**II. CATEGORY I FACULTY – POLICIES & PROCEDURES**

A. Description of Category I Faculty

Category I Faculty are tenure-line faculty, which means they are either: 1) tenure-track (or probationary) faculty; or 2) tenured faculty.

1. Tenure-track faculty members are full-time faculty, appointed for a term consisting of one academic year. Tenure-track faculty members are reviewed for retention each year under the applicable criteria, standards, and guidelines of the University, and may be reappointed for up to six terms. Tenure-track contracts are subject to non-renewal upon notice. Faculty members holding tenure track positions are uniquely eligible to be awarded tenure, in the sole discretion of the Board of Trustees.

2. Tenured faculty members are subject to comprehensive performance review every five years under the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the University as provided in this Handbook and established by Colorado Revised Statutes.

3. Tenure is a full-time contract for an indefinite term, which is subject to dismissal and reduction in compensation on grounds and with procedures as provided in this Handbook. Tenured faculty members are also subject to termination and reduction in compensation when a reduction in force is authorized, subject to the procedures provided in this Handbook.

4. Category I faculty members are the core of the faculty. These tenured and tenure-track faculty members are an essential element enabling the University to achieve its mission, goals, and strategic initiatives. As such, Category I should comprise a majority of the faculty.

5. Category I faculty members receive initial salaries based upon market data and are eligible for increases based on promotion and merit, as provided in this Handbook.

B. Performance Reviews for Category I Faculty

In accordance with AAUP Guidelines, this section II.B. outlines institutional performance expectations for Category I faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, successful post-tenure review, and/or emeritus status. The review process requires compilation of data from multiple sources to demonstrate the complex and diverse work of faculty. These data are intended to present a holistic picture of individual faculty as each seeks reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.

1. Tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually during the tenure-track period for reappointment eligibility. At the end of the tenure-track period, normally six years post hire, a cumulative evaluation will become part of the tenure review process.

a. Award of tenure requires:

(1) Adherence to all contractual requirements;

(2) A record of conduct consistent with professional standards;

(3) Faculty holding the appropriate terminal degree for the discipline (the Provost may make an exception after consultation with the affected Department Chair and Dean); and

(4) Demonstration of performance that meets the standards defined by departmental guidelines, which:

(a) Should recognize contributions to teaching as the most significant factors in evaluating faculty for tenure, but acknowledge that outstanding teaching will not be sufficient to justify tenure; and

(b) May allow for faculty to demonstrate a holistic performance record, where extraordinary accomplishments in one area might compensate for less robust accomplishments in another.

b. Promotion: Submission of a tenure portfolio by a tenure-track faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor will also constitute an application for promotion to Associate Professor.

2. Tenured Faculty will be evaluated through post tenure review every 5 years.

C. Definitions

1. Portfolio

a. Constitutes a cumulative record of a faculty member’s performance. These documents are meant to be utilized within the performance review process.

b. Shall include all of the following:

(1) Narrative Statement:

(a) Presents a reflective self-assessment, highlights accomplishments, and indicates plans for the future;

(b) Shows that the faculty member has read, reflected upon and addressed student comments contained in his or her SRI evaluations; and

(c) Is expected to be cumulative and to grow in length from one iteration to the next. Accordingly, length expectations for narratives are as follows:

(i) 2nd year: 1-3 pages

(ii) 3rd year: 2-5 pages

(iii) 6th year: 3-8 pages

(iv) For promotion to Professor: 3-8 pages

(v) For Post Tenure Review: 1-3 pages

(2) Curriculum Vitae:

(a) Annual annotated Curriculum Vitae (CV) shall include a comprehensive and detailed listing of faculty work in the Areas of Performance.

(b) Annotations should provide brief explanation of scholarly work completed or in progress and of service contributions.

