committee members review all submitted materials to evaluate faculty undergoing a post-tenure review. Faculty scheduled for post-tenure review will be notified by the college in the spring preceding the academic year in which the review will take place and will be provided with a deadline for the submission of their materials.

The following materials must be submitted in the digital dossier for post-tenure review: (i) a copy of the individual's current curriculum vitae; (ii) A two- to three-page self-evaluation and executive summary highlighting teaching, scholarly/creative work and leadership and service activity during the past five years, (iii) a copy of each of the past five years student evaluation summary sheets (front and back), as well as a graph or table showing your aggregate semester averages of FCQ Class Factor Scores over the past five years; (iv) a copy of the previous five-year professional plan developed for the candidate's last review; (v) a current five-year professional plan; (vi) annual performance ratings for previous five years;

(vii) scholarly reports for each of the last five years from the relevant Annual Faculty Activity Reporting system (Digital Measures, FRPA); and (viii) 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).

The PTRC should complete these reviews by the end of the fall semester. Following its review, the PTRC will prepare, complete, and upload its report to the dean, who will then review both the dossier and the PTRC report and prepare a summary report. The dossier, the PTRC's report, and the dean's report are then forwarded to the provost.

If a faculty member receives a post-tenure review summary rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations," in any of the evaluated areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, the faculty member must agree to a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). If the goals of the PIA are not met, an extensive review will be conducted, and a development plan will be written using the process detailed in APS 5008. Faculty must use the established college, campus and university appeal/grievance procedures when faculty believe an appeal/grievance is warranted.

The Process for Emerita/Emeritus Reviews

Emerita/Emeritus is an honorary title conferred upon retirement to faculty members who have demonstrated a record of significant contributions to the university. Faculty may be nominated for this designation by their department or may self-nominate. Once a nomination is submitted, the PUEC reviews the candidate's curriculum vitae and summary of accomplishments to evaluate their overall impact on the university. The PUEC then votes on whether to recommend emerita/emmeritus status.

Following the vote, the PUEC chair prepares a letter summarizing the committee's decision and submits it to the dean of the COB. For emerita/emmeritus reviews, the PUEC consists of all tenured faculty within the COB. After receiving the PUEC's recommendation, the dean forwards both the dean's own recommendation and that of the PUEC to the provost. The provost then informs the chancellor of the PUEC's and dean's evaluations, along with the provost's own recommendation. The emerita/emmeritus designation is added to the faculty member's title or rank as it stood at the time of retirement. Additional details on the process for emerita/emmeritus reviews are provided in APS 5060, Section D.

Section 3. Primary Unit Criteria

The primary unit criteria apply to initial, comprehensive, promotion and/or tenure reviews, promotion to full professor reviews, post-tenure reviews, and emerita/emmeritus professor reviews.

Initial Reappointment Review

The initial reappointment review occurs in the candidate's second year. This review ensures that faculty are making satisfactory progress toward tenure and identifies areas for improvement. The review is conducted in accordance with UCCS Policy #200-001 and evaluates the candidate's overall record in teaching, scholarly and creative work, and leadership and service.

For each of the three areas (teaching, scholarly and creative work, and leadership and service), PUEC members will vote using one of the following categories: “on track for tenure” (candidate is meeting expectations), “not yet on track but could meet standards with appropriate corrections” (candidate needs improvement but has potential), or “not on track for tenure” (candidate is unlikely to meet standards without significant changes). Formal quality ratings such as *meritorious* or *excellent* are not used in the initial reappointment review.

In addition to the tenure progress votes, PUEC members will vote on reappointment. This separate reappointment vote allows the committee to recommend reappointment even if improvements are needed in one area, provided overall progress toward tenure is satisfactory. Candidates are responsible for demonstrating such progress by presenting evidence aligned with the expectations for scholarly/creative work, teaching, and leadership and service described below.

Scholarly/creative work: Candidates must present a clear and well-designed research plan that shows how they will meet the COB’s criteria for tenure and/or promotion. This plan should summarize current publications since starting on the tenure-track at UCCS, works under review, in-progress projects, and conference presentations. While publications are not required at the initial review stage, candidates must articulate a coherent and feasible path for achieving the COB’s scholarly expectations by the time of their tenure and/or promotion review. Published works count when they are officially published, in print, ahead of print or online first (or other status that reflects the same) or when evidence can be provided that the publication has been unconditionally accepted by the journal.

Teaching: Candidates must demonstrate meaningful progress toward meeting the COB’s teaching standards in the areas of (i) the self-assessment of the continuous improvement of teaching, (ii) peer evaluations, and (iii) FCQ Class Factor Scores.

Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching (weighted at one-third)

The purpose of the self-assessment is for candidates to demonstrate how they have engaged in the continuous improvement of their teaching. Candidates should submit a reflective statement with an improvement plan that addresses the ongoing development of their teaching. This document should include (i) an initial reflective statement describing the candidate’s first year of teaching, (ii) a detailed description of specific improvements implemented to enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning, (iii) an explanation of how areas for improvement were identified, drawing on evidence such as FCQ data, student feedback, peer evaluations, reflective practice, (iv) an overview of the impact of these changes on teaching effectiveness and student success, (v) an explanation of how these improvements align with and are informed by the candidate’s teaching philosophy, demonstrating a clear connection between the teaching philosophy and classroom practice, and (vi) any supporting documentation (e.g. syllabus, class materials, etc.) to show how these improvements were implemented in the candidate’s classes.

Peer evaluations (weighted at one-third)

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes (detailed above). Representative

courses should reflect the candidate's course mix during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and an online course. If the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course.

For the initial reappointment review, candidates must complete at least one peer evaluation (internal or external) and explain why the course was selected for peer evaluation, summarize key feedback, describe instructional adjustments made in response, and present a plan for completing the remaining required evaluations before the tenure and/or promotion review.

