Department of Health Sciences

CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs
JULY 1, 2020

PREAMBLE

The tenured faculty in the Department of Health Sciences assess the influence of the teaching, scholarly/creative work and leadership and service of its tenure-track and tenured faculty on the health science professions represented in the department and its constituents. The mission of the Department of Health Sciences is to provide instruction to its majors and the University as a whole, create new knowledge through research and scholarly activity and provide service to the local, state, national and international communities in the specialized areas under the Health Sciences. The department is committed to quality teaching, scholarly/creative work, and effective leadership and service to the department, college, university campus, university system, profession and community. The department embraces the teacher-scholar-leader model with an emphasis on demonstrating integration of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. While professional practice is not evaluated as a separate category, it may be incorporated throughout and contribute to teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Faculty members will demonstrate exemplary ethical standards in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. The department values collaboration with all faculty appointments (both within and outside of the department), collegiality, the development of a faculty member as a 'whole' person, and the culture of wellness including work/life balance.

The criteria presented in this document are to be considered guidelines for the review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review in the Department of Health Sciences (HSCI). Candidates need to include the criteria under which they are being evaluated in their dossier.

The University of Colorado policies and criteria for personnel actions are defined in the University of Colorado Board of Regents' Laws and Policies, and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy. The following Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure criteria were developed by the tenure-track and tenured HSCI faculty and adopted by the tenure-track and tenured HSCI faculty in accordance with the criteria and standards provided in the aforementioned documents and are designed to provide guidance concerning the interpretation of those activities expected of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member.

Quality Indicators The indicators of faculty achievements in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service contained in this document are considered criteria for the review of candidates. These indicators will be used as a framework to make a professional judgment about the candidate's record consistent with respect to the specific discipline of the candidate's expertise and current practice. The items listed here as indicators of quality teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service are suggestions that are neither all-inclusive nor individually required. Examples under each criterion are not rank-ordered. Judgments regarding any item and the record as a whole will not be reduced to just quantitative counting, but will also consider the quality of the works presented in accordance with the standards of the health science disciplines/professions.

These indicators serve as a framework to the faculty for self-assessment and peer review as well as indicators for appropriate rank at the time of appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and during post-tenure reviews. Faculty will demonstrate growth in teaching, scholarly/creative

work, and leadership and service with an increasing number of indicators over the time in rank. The indicators apply to all tenure-track and tenured faculty with the expectation that the performance of an individual faculty member takes into account any approved differentiated workload distribution of responsibilities assigned to that faculty member during the time being evaluated as defined by the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) and/or a differential workload document. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances within the policies and procedures of the campus and university.

Workload Distribution/Differentiated Workload The criteria provided for the reappointment review, comprehensive review, tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor in the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service categories generally reflect a 50% teaching, 30% scholarly/ creative works and 20% leadership and service workload distribution. If the faculty member utilizes an approved differentiated workload or elects to use the workload specified in their letter of appointment related to teaching, scholarly/creative work, and/or leadership and service, then the expectations related to quality and growth in the affected categories will remain the same but the evidence required will be evaluated accordingly.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW (Second year)
At this level of review, candidates will provide evidence of the initiation of efforts to establish effective programs of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and demonstrate willingness to serve in department and professional capacities (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*). Review committees will vote on a recommendation for reappointment and, will vote under each of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW (Fourth year):
At this level, the candidate will have demonstrated that adequate progress is being made toward tenure. The faculty member is becoming established as a teacher and scholar, and a contributor to the Department, and to some extent, to the campus or wider community in the area of leadership and service. Review committees will vote on a recommendation for reappointment and, will vote under each of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
At UCCS, the review for promotion to Associate Professor generally occurs at the same time as the tenure review. At this level, tenure may only be awarded to faculty members who are judged "meritorious" in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, and "excellent" in either teaching or scholarly/creative work. Candidates and evaluators are referred to UCCS RPT Policy, regarding tenure and early tenure (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*). External review letters will be required as described in the addendum to these criteria.