(3) Student Ratings of Instruction:

(a) All portfolios shall include student ratings of instruction for all classes assigned using the approved “Student Ratings of Instruction” (SRI) form. Exceptions include:

(i) Field experiences and internships as determined by the Department; and

(ii) Classes with fewer than five students must be evaluated according to Department Guidelines.

(4) Letters of Review and Faculty Responses:

(a) Letters of Review:

(i) Are required at each level of review; and

(ii) Must:

a) Be based on the evidence and the criteria established by departmental evaluation guidelines;

b) Contain substantive comments useful to subsequent reviewers and to the faculty candidate;

c) Include recommended conditions for subsequent reappointment when relevant;

d) Include a rationale noting, if appropriate, commendable performance; and

e) Address any changes made to the Portfolio during the review and the reasons for those changes.

(iii) As Letters of Review are added to the portfolio, the Committee Chair, Department Chair, or Administrator at each level of review shall promptly provide to the faculty member a copy of the Letter of Review by uploading that letter into the electronic portfolio review system.

(iv) Upon receipt of the Letter of Review and a copy of any Provost-approved information added to the Portfolio pursuant to II.C.1.b(7) below, the faculty member has the option of providing a written response within seven (7) calendar days of the deadline for submission of the evaluation letters as specified in the Procedural Calendar. The written response will become part of the Portfolio.

(b) Reappointment or tenure/promotion portfolios for faculty in years two through six shall include:

(i) All previous Letters of Review for reappointment; and

(ii) Any responses by the faculty member.

(c) Portfolios for Promotion to Professor shall include:

(i) All Letters of Review from the previous tenure/promotion review; and

(ii) All Letters of Review from post-tenure reviews; and

(iii) Any responses to the above from the faculty member.

(5) Reassigned Time Reports and Evaluations: If faculty has received reassigned time to conduct work beyond normal duties—e.g., to engage in grant-funded activities, to work on projects for the University such as program review or assessment, to administer a program—the faculty member must provide:

(a) Reports of their accomplishments; and

(b) The evaluations of this work.

(6) Additional Materials for Review Required:

(a) For Years Three and Six:

(i) Faculty members can choose to include as many as nine items or as few as four items; and

(ii) At least two must be from the Teaching category and one each from the Scholarly Activities and Service categories.

(b) For Promotion to Professor:

(i) Faculty members can choose to include as many as nine items or as few as four items; and

(ii) At least two must be from the Teaching category and one each from the Scholarly Activities and Service categories.

(7) Supplementary Documentation and Other Official and Relevant Information:

(a) Any level of review may request relevant and official information not present in the faculty Portfolio to assist the evaluation process.

(b) Only Provost-approved requests constitute official and relevant information.

(c) Any additional Provost-approved materials must be addressed in the Letters of Review and supporting documents included as an appendix thereto.

(d) The faculty member will be provided copies of the correspondence to and from the Provost and have the opportunity to respond according to section II.C.1.b.(4)(a)(iv), above.

2. Review Committees for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

a. Eligibility for review committee members:

(1) Committee members must be tenured.

(2) Any person on a full-time administrative contract is not eligible to serve or vote on faculty review committees, regardless of faculty rank and tenure.

(3) Faculty members serving on review committees and simultaneously being considered for promotion to Professor cannot participate in the discussion and vote on any promotion decisions at any level (Department RTP Committee, College/School RTP Committee or Faculty Senate RTP Committee) for the rank of Professor.

(4) Faculty members undergoing Post Tenure Review cannot participate in the discussion and vote on any Post Tenure Review decisions at any level (Department PTR Committee or University Appeals Committee).

(5) No faculty member may serve as a voting member of more than one review Committee (Department/Peer Review, College/School, Senate or University Appeals Committee).

b. Department/Peer Review Committees composition:

(1) Shall consist of at least a majority of the eligible tenured faculty members in the department.

(2) Shall consist of at least three members.