Peer evaluations may focus on teaching techniques or content. Techniques can be assessed through class observations, recorded sessions, engagement through the learning management system (LMS), or analysis of instructional activities and assignments. Content reviews may include syllabi, exams, cases, and course organization within the LMS. Typically, peer evaluations are completed by tenure-track faculty who teach or have taught similar courses. If candidates use reviewers outside this group, they must provide a clear justification.

Student Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) - Class Factor Scores and Student Comments (weighted at one-third)

Candidates must submit all available FCQs and provide a detailed analysis of quantitative class factor scores and qualitative student comments. If possible, they should also highlight positive trajectories in their class factor scores (e.g., by class, overall, etc.) that trend toward an average of 4.8 or higher. Lastly, they must offer explanations and improvement strategies for any lower scores. Together, these three elements evaluating teaching should show that the candidate is reflective, responsive to feedback, and steadily building the foundation required to meet the COB's teaching standards for tenure and/or promotion. The method for calculating the class factor score is set out below:

- **Step 1. Calculate the class score: the average of Questions 1-4**
(These questions ask about organization, usefulness, alignment of assessments, and learning gains).
- **Step 2. Calculate the instructor score: the average of Questions 7-11**
(These questions ask about clarity, engagement, student support, respect, and communication).
- **Step 3. Calculate the class factor score = the average of the class score and the instructor score.**

Leadership and Service: Candidates should provide a concise description of the service activities they have undertaken since appointment, including their role, contributions, time commitment, and any early indicators of impact. By this stage, candidates are expected to have participated in at least one meaningful service activity, typically through a COB committee or a comparable role at the campus, system, disciplinary, or community level.

Candidates should also outline their aspirations for future leadership and service assignments across these areas to demonstrate how they will meet the COB's standards for tenure and/or promotion.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

Each tenure-track faculty member will undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least once during the tenure probationary period, separate from the tenure and/or promotion review. The comprehensive reappointment review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service and results in one of two outcomes: (i) the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or (ii) the faculty member is informed that they will receive a one-year terminal appointment and that the tenure-track appointment will not be continued. At the candidate's request and with the approval of the dean and the PUEC chair, the comprehensive review may be conducted earlier than originally scheduled. The review process is scheduled and conducted in accordance with Regent Law, Regent Policy, system policy (APS 1022), and campus policy (UCCS Policy #200-001).

Candidates may request external letters of recommendation, although this is not required. If external letters are requested, the process is similar to the one for a candidate undergoing a tenure and/or promotion review. The only deviation is that only three letters are required for the comprehensive reappointment review. The PUEC and DRC will use the external letters to inform their evaluation of the candidate, with respect to intellectual contributions, as these letters provide an independent assessment of the candidate's research from a disciplinary expert. Key comments from the external letters will be referenced in the PUEC and DRC letters.

The candidate's total record—including teaching, scholarly and creative work, and leadership and service—will be evaluated. Formal quality ratings such as *meritorious* or *excellent* are not required. Instead, the PUEC votes on whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward meeting the standards for tenure or promotion to associate professor in each of the three areas. For each area, PUEC members will vote using one of the following categories: “on track for tenure”, “not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards with appropriate corrections”, or “not on track for tenure”. With respect to scholarly and creative work, the current rate of production—including published work, submissions, and work in progress—should indicate satisfactory progress toward the tenure and/or promotion standards.

In addition to the tenure progress votes, PUEC members will vote on reappointment. This separate vote for reappointment allows the committee to recommend reappointment even if improvements are needed in one area, provided overall progress toward tenure is satisfactory. Candidates are responsible for demonstrating such progress by presenting evidence aligned with the expectations for scholarly/creative work, teaching, and leadership and service described below.

Scholarly/creative work: For the comprehensive reappointment review, the COB uses a publication scoring system to evaluate a candidate's publication record (see appendix A). The comprehensive review includes consideration of published articles and the candidate's pipeline of research papers under review since joining UCCS. Published works count when they are officially published, in print, ahead of print or online first (or other status that reflects the same) or when evidence can be provided that the publication has been unconditionally accepted by the journal.

To be deemed on track for tenure, candidates must demonstrate a minimum of 100 publication points from published papers, including at least 70 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. Additional details

on the COB's publication scoring system are provided in Appendix A. Candidates who have not yet reached the 100-point threshold for published papers may still be considered on track if they demonstrate a strong and credible research pipeline. For the research pipeline to be considered strong and credible, the combined total of points from published papers together with points for manuscripts currently under review in relevant outlets must be at least 160 points, including a minimum of 120 points from peer-reviewed journal articles.

The term *under review* refers to a manuscript that is actively being evaluated by a recognized (i.e., non-predatory) academic journal. This may include an initial submission, a second-round review, a revise-and-resubmit decision, or any other stage at which the manuscript remains under editorial review. Manuscripts that have recently been rejected (i.e., a few weeks before submission of the dossier) may also be counted toward the candidate's research pipeline. In such cases, candidates must clearly explain the reasons for rejection and outline plans for future submission, including the timeline, identification of the intended target journal and its tier ranking in accordance with the COB publication policy.

Candidates should clarify the status of all papers, including the specific stage of review, and provide appropriate supporting evidence regarding manuscript status (e.g., an email from the journal editor).

Teaching: Since their appointment, candidates should be able to track and show continued progress in the areas of the self-assessment of the continuous improvement of teaching, (ii) peer evaluations, and (iii) FCQ Class Factor Scores.

Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching (weighted at one-third)

The purpose of the self-assessment is for candidates to demonstrate their engagement in the continuous improvement of their teaching. Candidates should submit a reflective statement with an improvement plan that addresses the ongoing development of their teaching practice. This document should include (i) a detailed reflective statement of the candidate's teaching practice, (ii) a detailed description of specific improvements implemented to enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning, (iii) an explanation of how areas for improvement were identified, drawing on evidence such as FCQ data, student feedback, peer evaluations, reflective practice, (iv) an overview of the impact of these changes on teaching effectiveness and student success, (v) an explanation of how these improvements align with and are informed by the candidate's teaching philosophy, demonstrating a clear connection between philosophy and classroom practice, and (vi) any supporting documentation (e.g. syllabus, class materials, etc.) that illustrates how these improvements were implemented in the candidate's classes.