Tenure-track faculty members must have been appointed on the tenure-track at UCCS for at least three years and have undergone a comprehensive review before they may apply for tenure

consideration. Exceptions to this three-year requirement may be made for individuals who already have been granted tenure at another institution and for whom specific alternative provisions are detailed in the Letter of Appointment. Initial appointment as an Associate Professor or Professor without tenure will substitute for the comprehensive review. The candidate's dossier must include the relevant documentation in the initial letter of appointment in the latter cases.

If a candidate chooses to apply for early tenure, he/she will be held to the same standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure clock. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member applying for tenure at UCCS in the seventh year, as outlined above. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
Promotion to Full Professor is self-initiated. Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contributions 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/or promotion to Associate Professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Consideration and weighting of rating in all categories will be given in terms of productivity for any official responsibilities such as differentiated workloads, administrative positions, and faculty governance offices held since the time of award of tenure (if applicable). External review letters will be required as described in the addendum to these criteria.

TEACHING

The Department recognizes that individual teachers have a personal philosophy of teaching and learning and it is expected that these philosophies will be congruent with the values of the Department and of the profession. Values of the Department include creating a safe, stimulating and supportive environment for students; utilization of current, relevant and evidence-based information in the classroom and in practice; and innovative course development and delivery. Department faculty recognize and value the scholarship of teaching and its influence on and integration with the practice of teaching, the ability of professional practice to inform course content, and encourage and expect the critical analysis of teaching to improve delivery of courses and/or maintain high-quality teaching, and the integration with clinical practice. These values should be embodied by the candidate, and the candidate should demonstrate how they do so by addressing the following within their narrative of their teaching statement:

- Articulation of a teaching philosophy,
- Engagement of students in the teaching-learning process reflected in both philosophy and practice,
- Description of linkages between their teaching and scholarly/ creative works and/or leadership and service,
- Engagement with mentorship of students beyond the classroom,
- Engagement with interprofessional education to prepare students for intercollaborative practice,
- Reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice, and
- Promote critical thinking.

The candidate will articulate these specific items in the teaching statement that fulfill the criteria presented along with a body of evidence (Appendix A: Teaching Quality Indicators) to demonstrate and support the quality of and effectiveness in teaching. The teaching statement and representative evidence presented will demonstrate professional development in teaching during the time under review. Work on curriculum reform, development, or accreditation in an administrative role (e.g., department chair, associate dean) may count in the category of Teaching Quality Indicators.

<u>Required items to submit for each review:</u>
Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution and professional development of the individual. Candidates should, at minimum, submit the following but may submit additional materials in support of their case.
- Minimum of three (3) methods of teaching evaluation for each academic year under review.
  - One (1) of the methods of teaching evaluation for each academic year will be the summative interpretation of all quantitative and qualitative information of Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) or a similar, campus-approved system and form for each course taught during the time under review. The FCQs will constitute no more than 30% consideration of the teaching evaluations.
- Minimum of one (1) peer review (review of one class) conducted during the time under review.

- A majority of peer reviews of teaching will be conducted by tenure-track or tenured faculty who are at or above the rank of the candidate.
  - The peer review will count as one (1) of the three (3) methods of teaching evaluation for the academic year during which it was conducted.
- Most recent syllabus for each course taught during the time under review
  - demonstrate coherent organization,
  - have learning objectives that meet curricular needs and requirements, and
  - meet accreditation and/or professional curriculum requirements, as applicable.

Initial Reappointment Review

Candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching as indicated above through their teaching statement, and, presentation of evidence of which may include:

- professional interaction with students,
- responsiveness to reasonable student perspectives,
- utilization of multiple means of teaching and learning evaluation strategies, and
- initial development of course structure and instructional strategies.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

In addition to the expectations for the initial reappointment review, candidates will demonstrate their efforts to develop as a teaching professional through continuous development in teaching such as innovation in instructional methods and assessment strategies. Candidates will describe their strategies for development in teaching including:

- how their courses relate to the context of the curriculum,
- how they adapt course content based on student learning needs, and
- how they engage students in the application of course content.

