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This list is to be used in tandem with the Requirements document that comes with your reappointment packets. Most of the materials in the reappointment packets, and many of those referenced in this document, are available on the web at: http://artsandsciences.colorado.edu/facultystaff/tenure-track-reappointment-promotion-and-tenure-processes/

If you have questions, please call the staff member supporting the A&S Personnel Committee at 492-7593.

General Timeline

April: List of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure sent to departments from the Dean’s Office

Approximate Deadlines for submitting files to the Dean’s office (definitions below):

- Oct 1: Comprehensive Review
- Nov 1: Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure
- Jan 2: Promotion to Full Professor
- Feb 1: College Professor of Distinction -- Complete Files

March: Decisions begin being received from the Vice Chancellor’s Office.

Definitions for Terms used on the Reappointment List sent by the Dean's Office

For Professors

Comprehensive: A complete evaluation during the fall of the last year of the current appointment (usually the 4th year) or as indicated in the letter of offer.

Promotion to Associate and/or Tenure: Review for tenure is required during the seventh year of probationary service. Earlier consideration is possible, but this possibility should be discussed first with the divisional dean. Tenure is normally linked with promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, although this is determined by the department and the Dean.

Promotion to Full: This voluntary review for promotion may be requested by the department or by the professor. This may occur at any time, but is typically after six or seven years as an Associate Professor with tenure.

College Professor of Distinction: The department may submit a pre-nomination (an abbreviated packet) for an individual who is considered to be distinguished as an exemplary teacher, scholar, and public servant who has extraordinary international importance and recognition. The department will be notified whether a complete file should be assembled and submitted for further consideration. Additional information will be sent from the Dean’s office when nominations are being accepted.
Standards to be Met

The Chair’s Report should use the following language (bolded) when assessing the strength of a candidate’s file.

Comprehensive Review:
The purpose of this review is to ascertain whether the candidate is making normal progress for promotion and tenure.

Promotion and/or Tenure:
“Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research or creative work …

Promotion to Full Professor:
“Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.” (Adopted by the Board of Regents 2/17/94.)

Procedures

Each department submits two identical three-ring binders for each tenure-track candidate, one notebook with originals and one with copies. Include in the original binder a CD with the Chair and PUEC letter, the candidate’s CV and statements on teaching, research and service. Only one binder is required for instructor reappointments. [The department may wish to keep a binder copy for its records. Nothing goes back to the department once the review process is complete other than the binder(s) with publications and semester FCQs.] Be sure that the binders are large enough so that the pages turn freely.

Binders are set up with dividers, one section for each item shown on the yellow VCAC Checklist: The first divider is for the Dean’s Recommendation (this section will be empty), followed by the A&S Personnel Committee Recommendation (also empty), then the Chair’s Report of Department Evaluation, etc. Additional information that the candidate wishes to submit but that is not required on the VCAC Checklist may be placed throughout the notebook as appropriate.

On the spine of the notebooks indicate the candidate’s name, department, personnel action (reappointment, tenure, etc.), and whether the binder is the original or copy.

For tenure-track faculty, publications are only necessary in the “original” binder. Otherwise the two notebooks must match exactly.

VCAC Checklist

This section gives information in addition to what is provided on the Description of VCAC Checklist Requirements, and matches the numbering from the VCAC Checklist.

1. Dean’s Recommendation. Completed in the Dean’s Office.

2. Statement of Dean’s Review Committee. Completed by the A&S Personnel Committee through the Dean’s Office.

3. Chair’s Report of Department Evaluation and Recommendation. A copy of this letter is to be given to the candidate by the department at the time the letter is finalized. The Chair of the primary unit is responsible for preparing a report of the department’s recommendation. In addition to what is stated on the Description of VCAC Checklist Requirements, this report needs to relate recommendations to the standard within the department and to the standards of the Regents for this level of decision and make a case for the standard being met. This includes an assessment of the quality of journals and presses in which publications appear. For tenure/promotion files, include a copy of the letters from the comprehensive review written by the Chair, the Dean, and the VCAC. The Chair’s report should address whether or not issues raised during the Comprehensive Review were met. Is there a
different standard now? Explain anomalies in time lines; e.g., PhD in 1988, but tenure now. Why? Where are PhD students (if any) placed? If faculty eligible to vote did not, provide and explanation for this.

Do not reveal external reviewers’ names or the names of the institutions, or provide descriptive information about the reviewers that may identify them in any letters (whether from the Chair, the subcommittee, or any other internal letter. Descriptive information can be provided on the list of external reviewers that identifies those chosen by the department and those chosen by the candidate.) Letters disclosing outside names will be returned for editing.

