

# 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

DECEMBER 2017

APPROVED BY PROVOST 7/13/2018

## **Preamble**

The tenured faculty in the Department of Health Sciences assess the influence of the teaching, research/scholarship/creative works 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, research/scholarship/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, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service. While professional practice is not evaluated as a separate category, it may be incorporated throughout and contribute to teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate exemplary ethical standards in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, 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 criteria for the review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review in the Department of Health Sciences (HSCI) in the Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Faculty members currently within HSCI may choose to use these criteria or the criteria under which they were hired. 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 (*Regent Laws Article 5: Faculty, Part B: Appointment and Evaluation; Regent Policy 5. Faculty, M. Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion, available on the website <https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies>*), University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements [*APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion; APS 1018 Justification for Appointment with Tenure (Outside Hire with Tenure), available on the website <https://www.cu.edu/ope/policy/aps-az>*], and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy (*Policy 200-001, available on the website <http://web.uccs.edu/vcaf/>*). 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.

The indicators of faculty achievements in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service contained in this document are considered criteria for the review of candidates. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in the various health science disciplines. 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, Research/Scholarship/Creative Works, 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 individual 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. It is expected that the faculty demonstrate growth in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, 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.

Faculty may be hired with or without credit for prior service towards tenure and rank. Credit for prior service towards tenure and rank are negotiated at the time of hire and described in the initial letter of offer. The review schedule for the individual faculty member is also contained in the initial letter of offer. When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure and rank, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. 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. While a faculty member's career record may be considered in personnel actions described here, 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. 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 and/or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and leadership and service.

The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities. These criteria are published to 1) assist the faculty in interpreting the Regents' standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure by clarifying the conditions under which candidates meet requirements for advancement; 2) provide HSCI Primary Unit Committee with well-defined criteria on which to determine a faculty member's accomplishments; 3) provide the Dean's Review Committee, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor's Review Committee (VCRC) with Department standards for RPT; and 4) provide criteria for external reviewers to evaluate candidate's accomplishments towards RPT. In addition to the UCCS requirements for the dossier, HSCI requires the candidate to submit a copy of their initial contract, any revised contracts, and any subsequent differential workload documents [Faculty Responsibility Statements (FRS)].

The criteria provided for *the reappointment review, comprehensive review, tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor* in the Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Works, and Leadership and Service categories reflect a 40% teaching, 40% research/scholarship/creative works and 20% leadership and service workload distribution.

If the faculty member utilizes an approved differentiated workload related to teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, 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, research/scholarship/creative works, and demonstrate willingness to serve in department and professional capacities (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*).

### **COMPREHENSIVE 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 researcher, and a contributor to the Department, and to some extent, to the campus or wider community in the area of leadership and service. At the comprehensive review level, candidates should not be awarded ratings of *meritorious* or *excellent*. Evaluations should reflect that significant progress is being made toward 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, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service, and “excellent” in either teaching or research/scholarship/creative works. Candidates and evaluators are referred to UCCS RPT Policy, Section VII, Standards for Review, and subsections: A) Tenure, and B) Early Tenure (*UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*).

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 only if a positive recommendation results from a review of the candidate’s credentials by the Committees and Officers involved in the normal promotion and tenure review process. 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, the standards of performance that apply to faculty on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty who apply for early tenure review. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member applying for tenure at UCCS in the seventh year. Regent policy calls for meritorious performance in teaching, research/scholarship/creative works and leadership and service as well as excellence in either teaching or research/scholarship/creative works. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure review. The department chair and tenured colleagues have a responsibility to advise tenure-track faculty on the

wisdom of going up for early tenure review and should not encourage any colleague to stand for early tenure review unless they are confident that their record is tenurable. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock. (*APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion and UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*)

### **PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

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, research/scholarship/creative work, and leadership and service (*University of Colorado Board of Regents Policy 5: Faculty 5.L Policy on Approved Faculty Titles; APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion; and UCCS RPT Policy, 200-001*).

Promotion to Full Professor requires that the candidate must be judged as making significant contributions in all three areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, and leadership and service since receiving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. Differentiated workloads should be considered based on needs of the Department, College and University. Differentiated workloads need to be documented by the Chair of the Department and Dean of the College and will be evaluated based on actual percentages of the differentiation.