(3) If a Department cannot constitute a three-member Department/Peer Review Committee, a Department/Peer Review Committee will be established by the Dean, which may include members from cognate departments.

c. College/School Review Committees composition:

(1) Must be representative of the range of disciplines in a College/School. Half of the members of the College/School Committee shall be elected by the College/School faculty and half appointed by the Dean.

(2) Size will be determined by the tenured faculty of the College/School and a vote of the tenured faculty will be required to change the number of members of the Committee.

d. Faculty Senate Committee: Membership of the Faculty Senate Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee is established by the Senate Bylaws, Article V, Section 17.

e. University Appeals Committee shall consist of:

(1) One tenured faculty elected from each College/School; and

(2) One at-large tenured faculty elected from the Faculty Senate.

3. Areas of Performance: University faculty are reviewed on their performance in three areas: teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

a. Teaching

Teaching is a complex and reflective human activity that, in the higher education context, is offered in a forum that is advanced, semi-public, and essentially critical in nature. No single definition can possibly suffice to cover the range of talents that go into excellent teaching or that could be found across the board in the varied departments and disciplines of an entire college or university. Effective teachers are scholars, researchers, inventors, scientists, creators, artists, professionals, investigators, practitioners or those with advanced expertise or experience who share knowledge, using appropriate methodologies and who demonstrate and encourage enthusiasm about the subject matter in such a way as to leave the student with a lasting and vivid conviction of having benefited from that interaction.

Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work. At the instructional level, the most important responsibilities of a teacher to his/her students include the following:

(1) Content Expertise - to demonstrate knowledge and/or relevant experience: Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters in the relevant learning environment (classroom, on-line, hybrid, field work, etc.), which typically includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.

(2) Instructional Design - to re-order and re-organize this knowledge/experience for student learning: Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences for in-person and online delivery that are conducive to learning for all students in alignment with accessibility requirements.

(3) Instructional Delivery - to communicate and “translate” this knowledge/ experience into a format accessible to students: Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, use an appropriate variety of teaching methods, and use university-supported technological tools including the institutional learning management system to facilitate in-person and online learning.

(4) Instructional Assessment - to evaluate the mastery and other accomplishments of students: Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.

(5) Advising in and Beyond the Classroom - to provide guidance for students as they pursue undergraduate and post-baccalaureate education and/or employment: Effective advisors interact with students to provide career guidance and information, degree program guidance and information (e.g., advice on an appropriate schedule to facilitate graduation), and answers to questions relating to a discipline. Normally, Category I faculty are expected to maintain a minimum of five scheduled office hours per week during the academic semester.

(6) NOTE: Teaching performance will be evaluated based on the teaching done by a faculty member. Faculty who teach less than twelve (12) credit hours each semester will not be penalized for performing other critical duties needed by the Department, College/School, or University. Normally, these responsibilities will be delineated in and accounted for through reassigned time awards and evaluations and documented in Digital Measures.

b. Scholarly Activities

Scholarly and creative activities are disciplinary or interdisciplinary expressions or interpretations that develop ideas, frame questions, create new forms of representation, solve problems, or explore enduring puzzles.

Purposes include, but are not limited to, the following: advancing knowledge or culture through original research or creative activities; interpreting knowledge within or across disciplines; synthesizing information across disciplines, across topics, or across time; aiding society or disciplines in addressing problems; or enhancing knowledge of student learning and effective teaching.

Typically, to be considered scholarship, findings should be disseminated to either peer review by disciplinary scholars or professional or governmental organizations; or critical reflection by a wider community, including corporations or nonprofit organizations, for example.