Implementation of alternative assessment strategies, changes in teaching practice, innovations in teaching methods, utilization of mentorship for teaching improvement, and course or curriculum development or revision will be taken into consideration. Candidates will demonstrate involvement in curriculum development and evaluation through participation in course review and evaluation, and, when applicable, accreditation or recognition processes.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

To be *on track for tenure* candidates must demonstrate that they have attained and/or sustained effectiveness in teaching at the time of review as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the

judgment of performance. In cases in which this standard is not met, the candidate must provide an explanation for the failure and an appropriate remedial plan.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
The same criteria for comprehensive reappointment review apply for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. In addition to that criteria, the candidate will demonstrate a record as a teaching professional with proficiency in the classroom and/or clinical teaching as supported by multiple means of teaching evaluation. Candidates will demonstrate involvement in curriculum development and evaluation through participation in course review and evaluation, and, when applicable, accreditation or recognition processes.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate commitment to, continuing development of, and effectiveness in teaching as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation, the tenure and/or promotion criteria listed above and at least three (3) indicators from those listed in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate, along with the qualities for meritorious, additional evidence of effectiveness, competence, and leadership in teaching as documented by evidence for additional indicators as delineated in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). The candidate must also demonstrate achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond their immediate instructional setting (defined as the candidate's professional content area, such as health promotion or athletic training).

Promotion to Full Professor
The candidate will demonstrate expert teaching skills through an on-going record of professional development in teaching. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, promote critical thinking, and align with the Department mission, and meet accreditations standards, as applicable. The candidate will demonstrate continuing growth and expert teaching skills and impact on student learning as measured by multiple methods of teaching evaluation. The candidate must provide multiple teaching quality indicators to support effective and expert teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the Teaching Quality Indicators (Appendix A). Candidates may design and test innovative teaching strategies to enhance student learning. They will be actively engaged in mentorship of students including modeling integration of theory, research, and practice, and appropriate interprofessional engagement both within and outside of the department as applicable. Candidates will demonstrate participation and leadership in curriculum development and evaluation through peer mentorship, and accreditation or

recognition processes, as applicable. They will be recognized by peers and others as a master teacher and may have received honors for teaching. Candidates may provide leadership on university, state, or national committees (i.e.: curriculum development, professional standards, certification). Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance.

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for teaching alone.

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK

The department recognizes that scholarly and creative works can take many forms. We value work that generates new knowledge, integrates existing knowledge, the development of evidence to support and advance evidence-based practice, thus advancing our professions and applied research. We recognize the scholarship of teaching and learning in our disciplines as a form of research and scholarship. We also recognize the scholarship of professional practice and the scholarly study of evidence-based practice in our disciplines as forms of research.

Items listed under Quality Indicator 1: Peer Reviewed Activities (Appendix B) are most important. Other scholarly and non-peer-reviewed works (Quality Indicator 2; Appendix B) will be considered on their scholarly merit and impact on the profession. In the assessment of scholarly/creative works, *the department places greater emphasis on items that have undergone peer review than those that have not*. Non-peer reviewed work will also be considered as part of the candidate's record but will be weighted less than peer reviewed work in consideration of the body of work. Such material may be submitted to outside peer review (generally non-blind) for evaluation and such review may then enhance the weight given to that material compared to non-peer reviewed work (e.g., white papers, technical reports, etc.).

Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate research merit. *Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity in a variety of scholarly pursuits over a period of years.* Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, the relevance of the topic of those items to the profession (e.g., how does the information enhance the profession; how does it move the profession forward) and the rationale behind where papers were disseminated. *Faculty are encouraged to seek venues to communicate their research results that will reach a national or international audience.* This may be accomplished by publishing some research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting at conferences that attract participants from the broader community. Quality of scholarly work will be stated by the candidate and supported by means pertinent to the field of study.

HSCI encourages collaborative research and recognizes that senior or sole authorship will be less frequent in collaborative studies than for more autonomous research. Work with other collaborators (within the department, college, UCCS, CU system, or at other institutions) will be considered equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants or contracts if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution by the candidate to the paper, grant or contract; otherwise, the collaborative work will still be counted as part of the candidate's overall record but will be weighted less. Faculty are encouraged to take a leadership role in some of the multi-authored publications.