In preparing dossiers for submission to the Arts & Sciences Personnel Committee, chairs shall adhere to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (III 30-31):

The head of the primary unit making the recommendation shall prepare a comprehensive dossier on the candidate for submission to the group or individual making both the first and second level review. The dossier shall include the following materials: ... a statement describing the procedures followed and actions taken by the unit making the recommendation, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation. (This statement must include the results of any vote taken.)

A chair may submit an independent opinion of a case, either in a separate letter or as part of the Chair’s Report (see Faculty Handbook I 20-21).  

4. Statement of Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC). A copy of this letter is to be given to the candidate by the department at the time the letter is finalized. There is an advisory memo written to PUEC members regarding their duties available on the College web site. Department Chairs and Program Directors are not allowed to also be members of a candidate’s PUEC.

5. Current Vita. This should be comprehensive and up-to-date. Include information on all career matters, not just publications. Discriminate between peer versus non-reviewed scholarly work, and between performances of a scholarly nature versus service and outreach activities. See former Associate Vice Chancellor Gleeson’s memo titled “Advice on Curriculum Vita Construction for Personnel Reviews” for complete information (included in personnel packets and available on the web).

6. Faculty Statement on Research/Creative Work.

7. Faculty Statement on Teaching.

8. Faculty Statement on Service/Outreach.

9. Comprehensive Review Letters from Dean’s Review Committee and from Dean. Required for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure decisions only.

10. Multiple Measures of Teaching. The department receives the instructor's summary FCQ directly from the FCQ office. A breadth of measures helps the Arts and Sciences committee make its assessment. A sample letter for solicitation of student comments is available on the web. If student letters are included, state how they were solicited. The most valuable letters are ones that were selected randomly (for example, every XX student from a class list, all students from a particular group, etc.). A recent policy reinterpretation provides that all letters from students (current, former, graduate students, postdoctoral trainees) are to be treated as confidential and protected in the same way as are external referee letters. Faculty peer review is essential. This peer review, generally conducted at least once per year, should include visits to the classroom for multiple courses over multiple years. For faculty peer review, state the basis for faculty peer review, how faculty were chosen, and by whom. An evaluation by the primary review committee of the teaching portfolio (syllabi, exams, etc.) also is helpful.

11. One copy of your letter soliciting letters of evaluation (for external evaluation).

12. Six External Letters of Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure. At least six outside letters are required. Departments may want to request one or two additional letters above the required six, so that at least six are received. Do not overload the file with an
excessive number of letters by requesting an excessive number. However, all outside letters that are received must be included with the file. Do not promise absolute confidentiality or privilege to the potential reviewers. Use the wording in sample letters provided by the VCAC. There is an advisory memo on external reviewer selection on the College web site.

Along with the external letters include:
A. A CV or a brief statement of qualification for each referee
B. A listing of who suggested each referee: the department, the candidate, or both
C. Information on the candidate’s relationship to each referee

If a reviewer did not write a review, indicate the reason if known. Where possible the department should request approximately an equal number of reviews from the candidate’s and the department’s list of potential reviewers. Since the 6 outside letters are meant to provide some sense of how candidates look to disinterested observers, letters from mentors and close collaborators are discouraged in this section. However, nothing prevents the addition of supplementary documents, e.g., from collaborators, in a separate section.

13. One copy of “Primary Unit Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.”

14. Examples of Publications. At least 3 publications are needed for the original notebook only. For grants, include dollar amounts of direct costs only. If the file is for promotion to full professor, remember that the committee will be looking for evidence of significant and continued growth and accomplishment since tenure. Therefore, publications since tenure are appropriate.

Miscellaneous

Supplemental Information Received by the Dean’s Office:
Occasionally supplemental information such as a minority opinion from the department, additional information from the candidate, or letters from students are received directly by the Dean’s office for inclusion in a notebook. In these cases, both the candidate and the Chair are notified in writing, and are given the opportunity to review the information. According to University Counsel, a candidate is eligible to read everything in a file except the external and student letters.

Size of the Voting Unit:
In cases for hiring, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, Departments and Programs with fewer than five faculty eligible to vote on a particular personnel action should select additional faculty members from a cognate department or program to bring the voting membership up to five. This expanded group will participate in the departmental discussion prior to a vote, and vote on the personnel action. The names of the faculty to be added must be submitted by the Chair of the Primary Unit to the divisional dean for approval prior to any discussions or votes in which they participate.

FCQ Comment Sheets:
Comments that students write on the FCQ forms are confidential comments for the benefit of the instructor. Faculty are not required to provide these comments as part of their evaluation. Although FCQs are required and the results of the FCQs may be used for evaluation as well as for instructor feedback, that is not the case for written comments. The instructor may withhold those from the department if he or she wishes.

Less than 100% Appointments:
Review timing for faculty with appointments less than 100% is the same as for full-time faculty. However, the level of expectations for quantity (but not quality) of activities will be according to the percent-time appointment during the entire review period. Standards for quality of teaching, research, and service will be the same as for full-time faculty.