Peer evaluations (weighted at one-third)

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes (detailed above). Representative courses should reflect the candidate's course mix during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and an online course. If the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course.

For the comprehensive reappointment review, candidates must complete at least two peer evaluations (internal or external) and explain why the courses were selected for peer evaluation, summarize key feedback, describe instructional adjustments made in response, and present a plan for completing the remaining required evaluations before the tenure and/or promotion review.

Peer evaluations may focus on teaching techniques or content. Techniques can be assessed through class observations, recorded sessions, engagement through the learning management system (LMS), or analysis of instructional activities and assignments. Content reviews may include syllabi, exams, cases, and course organization within the LMS. Typically, peer evaluations are completed by tenure-track faculty who teach or have taught similar courses. If candidates use reviewers outside this group, they must provide a clear justification.

Student Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) - Class Factor Scores and Student Comments (weighted at one-third)

Candidates must submit all available FCQs and provide a detailed analysis of both quantitative results and qualitative student comments. They should also highlight positive trajectories in their class factor scores (e.g., by class, overall, etc.) that trend toward an average of 4.8 or higher. Lastly, they must offer explanations and improvement strategies for any lower scores. Taken together, these materials should demonstrate that the candidate is reflective, responsive to feedback, and actively building the foundation necessary to meet the College of Business's teaching standards for tenure and/or promotion. The method for calculating class factor scores is set out above (refer to the Teaching subsection in the Initial Reappointment Review section of this policy).

Leadership and Service: Candidates should provide a concise description of the service activities they have undertaken since appointment, including their role, contributions, time commitment, and any early indicators of impact or effectiveness. By this stage, candidates are expected to have participated in at least three meaningful service activities, typically through COB committees or through comparable service at the campus, system, disciplinary, professional, or community level. Candidates should also describe their plans for future leadership and service across these areas to demonstrate progress toward meeting the COB's standards for tenure and/or promotion.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

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

All candidates must have undergone a comprehensive review and will typically have been appointed to a tenure-track faculty position at UCCS for at least three years before applying for tenure consideration. The comprehensive reappointment review and consideration for tenure may not occur in the same academic year. The dean or the PUEC chair may require that the candidate wait until the seventh year to apply for tenure. Exceptions to the three-year expectation may be granted by the dean with approval from the provost and chancellor.

The COB evaluates the candidate's total record when making tenure decisions. These standards apply equally to tenure and/or promotion decisions, whether made together or separately. Candidates must demonstrate continued accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service since joining UCCS. It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate that they have met the standards for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. In addition to the criteria below, the COB requires four external letters for promotion and/or tenure. The PUEC and DRC use the external letters to inform their evaluation of the candidate, particularly regarding intellectual contributions, as these letters provide an independent assessment of the candidate's research from disciplinary experts.

Scholarly/Creative Work: For the promotion and/or tenure review of scholarly and creative work, the COB uses a two-part evaluation framework to determine whether a candidate's record is *excellent*, *meritorious*, or not *meritorious*.

The first component establishes a baseline for scholarly productivity. All candidates must have at least six peer-reviewed journal articles since starting as a tenure-track faculty member at UCCS, unless a prior agreement has been reached with the dean upon the candidate's hire. Published works count when they are officially published, in print, ahead of print or online first (or other status that reflects the same) or when evidence can be provided that the publication has been unconditionally accepted by the journal. While a candidate's broader publication record may exceed this number (e.g., books, book chapters, etc.), a minimum of six publications must appear in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates who meet this requirement advance to the second component of the evaluation; those who do not will receive a rating of *not meritorious* for scholarly/creative work.

The second component evaluates the quality and impact of the candidate's overall publication record using the COB publication scoring system (see Appendix A). To be rated *meritorious*, candidates must earn at least 160 publication points, with at least 120 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. Candidates who do not meet all the requirements of this second component—specifically, a total of 160 points, with a minimum of 120 points derived from peer-reviewed journal articles—do not meet the criteria for a meritorious rating.

To be rated *excellent*, candidates must earn at least 200 publication points, including at least 150 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. For an excellent rating, at least 100 of these points must come from Tier 1 or Tier 2 outlets, ensuring the record is not based predominantly on Tier 3 publications.

In addition, a recommendation for tenure based on excellence in scholarly or creative work must demonstrate impact beyond the institution (APS 1022, Section IV.B). Thus, candidates seeking an excellent rating for intellectual contributions must provide a persuasive narrative demonstrating how their work has made a broader impact beyond the institution. Appendix B provides illustrative (but not exhaustive) examples of potential indicators of impact and quality. Candidates who do not meet all requirements of this second component do not qualify for an excellent rating.

The COB's publication scoring system aligns with the COB's annual faculty evaluation policy. Points are assigned based on both the type and quality of the publication. Peer-reviewed journals are assessed for quality and assigned to Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 categories, with Tier 1 representing the highest-quality

outlets. Candidates should consult the most recent version of the COB Publication Policy for complete guidance on determining journal tier rankings.

Acceptable scholarly outlets include discipline-based, pedagogical, or practice-focused journals, as well as books and book chapters, provided they are peer-reviewed. For the purposes of evaluation, *peer review* refers to a blind, independent, rigorous, constructive, and transparent assessment by experts in the field prior to publication.

Candidates may also provide evidence of additional scholarly activity—such as external grants, translational research, peer-reviewed proceedings, or conference presentations. These activities can strengthen a case for excellence and support the candidate’s narrative, but do not substitute for the requirement of at least 200 publication points, with at least 150 of these points derived from peer-reviewed journal articles and at least 100 of these points derived from higher-quality journals (Tier 1 and Tier 2).