The department also encourages collaboration with and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research. Co-authored papers, grants or contracts will be considered as equivalent to sole-authored papers, grants or contracts if the first author is a student (undergraduate or graduate) collaborator.

Initial Reappointment Review

Candidates will demonstrate their initiation of scholarly/creative work. Evidence of progress may include drafts of articles or book chapters submitted for publication, works in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or grant proposals in preparation or submitted.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

For a rating of *on track for tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making significant progress in scholarship at the time of tenure by presenting multiple scholarly activities, compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B). The candidate will present clear evidence that a focused scholarly/creative works program has been established that will produce rigorous, publishable research that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline. Exceptional quality of scholarly work will be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. These activities will include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional and/or national levels. Candidates will be seeking internal and/or external funding for their research.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate must demonstrate a body of work that makes an original scholarly contribution. A variety of completed work, compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B), will be submitted as evidence of a focused productive scholarly/creative work program. In all cases, the quality of the scholarship/creative work and impact on the profession through the influencing of peers and/or practitioners are of utmost importance.

Work on grant development for the department, college, campus and university in an administrative role (e.g., department chair, associate dean) may be considered in the category of scholarly/creative work indicators.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, the candidate must demonstrate they have established an emerging regional and/or national reputation with demonstrated scholarly productivity based upon a clearly defined focused productive scholarly/creative work program. The record of scholarly/creative work will demonstrate quality and consistency over time and potential for distinction in the field or profession. These activities will include items that are peer reviewed

and are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional and/or national level. Publication in peer-reviewed journals that are congruent with the faculty member's research plan are expected. An average of one peer-reviewed indicator, per year since the comprehensive reappointment review is expected. (Appendix B, Category 1) and engagement with other scholarly indicators (Appendix B, Category 2).

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate that they are a productive scholar with an established national and/or international reputation based upon focused productive scholarly/creative work. The candidate will present a balance of scholarly activities commensurate with the rating of meritorious and present a record of scholarly pursuits that demonstrates continuing development and sustained quantity and quality over time as well as significant contributions to, and distinction within, the field or profession. Scholarly contributions will be represented by greater quantity and/or quality of peer-reviewed quality indicators (Appendix B, Category 1) and sustained engagement with other scholarly indicators (Appendix B, Category 2).

Promotion to Full Professor
The candidate will demonstrate substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure and/or promotion. Quantity is necessary but is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate research excellence. Although quality is deemed of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of a steady rate of productivity in a variety of scholarly pursuits since tenure and/or promotion as demonstrated by multiple Scholarly/Creative Work Quality Indicators (Appendix B). Publication in peer-reviewed journals that are congruent with the faculty member's research plan are expected. Other indicators of scholarly maturity may indicate publications of a scholarly book, continuity of seeking external and/or internal grant and/or contract funding, invitations to speak at major national conventions, or awards for scholarly work. Candidates will explain their contributions to papers, grants or contracts, and the relevance of the topic of those items to the profession (e.g., how does the information enhance the profession; how does it move the profession forward). Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. The case for quality will be stated by the candidate and supported by measures germane to the field of study. Collaborative work as a co-investigator is encouraged and will support the candidates' case for recognition within and impact on the field. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity. In addition, there must be evidence of national or international esteem for his or her publications as important and authoritative works in the candidate's specialty discipline. This may be accomplished by publishing research findings in journals with a broader readership or high visibility, or by presenting research data at conferences that attract participants from the broader community. It is assumed that faculty will take a leadership role as PI or co-PI in multi-authored grants, contracts, and/or publications. The department also encourages collaboration with and mentoring of junior faculty, graduate and/or undergraduate students in research.