## TEACHING

The Department recognizes that individual teachers have a personal philosophy of teaching-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. Interprofessional engagement both within and outside of the department is encouraged. 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 teaching. It is expected that engagement of students in the teaching-learning process will be reflected in both philosophy and practice. Teaching is evaluated by examining teaching effectiveness, course development, evaluation, innovation, and curriculum development.

The candidate will articulate the specific item(s) in the teaching statement that fulfill the criteria presented and provide evidence in the dossier. Candidates will build a body of evidence to demonstrate and support the quality of and growth in teaching. The teaching statement and representative evidence presented will demonstrate a progressive improvement in teaching during the time under review. Candidates are encouraged to describe linkages between their teaching and research/scholarship/creative works and/or leadership and service.

Works 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.

### **For Each Review**

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution and progressive growth of the individual. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses

- reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice,
- are coherently organized,
- thoughtfully presented,
- promote critical thinking,
- reflect the Department values and mission,
- have learning objectives that meet curricular needs and requirements, and
- meet the accreditation and/or professional curriculum requirements.

### **Required items to submit for each review:**

- 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 summary Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) or a similar, campus-approved system and form for each course taught during the time under review.
- 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

### **Initial Reappointment Review**

Candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include:

- professional interaction with students,
- responsiveness to reasonable student perspectives,
- utilization of several teaching and learning evaluation strategies and
- initial development of skills in presenting material.

The candidate will also maintain a collegial working relationship with peers, staff and administration.

### **Comprehensive Review**

In addition to the expectations for the initial reappointment review, candidates will demonstrate

- efforts to develop as a teaching professional through assessing the quality of his/her teaching,
- how they have responded to evaluations of their teaching, and
- how they have demonstrated continuous improvement in teaching.

Candidates will develop a plan and focus for their teaching including

- the role/purpose of their courses in the context of the curriculum,
- how their teaching practice results in student engagement with course material,
- how the course content influences their teaching practice and student learning, and
- how they evaluate the ability of students to apply 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, accreditation or recognition processes, and curriculum development and evaluation.

For a rating of *making significant progress toward tenure*, candidates must demonstrate that they are making significant progress in teaching at the time of tenure as measured by the required items to be submitted for each evaluation, the criteria listed above and at least three indicators from those listed in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators. In cases in which this standard is not met, the candidate must provide an explanation for the failure and an appropriate remedial plan. 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. Candidates with stronger teaching records may additionally show that they are making reasonable progress toward tenure in terms of effective teaching as indicated by multiple examples of evidence of effective teaching, dedication to student learning, and commitment to contributing to a strong, cohesive curriculum as delineated in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators.

### **Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

The same criteria for comprehensive review apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In addition to that criteria, the candidate is expected to demonstrate growth as a teaching professional and proficiency in the classroom and/or clinical teaching, as demonstrated by

- the ability to set priorities and goals,
- the ability to effectively convey both abstract and analytical content and practical skills, and
- the capability to organize and coordinate teaching/learning activities within the curriculum.

Candidates will demonstrate involvement in curriculum development and evaluation through participation in course review and evaluation, accreditation or recognition processes, and curriculum development and evaluation.

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. 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, sustained effectiveness, competence, distinction, and leadership in teaching as documented by evidence for additional indicators as delineated in the Department's Teaching Quality Indicators.



## RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS

Our department recognizes that research, scholarship and creative works can take many forms. We value work that 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. 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 (Appendix B) are most important. Other 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 research, scholarship and 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.

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 present evidence of research/creative work potential through the continuing development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include copies of drafts or work in progress or submitted for publication presentations at professional meetings, and/or grant proposals in preparation.

### **Comprehensive Review**

For a rating of *making significant progress toward 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 research 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 there is a lower quantity of work. These activities will include items that are peer reviewed or are deemed to have an appropriate professional impact at the regional, national, or international levels. Candidates will be seeking internal and/or external funding for their research.

### **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), may be submitted as evidence of a productive research program. It is expected that candidates will be presenting at national meetings and seeking external research funding. In all cases, the quality of the research, scholarship or creative works 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 Scholarship Indicators.

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 research agenda or line of research by presenting multiple scholarly activities compiled and documented from those listed in the Department's Scholarship Quality Indicators (Appendix B). The record of research shall 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, national, or international levels.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate that they are a mature productive scholar with an established national and/or international reputation based upon a clearly defined research agenda or line of research. The candidate will present a balance of scholarly activities indicated in the rating of meritorious and present a record of research that demonstrates continuing development and sustained quantity and quality over time as well as significant contributions to, and distinction within, the field or profession. The candidate will be among the best in the field.

## LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

Our 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).

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; and participation in at least one graduation during each academic year. The candidate will be planning for increased service contributions within the department and addition of service contributions within the college.

### **Comprehensive Review**

For a rating of *making significant progress toward 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 at least one graduation during each academic year are expected. In evaluating faculty leadership and service, both the quality and quantity (depth and breadth) of contributions will be considered.

### **Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

For a *meritorious* rating, in addition to meeting their primary obligations to the department and college, candidates will also have contributed leadership and 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 at least one graduation during each academic year 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 leadership and service responsibilities within the department and college and leadership roles or multiple service contributions to the department,

college, 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

Promotion to full professor is self-initiated and the evaluation period begins from when the individual is awarded tenure or Associate Professor status.

The Department has adopted the University's standard for promotion to Full Professor which states that a candidate's dossier must reflect "a record that taken as a whole, is judged excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education unless individual or department 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, research, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service" (*Regent Policy 5 Faculty, L Policy on Approved Faculty Titles, see also APS 1022, UCCS Policy 200-001*). Consideration and weighting of ratings 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 the award of tenure (if applicable).

### Teaching

Emphasis will be placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. The candidate will demonstrate expert teaching skills. Candidates will be dynamic and excel in substantial development/implementation of courses, teaching materials and strategies, and assessment of learning and program outcomes. They will model for students the relationship of theory, research and practice, and effectively convey both abstract and analytical content. They will participate in and model appropriate interprofessional engagement both within and outside of the department as applicable. They will be recognized by peers and others as master teachers, mentor others, and may have received honors for teaching. Candidates may design and test innovative teaching strategies.

Candidates will demonstrate that their courses reflect current knowledge and evidence-based practice, are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, promote critical thinking, and that they deal with significant areas in the field of health sciences. Candidates will ensure that courses reflect the Department philosophy and mission, ensure that course learning objectives meet curricular need and requirements, and that courses meet the accreditation and/or professional curriculum requirements. Furthermore, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which may include professional interaction with students, responsiveness to rational student perspectives, concern with curriculum, utilization of several teaching and learning evaluation strategies and continued satisfactory development of skills in presenting material.

Candidates will demonstrate participation and leadership in curriculum development and evaluation. Candidates are expected to mentor other faculty to improve teaching effectiveness, conduct course reviews and evaluations, participate in or lead accreditation or recognition processes, and mentor others in curriculum development and evaluation.

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate must demonstrate continuing growth and expert teaching skills as measured by multiple methods of teaching evaluation. The candidate must provide multiple indicators to support effective and expert teaching, and dedication to student learning as delineated in the Teaching Quality Indicators. Relevant factors regarding the courses taught, such

as class size, course difficulty, delivery mode, courses being a mandatory requirement, etc., may be considered in the judgment of performance. Candidates will demonstrate leadership in curriculum development, mentor others in course development, and may provide leadership on university, state or national committees (i.e. curriculum development, professional standards, certification).

### **Research/Scholarship/Creative Works**

For a rating of *excellent*, the candidate will demonstrate substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure. 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 over a period of years. Publication in peer-reviewed journals that are congruent with the faculty member's research plan would be expected. Other indicators of scholarly maturity may indicate publications of a scholarly book, continuity of seeking grant and/or contract funding, invitations to provide keynote addresses at major national conventions, or invitations to contribute to handbooks in the discipline of practice. 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. 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.

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. It is assumed that faculty will take a leadership role in some of the multi-authored grants, contracts, and/or publications. The department also encourages collaboration with and mentoring of junior faculty, 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. Again, clear evidence of the faculty member's role is expected.

### **Leadership and Service**

For a rating of *excellent*, 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. Candidates will demonstrate collegiality in interactions with students, faculty, staff and administration, participation in at least one graduation during each academic year 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.

## **TENURE TRACK FACULTY WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION**

Prior to tenure appointment, most faculty are evaluated based on the following workload:

40% Teaching

40% Research/Scholarship

20% Leadership and service

The Department Chair and Dean may adjust faculty workload distribution (*APS 1006 Differentiated Annual Workloads for Faculty*; available at <https://www.cu.edu/ope/policy/aps-az>). A differentiated workload distribution of responsibilities defined by the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) will be approved by the Department Chair and Dean and used for evaluation, and will be submitted with the dossier. If there are senior faculty (Full Professors) for whom a different distribution would be appropriate, the Department Chair, in conjunction with the faculty member and Dean, will develop an agreement documenting a differentiated workload and assignment. If no agreement is in place, the faculty member will be evaluated based on the 40/40/20 percentages above.