For tenure-track faculty joining UCCS with prior publications, the candidate and the dean, in liaison with the PUEC chair and DRC chair, will determine how those publications count toward tenure. This agreement will be documented in the offer letter, and candidates are responsible for addressing these details clearly in their dossier.

Teaching: To receive a rating of *meritorious*, the candidate must provide strong evidence of effective teaching. The COB acknowledges that teaching performance is multi-dimensional and evaluates it using the following three measures of teaching effectiveness to determine a meritorious rating:

Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching (weighted at one-third)

The purpose of the self-assessment is for candidates to demonstrate their engagement in the continuous improvement of their teaching. Candidates should submit a reflective statement with an improvement plan that addresses the ongoing development of their teaching practice. This document should include (i) a detailed reflective statement of the candidate’s teaching practice, (ii) a detailed description of specific improvements implemented to enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning, (iii) an explanation of how areas for improvement were identified, drawing on evidence such as FCQ data, student feedback, peer evaluations, reflective practice, (iv) an overview of the impact of these changes on teaching effectiveness and student success, (v) an explanation of how these improvements align with and are informed by the candidate’s teaching philosophy, demonstrating a clear connection between philosophy and classroom practice, and (vi) any supporting documentation (e.g. syllabus, class materials, etc.) that illustrates how these improvements were implemented in the candidate’s classes.

Peer evaluations (weighted at one-third)

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes (detailed above). Representative courses should reflect the candidate’s course mix during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and an online course. If

the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course.

For the promotion and/or tenure review, candidates must complete at least three peer evaluations (internal or external) between the start of their UCCS employment and their tenure and/or promotion review and explain why the courses were selected for peer evaluation, summarize key feedback, describe instructional adjustments made in response, and present a plan for completing the remaining required evaluations before the tenure and/or promotion review.

Peer evaluations may focus on teaching techniques or content. Techniques can be assessed through class observations, recorded sessions, engagement through the learning management system (LMS), or analysis of instructional activities and assignments. Content reviews may include syllabi, exams, cases, and course organization within the LMS. Typically, peer evaluations are completed by tenure-track faculty who teach or have taught similar courses. If candidates use reviewers outside this group, they must provide a clear justification.

Student Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) - Class Factor Scores and Student Comments (weighted at one-third)

Candidates must submit all FCQs completed since being hired at UCCS and maintain an average overall class factor score of 4.8 or higher in at least two of the three academic years preceding the academic year in which they apply for tenure. Candidates must also provide a teaching summary (distinguishing between undergraduate/graduate and online/campus courses) that evaluates and provides context for class factor scores (the method for calculating class factor scores is set out above in the Teaching subsection in the Initial Reappointment Review section of this policy) and offers a brief qualitative analysis of the student comments. Candidates are encouraged to highlight positive trajectories in their class factor scores (e.g., by class, overall, etc.) and to offer explanations and past and future improvement strategies for any lower scores. The COB recognizes that various factors may influence FCQs, and faculty are encouraged to provide information on new courses, changes in textbooks, software, or teaching platforms, class sizes, response rates, response variability, or other important circumstances that may contextualize FCQ results.

A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting (APS 1022, Section IV.B).

To receive a rating of *excellent in teaching*, candidates must meet the standards for a meritorious rating as well as demonstrate high performance in student instruction by achieving at least two of the following three criteria: (i) demonstrating their continuous improvement of teaching in their reflective statement and improvement plan through multiple measures of effectiveness (see Appendix C for a non-exhaustive list of examples). For example, if a candidate's teaching philosophy emphasizes practical application or critical thinking, they might describe how related activities, assessments, and materials have evolved and improved over time, supported by evidence in supplemental documents; (ii) obtaining two or more of the

required minimum peer evaluations from respondents external to the COB; and (iii) averaging class factor scores greater than or equal to 5.8 in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.

In addition, in line with the requirements of APS 1022, a recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching must include demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. Thus, candidates seeking an excellent rating for teaching must provide evidence in their teaching summary that explicitly demonstrates how their work has furthered the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond their immediate instructional setting. Such evidence may take many forms, some of which are outlined in Appendix D.

Importantly, it is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate all the above requirements (i.e., two of the three criteria for self-assessment of continuous improvement, peer evaluations, and FCQs, plus demonstrating impact beyond the immediate instructional setting) in their dossier to be rated excellent in teaching.

Leadership and Service: Although service typically represents only 10% of the candidate's workload, it is essential to the mission of the COB. Service is evaluated by both the time committed and the impact achieved. Contributions to the college, the campus, the university system, the community, and/or the candidate's discipline are all considered when evaluating leadership and service.

Candidates should clearly explain how their leadership and service support the COB's mission. They must describe their role, outline the nature of their contributions, approximate the time devoted to each activity, and explain its impact. If applicable, the candidate should also provide evidence of leadership roles, including the duration and scope of responsibilities. A non-exhaustive list of service activities is provided in Appendix E. If candidates plan to engage in new leadership or service activities not listed in Appendix E, they should seek written clarification from the associate dean to confirm whether the activity qualifies for RPT review purposes. This written confirmation should be included in the candidate's dossier. Any leadership or service for which the candidate receives compensation beyond their regular salary (e.g., stipend for journal editorship) must be disclosed.

Throughout the tenure process, candidates should demonstrate a consistent and progressive pattern of leadership and service. This progression may include adding new service roles every year or two or expanding existing commitments into leadership positions. Service growth should reflect steady growth rather than a step function, with minimal progression during years two through five, followed by a sudden increase in year six. From initial review through comprehensive review, and ultimately to tenure and/or promotion, candidates should demonstrate increasing service activity, expanding leadership responsibilities, and greater overall impact in leadership and service.

To be considered *meritorious* in leadership and service, candidates must demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of contributions to the COB, the university system, the community, and/or their discipline. Evidence should reflect annual engagement and growth throughout the period being reviewed. Typically, this includes participation on a COB committee within the first year or two, adding additional COB or campus committees by the comprehensive review, and expanding involvement to one or two

more committees by the tenure and/or promotion review. Equivalent leadership and service to the community or the candidate's discipline are considered to augment—not substitute for—service to the COB, campus, or university, which should constitute the majority of the candidate's service.