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for scholarship alone.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

The department values leadership and service that contributes to, and helps advance, our individual disciplines and the field of health sciences while supporting our department mission and goals. We recognize that leadership and service can take many forms and can be informal as well as formal. In the assessment of leadership and service the department places greater emphasis on the formal forms of leadership and service as indicated by the Department's Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Candidates should describe how they express these values within their narrative by addressing the following within the leadership and service statement:

- We expect all faculty to regularly and consistently contribute to service within the department regardless of their level of reappointment, review, tenure and/or promotion.
- As faculty advance through the reappointment, review, tenure and/or promotion process, they will demonstrate a progression toward assuming leadership roles within the department with subsequent progression of the *provision of service and leadership to include the college, campus, university, profession and community spheres*.

Initial Reappointment Review

The candidates will begin a process of identifying appropriate service contributions. Each candidate must have met his or her departmental service obligations including regular attendance at department meetings; collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration. The candidate will be planning for increased service contributions within the department and addition of service contributions within the college.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

For a rating of *on track for tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making significant progress in leadership and service at the time of tenure by demonstrating initial efforts in appropriate types and levels of leadership and service contribution as listed in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Candidates must have met their growing commitment and obligations to the department and college and be planning for service contributions to the campus, university, profession, and/or community. Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration; and participation in multiple graduation ceremonies in the time under review is expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) on track for tenure; 2) not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or 3) not on track for tenure.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
Review committees will vote on whether the candidate is 1) not meritorious; 2) meritorious; or 3) excellent.

For a *meritorious* rating, in addition to meeting their primary obligations to the department and college, candidates will also have contributed service to the campus, university, profession and/or community as listed in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration; and participation in multiple graduation ceremonies in the period under review are expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

A rating of *excellent* requires meeting the primary obligations (meritorious rating) of serving and engaging in leadership roles to the department and college, in addition to leadership and service contributions to the campus, university, profession, and/or community. In evaluating leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

Promotion to Full Professor
Candidates must provide evidence of meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department, in addition to multiple leadership and service contributions to the college, campus, university, profession and/or community as delineated in the Department's Leadership and Service Quality Indicators (Appendix C). Candidates will demonstrate collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration, participation in multiple graduation ceremonies and a dedication to helping the department achieve its goals. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

Under Regent policy, promotion to Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent. Review committees vote whether the criteria above have been met, but do not assign a specific rating for service alone.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The purpose of the post-tenure review is to (1) facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of HSCI; and (2) ensure professional accountability.

Standards and processes for post-tenure review of faculty are governed by *Article V of the Laws of the Regents*. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in *UCCS Policy # 200-016*. The Department of Health Sciences faculty adopts the UCCS campus Post Tenure Review policy (*UCCS Policy 200-016*) with the following additions:

1) The candidate will submit an Executive Summary addressing the current professional plan. The summary will articulate how the faculty member has met or has made significant progress toward meeting the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member's current professional plan. Reasons that goals and performance objectives have not been (or will not be) met will be explained. If goals and performance objectives were changed during the period under review, reasons for the change will be explained (e.g., change in differentiated workload, change in administrative duties, etc.).

2) The provost's office, with the assistance of the dean's office, will prepare the template in Digital Measures Workflow for the candidate to submit. The template will include the following:

   a) Primary unit RPT criteria
   b) Curriculum vitae
   c) Digital Measures summary report from the last 5 years
   d) Candidate's Executive Summary (1-3 page self-evaluation)
   e) FCQ summary pages for past 5 years
   f) Current professional plan (established per *UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016*). The current professional plan developed by the faculty member will be the main focus of the review. The committee will review the faculty member's self-set goals from the professional plan, the personal statement, and the curriculum vita to determine whether accomplishments are evident in the areas outlined in those goals. The outcome of the review will be a determination of whether appropriate effort was made in the targeted areas selected by the faculty member.
   g) Professional Plan addressing next 5 years. The professional plan is a qualitative document that provides an overview of the likely areas of professional accomplishment over the next five years
   h) Faculty differentiated workload statement(s) (if applicable)
   i) Annual performance evaluation reports (e.g., merit reviews) from previous 5 years, including evaluation letters from all levels of review
   j) Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FERPA/Digital Measures) for each of the last 5 years
   k) Sabbatical report if taken within the five-year period being reviewed
   l) Additional materials (optional)