### **FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT (FRS)**

The FRS identifies the proportion of effort by the faculty in 1) teaching, 2) research/scholarship/creative works, and 3) leadership and service. This statement is negotiated by the individual and the Department Chair and approved by the Dean for a specified period. If the faculty member renegotiates workload, then the expectations for meritorious and excellent work in the affected categories will be evaluated accordingly. Differentiated workloads need to be documented by the Chair of the Department, approved by the Dean, and will be evaluated based on actual percentages of the differentiation.

### **DETERMINATION OF PRIOR ACADEMIC WORK AT PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT TOWARD TENURE OR RECOMMENDATION OF HIRE WITH TENURE AND RANK**

When a candidate is appointed with credit towards tenure and rank, the years of credit will be evaluated by using the criteria adopted by the Department for the tenure process. 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 [*APS 1018 Justification for Appointment with Tenure (Outside Hire with Tenure)*, available on the website <https://www.cu.edu/ope/policy/aps-az>]. The PUC 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.

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 process.

## COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND REVIEW PROCESS

### **Appointment of the Primary Unit Committee (PUC)**

The PUC will consist of tenured members at the rank being reviewed for or higher from HSCI. At least one (1) member of the PUC will be from the discipline of the faculty member under review if possible. The PUC may include a tenured HSCI Department Chair and the Department Chair may serve as the chair of the PUC. Tenured faculty members from HSCI may serve on the PUC or DRC for a tenure-track HSCI Department Chair. Full Professors from HSCI may serve on the PUC 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 PUC, 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 PUC 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 PUC member list is shared with the College Faculty Affairs Council and Dean. The Dean will affirm that the members of the PUC meet the requirements for serving on the PUC. The PUC 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 PUC.

### **Responsibility of the Primary Unit Committee (PUC)**

After the PUC letter of recommendation is completed, the letter will be reviewed with the faculty member. The order of the review process is as follows:

- 1) Once the PUC letter has been signed by all committee members and submitted to the Dean's office, the chair of the PUC promptly informs the candidate orally of the PUC's recommendation during a face-to-face meeting. There must be no identification of the external reviewers in this or any other communication with the candidate.
- 2) The chair of the PUC ensures that the faculty member receives a copy of the PUC letter once the Dean's letter has been signed and submitted to the Provost's office. (*See policy <https://www.cu.edu/policies/aps/academic/1022.pdf>.*)

### **Selection of External Reviewers**

Candidates for comprehensive and promotion and tenure reviews will submit suggestions for external reviewers to the Primary Unit Committee (PUC) 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 PUC will review the candidate's suggestions and may add suggested external reviewers to the list or delete suggested reviewers from the list. The PUC 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 PUC, the list will be submitted to the Department Chair for review and approval. Once approved by the Department Chair, the list



will be submitted to the Dean for review and approval. Upon approval of the external reviewers by the Dean, the PUC Chair and program administrator will solicit the external letters of evaluation. Note: external review letters are not required for initial 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. (*UCCS Policy 200-001, section VIII. Dossiers, D. Reviewer Responsibilities, I. Primary Unit's Responsibility, b. (4) Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers.*)

### **Vote of the Tenured Faculty**

For candidates being considered for tenure (or being considered for hire with tenure and rank), the PUC Chair will bring to the tenured HSCI faculty the results of the committee discussion and decision and solicit a vote from tenured faculty who have not or will not vote on the candidate in another capacity (e.g., as a member of the PUC, DRC, or VCRC). Tenured HSCI faculty who are serving on the PUC or will serve on the DRC or VCRC review for the candidate being considered will recuse themselves from the HSCI tenured faculty vote. The vote of the tenured faculty will be provided in the PUC evaluation letter. A simple majority vote of the tenured faculty is required for recommendation of tenure. If the vote of the tenured faculty is a tie, the result of the vote will be recommendation for tenure. Tenured faculty voting in the minority may provide a minority opinion to be included in the PUC letter. If the faculty and the PUC disagree (i.e., one group recommends tenure and the other group does not) the outcome of the tenured faculty vote will be detailed in the PUC letter to the Dean, describing the rationale for the positive as well as negative votes. The tenured faculty vote will only occur in the case of tenure decisions or hire with tenure and rank decisions; all other decisions are based on the vote of the PUC.