To be considered *excellent* in leadership and service, candidates must demonstrate a sustained and consistent record of contributions that exceed the meritorious standard. Candidates are responsible for presenting detailed evidence of their roles, the nature of their contributions, the time they commit to each activity, the impact of their work, and their leadership responsibilities to make the case for excellence in leadership and service.

Evidence of excellence may include (i) an extraordinarily high volume of service; (ii) expanded leadership responsibilities, such as chairing committees, leading major initiatives, or holding elected positions; and/or (iii) greater impact, demonstrated through outcomes that benefit the college, the campus, the university system, the community, or the candidate's discipline in meaningful ways. It may also include awards or recognition for leadership and/or service. Excellence reflects not only more service but also higher-level contributions that advance the mission of the COB and the university.

Promotion to Full Professor

“To be promoted to the rank of professor (also referred to as “full professor”), an individual should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and:

- 1. A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; and*
- 2. A record of significant contribution to graduate and/or undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and*
- 3. A record since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service. (Regent Policy, Article 5, Policy 5.D.3 (C) 2018)*

When deciding on promotion to professor, the candidate's record as a whole shall be considered. Candidates must meet the established standards for the record to be judged excellent. The candidate must show continued accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service since joining UCCS. For those on a differentiated workload, additional time may be required to meet these standards. In addition to the criteria below, the COB requires letters from four external reviewers. The PUEC and DRC use the external letters to inform their evaluation of the candidate, particularly regarding intellectual contributions, as these letters provide an independent assessment of the candidate's research from a disciplinary expert. The majority of the external reviewers submitting letters for the promotion to full professor review must be different from those external reviewers submitting letters for the promotion and/or tenure review.

Scholarly/Creative Work: The COB publication scoring system is used to evaluate the candidate's publication record. Since their tenure and/or promotion—defined to include all publications that were

included and counted as part of the successful tenure and/or promotion to associate professor dossier—candidates are expected to have published at least four peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or book chapters and to have earned a minimum of 160 publication points, of which at least 120 points must be derived from peer-reviewed journal articles. In addition, candidates should not rely exclusively on Tier 3 outlets; a minimum of 100 publication points must come from Tier 1 or Tier 2 publications. Published works count when they are officially published, in print, ahead of print or online first (or other status that reflects the same) or when evidence can be provided that the publication has been unconditionally accepted by the journal.

The COB’s publication scoring system (see Appendix A), aligns with the COB’s annual faculty evaluation policy. Points are assigned based on both the type and quality of the publication. Peer-reviewed journals are assessed for quality and assigned to Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 categories, with Tier 1 representing the highest-quality outlets. Candidates should consult the most recent version of the COB Publication Policy for complete guidance on determining journal tier rankings.

Acceptable scholarly outlets include discipline-based, pedagogical, or practice-focused journals, as well as books and book chapters, provided they are peer-reviewed. For the purposes of evaluation, *peer review* refers to a blind, independent, rigorous, constructive, and transparent assessment by experts in the field prior to publication.

Candidates may also provide evidence of additional scholarly activity—such as external grants, translational research, peer-reviewed proceedings, or conference presentations. These activities can strengthen the candidate’s research achievements, but they do not substitute for the requirement for at least 160 publication points, with at least 130 points being derived from peer-reviewed journal articles.

Ultimately, candidates are responsible for presenting a compelling, well-documented case for excellence in research in their dossier and must explicitly demonstrate how their work has made an impact beyond the institution. Appendix B offers examples of impact and quality indicators, though it is not intended to be exhaustive.

Teaching: Evaluation of teaching for promotion to full professor is based on three measures: (i) student FCQs, (ii) self-assessment for continuous improvement in teaching, and (iii) peer evaluations. Each measure is weighted equally at one-third of the overall teaching evaluation. However, there are two important differences to consider when comparing the teaching standards for promotion to full professor with those used for the promotion and/or tenure review. First, there is no separate requirement for “demonstrating achievement ... beyond one’s immediate instructional setting” (as stated in Regent Law, Article 5, Policy 5.D.2.(B), 2018) for a rating of excellent in teaching for promotion to professor. Second, although criteria are listed for excellence in each of the following three measures of teaching, a candidate may have their teaching “record as a whole” deemed excellent without achieving an excellent rating in all three measures.

Self-Assessment of the Continuous Improvement of Teaching (weighted at one-third)

The purpose of the self-assessment is for candidates to demonstrate their engagement in the continuous improvement of their teaching.

Candidates should submit a reflective statement with an improvement plan that addresses the ongoing development of their teaching practice. This document should include (i) a detailed reflective statement of the candidate's teaching practice, (ii) a detailed description of specific improvements implemented to enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning, (iii) an explanation of how areas for improvement were identified, drawing on evidence such as FCQ data, student feedback, peer evaluations, reflective practice, (iv) an overview of the impact of these changes on teaching effectiveness and student success, (v) an explanation of how these improvements align with and are informed by the candidate's teaching philosophy, demonstrating a clear connection between philosophy and classroom practice, and (vi) any supporting documentation (e.g. syllabus, class materials, etc.) that illustrates how these improvements were implemented in the candidate's classes.

Peer evaluations (weighted at one-third)

Faculty are required to have a representative number of courses peer-reviewed throughout their career. Peer evaluations are to be used for continuous improvement purposes (detailed above). Representative courses should reflect the candidate's course mix during the review period. For example, if the candidate teaches both campus and online courses, the candidate should include a campus and an online course. If the candidate teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses, the candidate should include an undergraduate and a graduate course.

For the promotion to full professor review, candidates must complete two internal and two external peer evaluations since tenure, with one internal and one external peer evaluation completed within the last two academic years of the full professor review. Candidates must explain why the courses were selected for peer evaluation, summarize key feedback, describe instructional adjustments made in response, and present a plan for completing the remaining required evaluations before the tenure and/or promotion review.