Faculty who receive a "below expectations" rating on their Annual Performance Rating must develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) with their supervisor. If the goals of the PIA are met, the faculty member continues in the regular 5-year review cycle. If the goals are not being met, an extensive review process shall be conducted *(UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016).*

Since post tenure appointments are subject to workload differentiations, the dossier will be evaluated based on approved workload distributions. If no evidence of approved workload distribution is provided (via letter from the Department Chair and Dean), and the faculty member elects not to use the workload specified in their letter of appointment, the faculty will be evaluated on Teaching (50%), Scholarly/creative work (30%), and Leadership and Service (20%).

During the Post-Tenure Review, faculty members will be considered to "meet expectations" if the faculty member has met or has made significant progress toward meeting a majority of the goals and performance objectives that were established in the faculty member's current professional plan. The Post-Tenure Review committee may also determine that a faculty member has "exceeded expectations" or is "outstanding" based on the documentation provided by the faculty member. The Post-Tenure Review committee will provide a brief narrative explanation of its findings.

Appendix A: Teaching Quality Indicators
The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive, nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to support their narrative an make their case.

1. Influence of the course content/program on students' learning. Examples of evidence include:
   - student projects
   - pre- and post-tests
   - summative course evaluations (including FCQs)
   - formative course evaluations (mid-term or end of term)
     - Formative course evaluations are highly encouraged for faculty with minimal teaching experience or faculty teaching a new course or new preparation for the first time.
   - comprehensive examinations
   - course syllabi
   - student portfolios
   - student surveys

2. Influence of instructor's teaching practice on student learning and engagement with the course material. Examples of evidence include:
   - course evaluations
   - peer evaluations
   - evaluation of faculty member as a guest lecturer for a class internal or external to the department
   - student portfolios
   - student letters
   - practicum evaluations
   - follow-up studies
   - student surveys
   - work with students outside of the classroom setting

3. Influence of the course/program content on students' practice. Examples of evidence include:
   - supervisor or preceptor evaluations
   - students' self-evaluations
   - course evaluations
   - video recordings (e.g., of student experiences)
   - student portfolios
   - student initiation of new models
   - employer surveys
   - student media appearances (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV, social media)
   - student publications
   - interprofessional education outcomes

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

5. Advising and/or mentoring relationships with students or faculty developed over time to improve professional practice. Examples of evidence include:
- master's thesis supervision
- master's research project supervision
- undergraduate research
- independent studies
- student letters
- student portfolios
- supervision of internship experience
- mentoring faculty in teaching

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

7. Successful collaboration with faculty colleagues that results in program success in meeting and exceeding state and national standards within the faculty member's discipline. Examples of evidence include:
- leadership and/or participation in the design, alignment, and improvement of program curriculum
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to the development, design, alignment, and improvement of programs delivered online
- leadership and/or participation in the development of folios for learned society recognition
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to processes and activities relative to state and national accreditation
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that students meet the learning objectives for courses
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to ensuring that course learning objectives meet curricular needs
- leadership, participation, and/or contribution to interprofessional education experiences

8. Development as a teaching professional based on past performance and the development of a plan and focus for teaching. Examples of evidence include:
- demonstrate continuous improvement in course evaluations
- development and implementation of curricula and/or programs reflecting innovative practice and current research
- student letters
- annual reviews
- department chair letter
- peer observations or external evaluation

Appendix B: Scholarship Quality Indicators

The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive, nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to support their narrative an make their case.