## POST-TENURE REVIEW

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 a personal statement addressing the current professional plan. The personal statement 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 dean's office will prepare the binder with tabs for the candidate to submit. The binder will include the following:
  - a) Candidates Executive Summary (1-3 page self-evaluation)
  - b) Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FERPA) last 5 years
  - c) Curriculum vitae
  - d) Faculty differentiated workload statement(s) (if applicable)
  - e) Current professional plan (established per *UCCS Post-Tenure Review Policy 200-016*). The current professional plan developed by the faculty member shall 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.
  - f) Annual performance evaluation reports (e.g., merit reviews) from previous 5 years, including evaluation letters from all levels of review
  - g) All methods of teaching evaluation from the previous 5 years. These will include a minimum of 3 methods of teaching evaluation each academic year, one of which is the required FCQs. Faculty members will describe the methods of teaching evaluation utilized and include the results of the evaluation including but not limited to the summary sheets from FCQ's and at least one peer review of teaching evaluation.
  - h) 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

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), the faculty will be evaluated on Teaching (40%), Research/Scholarship/Creative Works (40%), and Leadership and Service (20%).

Post-tenure reviews shall be conducted by one review committee consisting of tenured faculty members from the department. Tenured faculty members may serve on the post-tenure review committee for the department chair of their department. The committee shall consist of at least three (3) members and will be appointed by the tenured department faculty who shall also designate the committee chair.

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 finding.

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.

Note: If changes occur within campus policy we will update to follow campus policy.

## Appendix A: Teaching Quality Indicators

1. Influence of the course content/program on students' learning. Examples of evidence include:
  - student projects
  - pre- and post-tests
  - summative course evaluations
  - 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
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 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

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

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

8. Development as a teaching professional based on past performance and the development of a plan and focus for teaching. Examples of evidence include:

- continuously improving course evaluations
- professional development plan
- student letters
- annual reviews
- department chair letter
- peer observations or external evaluation

## Appendix B: Scholarship Quality Indicators

1. Professional publications that report research, translate research into practice, or develop new knowledge or perspectives. These publications should influence peers, practitioners or the profession and may be published or accepted for publication. This category of scholarship is considered to be more influential than those in category 2. Examples of evidence include:

- articles in peer-reviewed journals
- invited publications (peer-reviewed)
- peer-reviewed books
- peer-reviewed textbooks
- peer-reviewed book chapters
- peer-reviewed and/or invited presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice
- peer-reviewed online publications
- other indicators of professional impact (e.g., conference presentations)

2. 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. While important to the faculty member's record, this category is not considered to be as influential as those in category 1. Examples of evidence include:

- books
- online publications
- book chapters
- textbooks
- articles in journals
- articles in newsletters
- curriculum materials
- editorials
- monographs
- critical reviews
- non-original presentations that advance the knowledge of practitioners

3. 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. Examples of evidence include:

- grant or contract proposals funded
- grant or contract proposals submitted
- leveraging internal grant funding to obtain external grant or contract funding

4. Regional, state, national, or international prominence as a professional researcher or educator. Examples of evidence include:

- editorship of a professional journal
- service as a reviewer for abstracts, articles or papers in conference proceedings
- service as a reviewer for journals of the faculty member's discipline

- service as a reviewer for grant proposals in the faculty member's discipline
- service on a grant funding board in the faculty member's discipline
- collaborative work with practitioners in the discipline to translate research into practice
- presentations at professional conferences that translate research into practice or develop new knowledge or perspectives
- development and implementation of curricula and/or programs reflecting innovative practice and current research
- reviewer of curricular content for scientific accuracy

5. Professional reputation with constituents at local, state, national, or international levels which translate research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.

Examples of evidence include:

- reviews of research, papers, presentations, articles, and/or books from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
- letters of commendation from peers at the local, state, national, or international levels
- elected offices in professional organizations that support the translation of research into practice or develop new knowledge in the faculty member's discipline

## Appendix C: Leadership and Service Quality Indicators

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 research/scholarship/creative works
  - 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 teaching or research/scholarship/creative works
  
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

7. Generally leadership roles in service activities are considered more influential than serving as a member in a particular endeavor.

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

Version 1: Initial Version

Approved by the Health Sciences Faculty, 12/7/2017

Approved by Interim Dean Amy Silva-Smith, 7/2/2018

Submitted to Dr. Tom Christensen, Provost, for approval 7/9/2018

Approved by Provost, 7/13/2018

---