Peer evaluations may focus on teaching techniques or content. Techniques can be assessed through class observations, recorded sessions, engagement through the learning management system (LMS), or analysis of instructional activities and assignments. Content reviews may include syllabi, exams, cases, and course organization within the LMS. Typically, peer evaluations are completed by tenure-track faculty who teach or have taught similar courses. If candidates use reviewers outside this group, they must provide a clear justification.

Student Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) - Class Factor Scores and Student Comments (weighted at one-third)

Candidates must submit all FCQs completed since being awarded tenure and maintain an average overall class factor score of 4.8 or higher in at least two of the three academic years preceding the academic year in which they apply for promotion to full professor. The method for calculating class factor scores is set out above in the Teaching subsection in the Initial Reappointment Review section of this policy.

Candidates must also provide a teaching summary (distinguishing between undergraduate/graduate and online/campus courses) that evaluates and provides context for class factor scores and offers a brief

qualitative analysis of the student comments. Candidates are encouraged to highlight positive trajectories in their class factor scores (e.g., by class, overall, etc.) and to offer explanations and past and future improvement strategies for any lower scores. The COB recognizes that various factors may influence FCQs, and faculty are encouraged to provide information on new courses, changes in textbooks, software, or teaching platforms, class sizes, response rates, response variability, or other important circumstances that may contextualize FCQ results.

A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting (APS 1022, Section IV.B).

Consistent with tenure standards, to receive a rating of *excellent in teaching*, candidates for promotion to full must meet the standards for a meritorious rating as well as demonstrate high performance in student instruction by achieving at least two of the following three criteria: (i) demonstrating their continuous improvement of teaching in their reflective statement and improvement plan through multiple measures of effectiveness (see Appendix C for a non-exhaustive list of examples). For example, if a candidate's teaching philosophy emphasizes practical application or critical thinking, they might describe how related activities, assessments, and materials have evolved and improved over time, supported by evidence in supplemental documents; (ii) obtaining two or more of the required minimum peer evaluations from respondents external to the COB; and (iii) averaging class factor scores greater than or equal to 5.8 in two of the three years prior to the candidacy year.

In addition, in line with the requirements of APS 1022, a recommendation for promotion to full based on excellence in teaching must include demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. Thus, candidates seeking an excellent rating for teaching must provide evidence in their teaching summary that explicitly demonstrates how their work has furthered the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond their immediate instructional setting. Such evidence may take many forms, some of which are outlined in Appendix D.

Leadership and Service: Candidates must demonstrate a record of significant, meaningful, and consistent leadership and service to the college, the campus, the university system, the community, and/or the candidate's discipline. Equivalent leadership or service to the community or to the candidate's discipline may substitute for a portion of college, campus, or university-system service; however, it should not replace such service entirely. Candidates should clearly explain how their service supports the COB's mission. They should clearly describe their role, outline the nature of their contributions, estimate the time committed to the leadership or service activity, and explain the impact of their work.

To demonstrate excellence, candidates must describe how their roles have expanded in leadership and service since achieving the rank of associate professor. This may include assuming greater leadership responsibilities, such as chairing committees, leading major initiatives, or holding elected positions; achieving greater impact through outcomes that benefit the college, the campus, the university system, the community, or the candidate's discipline in meaningful ways; and providing evidence of leadership

growth, illustrating progression from participation in service activities to undertaking more influential leadership roles over time.

Post Tenure Review

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

The post-tenure review process follows system and campus standards. Faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, with differentiated workloads considered, as appropriate.

Faculty receive one of the following ratings: outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations. A key component of the post-tenure review is the five-year professional plan. The initial review of the candidate’s five-year professional plan starts with the candidate’s review for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Subsequently, a new professional plan is developed for each post-tenure review cycle. Reviews for promotion to full professor also require the development of a new five-year professional plan.

To receive a rating of meeting expectations, faculty must demonstrate fulfillment of their professional plan commitments and meet COB qualifications per the AACSB Faculty Qualification and Sufficiency Policy at the time of review. A rating of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” is awarded for surpassing these standards.

If a faculty member receives a post-tenure review summary rating of “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations,” in any of the evaluated areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, the faculty member must agree to a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). If the goals of the PIA are not met, an extensive review will be conducted, and a development plan will be written using the process detailed in APS 5008. Faculty must use the established college, campus and university appeal/grievance procedures when faculty believe an appeal/grievance is warranted.

Emerita/Emeritus review

Emerita/emeritus is an honorary designation awarded upon retirement to faculty with a record of strong contributions to the university. Faculty are nominated for emerita/emeritus status by their department or can be self-nominated, and are approved by the dean, provost, and chancellor. The emerita/emeritus designation is added to the faculty member’s title/rank at the time of retirement. The COB PUEC votes on emerita/emeritus nominations by assessing the nominee’s CV and summary to evaluate their overall contribution to the university. For emerita/emeritus reviews, the PUEC comprises all tenured faculty in the COB.

APPENDIX A

College of Business Publication Scoring System

Type	Points
Tier 1 PRJ	50
Tier 2 PRJ	30
Tier 3 PRJ	20
Authored book (first edition)¹	50
Edited book (first edition)¹	50
Authored book (subsequent editions)¹	25
Edited book (subsequent editions)¹	25
Book chapter¹	15
Non-PRJ Case Study	15

Additional requirements:

A1	Comprehensive Review To be considered on track for tenure, candidates must demonstrate a minimum of 100 publication points from published papers, including at least 70 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. Candidates who have not yet reached the 100-point threshold for published papers may still be considered on track if they demonstrate a strong and credible research pipeline. For the research pipeline to be considered strong and credible, the combined total of points from published papers together with points for manuscripts currently under review in relevant outlets must be at least 160 points, including a minimum of 120 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. The term <i>under review</i> refers to a manuscript that is actively being evaluated by a recognized (i.e., non-predatory) academic journal. This may include an initial submission, a second-round review, a revise-and-resubmit decision, or any other stage at which the manuscript remains under editorial review. Manuscripts that have recently been rejected may also be counted toward the candidate's research pipeline. In such cases, candidates must clearly explain the reasons for rejection and outline their plans for future submission, including identification of the intended target journal and its tier ranking in accordance with the COB publication policy. The candidate should clarify the status of all papers, including the specific stage of review, together with appropriate supporting evidence concerning the status of the paper (e.g., email from the journal editor).
A2	Promotion and/or tenure review For the promotion and/or tenure review of scholarly and creative work, the COB uses a two-part evaluation framework to determine whether a candidate's record is <i>excellent</i>, <i>meritorious</i>, or not <i>meritorious</i>. The first component establishes a baseline for scholarly productivity. All candidates must have at least six peer-reviewed journal articles. While a candidate's broader publication record may exceed this number, a minimum of six publications must appear in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates who meet this requirement advance to the second component of the evaluation; those who do not will receive a rating of <i>not meritorious</i> for scholarly/creative work. The second component evaluates the quality and impact of the candidate's overall publication record using the COB publication scoring system (see Appendix A). To be rated <i>meritorious</i>, candidates must earn at least 160 publication points, with at least 120 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. To be rated <i>excellent</i>, candidates must earn at least 200 publication points, including at least 150 points from peer-reviewed journal articles. For an excellent rating, at least 100 of these points must come from Tier 1 or Tier 2 outlets, ensuring the record is not based predominantly on Tier 3 publications. In addition, candidates seeking an excellent rating must provide a persuasive narrative demonstrating how their work has made a broader impact beyond the institution. Appendix B provides illustrative (but not exhaustive) examples of potential indicators of impact and quality.
A3	Review for promotion to full professor Since their promotion to tenure, candidates must publish at least four peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or book chapters and earn a minimum of 160 publication points, with at least 120 points derived from peer-reviewed journal articles. Additionally, for promotion to full professor, candidates should not rely exclusively on Tier 3 outlets; at least 100 publication points should be derived from Tier 1 or Tier 2 papers.

¹ In instances where a candidate first edits a book and contributes book chapters or cases to the book (or volume), they will be granted credit for the first-edition edited book or for the book chapters, not both. The faculty member may choose the publication type they prefer for credit. The PUEC has the discretion to review and to reject points from book chapters in instances where a candidate claims more than 50 points in a first-edition edited book. Chapters cannot be counted for points in authored books or in subsequent editions of edited books.

APPENDIX B

Quality and Impact Indicators of Scholarly Work

This guidance highlights the types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate impact beyond the COB. This guidance presents an illustrative rather than exhaustive list of examples of demonstrating journal quality and impact. Candidates should consult the associate dean and/or the PUEC chair to discuss other examples of quality and impact.

EVIDENCE OF IMPACT FOR SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORKS

Journal Quality and Article Impact

Candidates should consult the most recent version of the COB Publication Policy for complete guidance on determining journal tier rankings. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence that their publications qualify as a Tier 1, 2, or 3 peer-reviewed journal article. Various resources are available to help substantiate an article's impact. Sites such as Google Scholar provide citation-based evidence about the impact of individual journal articles. Journal websites may also provide data on reads, downloads, views, and citation metrics, which may be helpful for explaining an article's impact. Journal websites may also list the "most read" or "most cited" articles, which can be useful for providing evidence of impact.

Authorship

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

Other Evidence of Impact

Peer-reviewed journal articles are the primary criterion used in the COB to evaluate candidates. However, candidates are likely to have other types of scholarly/creative works that provide evidence of impact beyond the COB. A list of these is provided below. This is by no means an exhaustive list but is meant to give examples of other types of scholarly/creative work.

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

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

- Editor/Associate Editor/Guest Editor
- Book/Book Review Editor
- Officer –Association
- Chair –Conference/Track

- Reviewer – Journal/Book/Grant
- Committee Member –Conference
- Reviewer/Discussant/Moderator –Conference
- Visiting Scholar – Research Appointment
- Administration - External Grant
- Media “Hit”

Book and Book Chapter Impact and Quality

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

Faculty who have questions or concerns regarding the impact and quality of a particular publisher or proposal should seek advice from the associate dean and/or the PUEC chair.

APPENDIX C
Examples of Evidence of Teaching Improvements
Adapted from CU System EPUS Committee suggestions

The following is a wide-ranging but non-exhaustive list of evidence to demonstrate continuous improvement in teaching.

- Student evaluations
 - Student mid-term evaluations (including steps taken in response to feedback)
 - Student focus groups, interviews, or surveys
- Instructional materials
- Course syllabi and examinations
- Curriculum development efforts
- Course improvement efforts
 - Evidence of continuous improvement in teaching and learning
 - Department and curricular work, including participation in curriculum revision, departmental efforts to focus on teaching
- Effectiveness of students in succeeding courses
- Student performance on standard professional examinations
- Professional development and innovations relating to teaching.
 - Participation in training in teaching effectiveness and new education-related technology
 - Evidence of effective utilization of contemporary teaching modalities, e.g. enhanced student learning
 - Engagement in peer assessment processes
- COB Teaching awards/recognitions
- Oversight of independent studies within the COB (e.g., honors theses, prelims, dissertations)
- Advising and mentoring, e.g., COB graduate students (as primary advisor or committee member)
- Video recordings of teaching
- Contributions to the COB's assessment/assurance of student learning efforts
- Documentation of efforts to create inclusive and equitable educational experiences for students
- Mentoring COB faculty members in their education enterprises

APPENDIX D

Examples of ways in which faculty can demonstrate excellence in teaching beyond their immediate instructional setting

The following is a wide-ranging but non-exhaustive list of examples of ways that faculty can demonstrate excellence in teaching beyond their immediate instructional setting. For the purpose of the COB RPT criteria, beyond the immediate instructional setting is taken to mean any pedagogically focused activity that takes place outside the candidate's classroom and the courses that they teach. It is the candidate's responsibility to document and provide evidence of their contribution.