1. Peer Reviewed Activities: Professional publications and other activities that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners or the profession and may be published or accepted for publication. Competency and continuity in seeking and/or procuring grants or contracts for research or support of research or programs that translate research or improve service through dissemination of innovative practice. This category of scholarship is considered to be more influential than those in category 2. Examples of evidence include:
- articles in peer-reviewed journal publications
- invited journal publications (peer-reviewed)
- peer-reviewed books
- peer-reviewed textbooks
- peer-reviewed book chapters (1st edition or substantial revision)
- peer-reviewed and/or invited presentations at professional conferences that report original research or translate research into practice
- peer-reviewed external grant or contract proposals submitted or funded

2. Other Scholarly Activities: Professional publications that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives which influence peers, practitioners, or other targeted audiences but are not peer-reviewed. These may be published, accepted for publication, or submitted for review. Regional, state, national, or international prominence as a professional researcher or educator. Professional reputation with constituents at local, state, national, or international levels which translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline. While important to the faculty member's record, this category is not considered to be as influential as those in category 1. Examples of evidence include:
- non-peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice (podium, poster, round-table)
- internal grant or contract proposals submitted or funded
- non-peer reviewed books
- non-peer reviewed textbooks
- mentoring faculty in scholarly/creative work
- book chapters (includes peer-reviewed book chapter editions with minor revision)
- editorship of a professional journal
- published curriculum materials
- monographs
- invited editorials
- collaborative work with practitioners in the discipline to translate research into practice
- original research articles in non-peer reviewed journals
- original research articles in newsletters
- critical reviews/non-invited editorials
- non-original presentations that advance the knowledge of practitioners

- reviewer for abstracts, articles or papers in conference proceedings
- reviewer for journals of the faculty member's discipline
- reviewer for grant proposals in the faculty member's discipline
- service on a grant funding board in the faculty member's discipline

Appendix C: Leadership and Service Quality Indicators

The elements below are provided as examples. They are not all-inclusive, nor should they be treated as a checklist of required elements. The candidate is to use these examples to support their narrative an make their case. Generally leadership roles in service activities are considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.

1. Professional leadership and service to the department. Examples of evidence include:
   - regular participation in department meetings
   - department committee or task force leadership
   - department committee or task force membership and participation
   - department search committee chair or member
   - department faculty evaluation committee chair or member
   - service as department chair, program coordinator, or director
   - mentoring faculty in teaching or scholarly/creative work
   - representing the department at college, campus, university, professional or community events (e.g., major/minor fair, student recruiting or orientation events, health fairs, etc.)

2. Professional leadership and service to the college. Examples of evidence include:
   - college assembly leadership
   - college assembly participation
   - college committee or task force leadership
   - college committee or task force membership and participation
   - college search committee chair or member
   - college faculty evaluation committee chair or member
   - service as associate dean
   - mentoring faculty in their role as a member of the professorate

3. Professional leadership and service to the campus. Examples of evidence include:
   - participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the campus Faculty Representative Assembly
   - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service/participation on the campus Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
   - campus committee or task force leadership
   - campus committee or task force membership and participation
   - service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

4. Professional leadership and service to the university. Examples of evidence include:
   - participation in faculty governance, such as service/participation on the University Faculty Council
   - leadership in faculty governance, such as offices held or service on the University Faculty Council Executive Committee
   - university committee or task force leadership
   - university committee or task force membership and participation

- service in campus leadership as a director, administrative associate, or other appointed administrative position

5. Professional community, regional, or national leadership and service. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment will be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:
- professional service related to the University or Department of Health Sciences mission, such as board membership, community service projects, and presentations
- professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation
- professional practice related to the University or Department of Health Sciences mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service

6. Professional leadership and service to community, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations. Context regarding service or leadership role, responsibilities and time commitment will be included in the leadership and service statement. Examples of evidence include:
- professional service, such as committee offices, committee membership and participation, task force membership and participation, or conference committees and participation
- professional practice related to the University or Department of Health Sciences mission, such as counseling, consulting, or direct service
- professional service and leadership in the governance of community, regional, national and/or international professional organizations
- elected offices in professional organizations that support the translation of research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline

Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences
HEALTH SCIENCES PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY
Version History

Version 1: Approved by Faculty December 2019, Approved by Provost 07/13/2018

Version 2: 2020 Revised Version
    Approved by the Health Sciences Faculty, 04/08/2020
    Approved by Dean Kevin Laudner, 04/08/2020
    Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee, 05/11/2020
    Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 06/05/2020
    Effective date, 07/01/2020

**Addendum to Department of Health Sciences Criteria for
Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
Implementation of the Criteria**

The following procedures are associated with the review of candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Health Sciences. These procedures supplement the procedures outlined by the UCCS Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences Policy for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure as well as UCCS and CU Regents' Laws and Policies. Updates to this addendum does not require vote of the full criteria, and may be adjusted, as applicable, to reflect relevant policy changes that do not impact the criteria.