- Presenting at teaching workshops and/or conferences at UCCS, the System level, or other universities
- Membership on education-related committees for academic organizations, professional associations, sections, or conferences
- Service on curriculum-related committees outside the COB (e.g., EPUS, campus dissertation committees, campus research grant committees, etc.)
- Publishing in pedagogical journals
- Authoring or co-authoring textbooks adopted by other higher education institutions
- Mentoring students beyond the immediate instructional setting (e.g., supervision of doctoral or medical students, and presenting teaching seminars to non-COB graduate students)
- Professional awards related to the education process or other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Receipt of grants external to the COB for teaching and education improvements
- Writing cases or teaching materials that are used outside COB
- Contributions to online teaching resources and clear evidence of their impact (e.g., on-site web analytics, likes, downloads, shares, re-posts, views, etc.). These may include a variety of forms, such as webinars, instructional videos and tutorials, games and gamification, and blog posts (including guest posts in popular business press outlets, e.g., Fortune, Bloomberg, etc., on topics related to business instruction/expertise).

APPENDIX E
Leadership and Service Categories with Examples
An adapted version of the COB Service Activities Guidelines

This list is intended to illustrate useful examples; it is not a definitive catalog of leadership and service activity across the college, the campus/university system, the community, and/or the candidate's discipline.

Examples of Leadership and Service to the College

Category	Example Activities
College Leadership	Team lead, search committee chair, Dean's Review Committee (P&T), PUEC Chair, COB Faculty Assembly Chair, or leading strategic initiatives at the college level.
College Committee Member	Serving as search committee member, member of academic program review, curriculum committees or working groups, (outside of discipline team meetings), or Scholarship Committee.
Educational Innovation and Faculty Development	Developing innovative or cross-disciplinary curriculum, designing faculty development workshops, and organizing teaching-related symposia or speaker series.
Event Participation	Volunteering at Career Networking Nights/Mountain Lion Visit Day/Graduation Brunch, President's Scholar Events (attendance at these events can also be mentioned but attendance is not considered equal to volunteering or any committee-level commitment that forms part of the leadership and service RPT criteria).
Faculty Citizenship	Conducting peer evaluations, mentoring new faculty, attending COB retreats, dialogues or interview presentations/lunches.
Short-Term or Ad Hoc Projects	Organizing discipline-specific or educational events that engage students and the campus community, helping with accreditation preparation, developing surveys or reports, participating in college policy revision committees.
Student Engagement (non-teaching)	Serving as faculty advisor for student organizations, mock interviews for students, student competitions (e.g. Daniels Fund Ethics Case Competition/Cyber/Spark the Springs) and undergraduate research.
Supporting the organization of Campus-wide Events	Organizing or volunteering to support the organization of events such as the campus open house, community showcases, or scholarship days.

Examples of Leadership and Service to the Campus/University System

Category	Example Activities
Educational Innovation and Faculty Development	Developing innovative or cross-disciplinary curriculum, designing faculty development workshops, and organizing teaching-related symposia or speaker series.
Search Committees (University-level Admin Roles)	Serving on dean, vice chancellor or campus leadership search committees.
University Committee Service	Serving on major campus or system-wide service committees such as Council for Undergraduate Education, Graduate Executive Committee, Faculty Assembly, UBAC, EPUS, IRB, CoR, and similar.
University-Level Task Forces or Working Groups	Participating in initiatives related to care and belonging, enrollment, AI integration, micro-credentialing or student success.

Examples of Leadership and Service to the Community

Category	Example Activities
Board leadership	Uncompensated board position on external non-profit or other community-oriented organization.
Consulting for community organizations	Providing pro-bono consulting or strategic planning for community organizations.
Educational clinics, public lectures, or workshops	Hosting free or low-cost educational sessions for the public.
Supporting Fundraising Efforts	Helping organize or coordinate fundraising for local charities or causes.
Volunteering for Local Events	Supporting the planning, organization, management and/or evaluation of local community events.

Examples of Leadership and Service to the Discipline*

Category	Example Activities
Conference organization	Planning and hosting conferences that advance research and networking in the discipline.
Conference session leadership	Planning and leading on specific panels or sessions that advance research in specific thematic areas of interest to the discipline.
Journal Associate Editor	Supporting the JE in overseeing policy, leading peer review processes, and ensuring the journal's overall quality and integrity.
Journal Editor	Leading the publication by overseeing policy, leading peer review processes, and ensuring the journal's overall quality and integrity.
Journal Guest Editor	Managing a special issue including setting the theme, soliciting articles, overseeing peer review, and ensuring high-quality publication.
Journal Editorial Team	Supporting the quality and direction of a specific and relevant journal by overseeing peer review, shaping editorial policy, and promoting scholarly contributions.
Leadership roles in professional associations	Acting as a committee chair, officer, task force member, etc. in associations related to their field.
Peer Review	Undertaking the review of manuscripts for academic journals.

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

Version History

Version 8

- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Faculty, 5/6/2026.
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Thomas Aicher, Dean, College of Business, 5/7/2026.
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Kevin Laudner, Acting Provost, 5/20/2026.
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Kevin Laudner, Acting Provost, 6/3/2026.

Version 7: Revisions to update teaching and service evaluations

- ✓ Approved by the College of Business Faculty, 5/16/2022.
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Karen Markel, Dean, College of Business, 6/14/2022.
- ✓ Submitted to Dr. Kelli Klebe, Interim Provost, 6/14/2022.
- ✓ Approved by Dr. Nancy Marhand-Martell, Provost, 7/7/2022.

Version 6: Revision to Incorporate Changes in Regent Law

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

Version 5

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

Version 4: Amendment 1

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

Version 4: Clarification of Intellectual Contribution Standard

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

Version 3: UCCS Required Clarifications

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

Version 2: Editorial Changes

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

Version 1: Initial Version

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