Appointment of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) The PUEC will consist of tenured members at the rank being reviewed for or higher from HSCI. At least one (1) member of the PUEC will be from the discipline of the faculty member under review, if possible. The PUEC shall consist of at least 3 members, will consist of an odd number of members, and will be appointed by the HSCI Tenured Faculty. The PUEC may include a tenured HSCI Department Chair and the Department Chair may serve as the chair of the PUEC. Tenured faculty members from HSCI may serve on the PUEC or DRC for a tenure-track HSCI Department Chair. Full Professors from HSCI may serve on the PUEC or DRC for an HSCI Department Chair under consideration for promotion to Full Professor. If it is necessary to have non-HSCI faculty members serve on a PUEC, the non-HSCI faculty members will be a minority representation when possible, and will preferably be UCCS tenured faculty members at the rank being reviewed for or higher. The PUEC member list is shared with the Department Chair. The PUEC members may not serve on the Dean's Review Committee (DRC) or Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC) for a candidate that they evaluated as a member of the PUEC.

Vote of the Tenured Faculty As permitted in *APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion*, the faculty of The Department of Health Sciences have voted (March 5, 2020) to not have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

Credit Towards Tenure and Rank Faculty may be hired with or without credit for prior service towards tenure and rank. When a candidate is appointed with credit towards tenure and rank, the candidate must continue to demonstrate significant progress in the areas of teaching, research/ scholarship/creative works and leadership and service since their initial appointment at UCCS based on the criteria adopted by the Department for the tenure and/or promotion process. The main emphasis of the evaluation up through consideration for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, on progress since initial appointment. If, in rare instances, a candidate is being considered for hire with tenure and rank, the candidate will be evaluated by using the process adopted by the Department for the tenure and/or promotion process. The PUEC will review the new faculty member's work and will make a recommendation of rank, years of credit towards tenure, or tenure and rank to the Department Chair and Dean to review and document in the letter of offer. Candidates under consideration for promotion to full professor will have a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent and a record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor

that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/ scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.

Selection of External Reviewers Candidates for promotion and/or tenure reviews will submit suggestions for external reviewers to the Primary Unit Committee (PUEC) Chair. External reviewers must have a terminal degree in their field, currently be at or above the rank for which the candidate is under consideration (or have held the rank at or above the rank for which the candidate is under consideration), and currently be serving at or have served at an institution of higher learning as a tenured faculty member. The PUEC will review the candidate's suggestions and may add suggested external reviewers to the list or delete suggested reviewers from the list. The PUEC Chair will meet with the candidate to review the revised list. The candidate may request the exclusion of suggested external reviewers that have been added to the list. Once the final list of external reviewers has been agreed upon by the candidate and PUEC, the list will be submitted to the Department Chair for review and approval. The Department Chair and program administrator will solicit the external letters of evaluation. External review letters shall not be required for initial reviews, comprehensive reviews, or post tenure reviews. The number of letters required for review shall be the minimum number required by the UCCS RPT Policy (UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001).

It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly specify his or her relationship to the external reviewers (e.g., co-author, etc.). External reviewers are expected to give an "arm's length objective" review. The solicitation of co-authors, mentors, and former colleagues must not constitute more than one (1) of the solicitation letters. Care must be taken to exclude any reviewers whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest, such as a dissertation director. Candidates may indicate specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations may be prejudiced against the candidate. Persons recommended by the applicant to write evaluation letters *must not* be relatives or current or former students since evaluations from these individuals might constitute a conflict of interest.