In addition to these scholarly activities, and depending on the specific Department Guidelines, this category may also include activities in which the faculty member shares other knowledge with members of the learned and professional communities; continued education and professional development activities appropriate to professional status or assignments; and other activities specific to the faculty member’s discipline or assigned responsibilities.

c. Service

Faculty engage in service when they participate in the shared governance and facilitate the good functioning of the institution. Service to the institution can be at the program, department, school, or college or university level. Beyond the institution, faculty engage in service when they use their disciplinary and/or professional expertise and talents to contribute to the betterment of their multiple environments, such as regional communities, professional and disciplinary associations, non-profit organizations, or government agencies. Examples of service might include (but are not limited to):

(1) Committee participation

(2) Committee leadership

(3) Program or department contributions

(4) Board participation

(5) Unpaid public service to community and/or professional organizations

(6) Contributions to disciplinary associations

(7) Other

d. Projects and tasks completed or undertaken on reassigned time will be evaluated in accordance with the three areas of performance delineated above as appropriate, e.g., service activities for which the faculty member received reassigned time will be evaluated as Service.

4. Periods of review

a. Tenure-track years 1 through 5: Portfolios for Category I faculty seeking reappointment in tenure-track years 1 through 5 are cumulative. Each portfolio should document faculty accomplishments from the beginning of the first tenure-track year up to the time at which the portfolio is submitted for review. Faculty who have received years of credit toward eligibility for tenure for previous tenure-track appointments should document their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service during those years.

b. Tenure: Portfolios for Category I faculty seeking tenure in years 4, 5, or 6 are cumulative. Each portfolio should document faculty accomplishments from the beginning of the first tenure-track year up to the time at which the portfolio is submitted for review. Faculty who have received years of credit toward eligibility for tenure for previous tenure-track appointments should document their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service during those years.

c. Promotion to full professor: Promotion portfolios will document accomplishments from the date on which the portfolio was submitted for the tenure review up to the date on which the promotion portfolio is submitted. Any accomplishment for which the candidate received credit during the tenure review may not also be counted toward the promotion to full professor evaluation.

d. Post-tenure review: PTR portfolios will document accomplishments from the date on which the portfolio was submitted for the previous major review (tenure, promotion, or PTR) up to the date on which the current PTR portfolio is submitted.

5. Evaluation under extreme circumstances

a. Should there be a case of a campus wide/state-wide/nation-wide emergency, departments shall be flexible, in accordance with accreditation, during the ongoing RTP/PTR process. Those serving on all level of review for RTP/PTR shall take into consideration the constraints these events have on faculty as they perform their required duties. All levels of review shall take into consideration the ways in which a declared emergency impacts faculty performance in their reviews as required by the Handbook. Such considerations may include, but are not limited to:

(1) granting credit to a faculty member who has been accepted to present at a conference which is subsequently cancelled due to the crisis;

(2) recognizing, and making allowances for, the effects that such crises may have on SRI scores;

(3) Recognizing, and making allowances for, the constraints on scholarship and service that will result from limitations on travel or the suspension of MSU Denver programs that support faculty scholarship (e.g., Sabbatical, Provost Mini-grant, etc.).

(4) Recognizing, and making allowances for, the effects of state or national crises on faculty grant-making activities.

These considerations will apply to all faculty evaluations (retention, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) and to all categories of faculty.

D. Departmental Guidelines

In accordance with AAUP Guidelines, this section delineates requirements for discipline-specific guidelines that clearly describe performance expectations for tenure-line faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, a successful post-tenure review, and/or emeritus status.

1. Differences in disciplines and faculty activities among departments will be reflected in the Departmental Guidelines for teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

2. Departmental Guidelines shall include specific criteria, not inconsistent with the definition of each area of performance, for teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

3. All Departmental Guidelines shall establish rigorous performance standards consistent with the goal of academic excellence. Departments should clearly delineate among expectations for successful reviews at each level, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, successful post tenure review, and emeritus status.

4. Departmental Guidelines must include qualitative and, if appropriate, quantitative standards of achievement and examples of activities for achieving each review status.

5. Departmental Guidelines shall also be the basis for the narrative used for tenure and promotion evaluation and Post-Tenure Review.

6. Departments may use guidelines to establish expectations for additional review activities, such as peer observations.

7. Each Department Chair, with the input and advice of departmental faculty, shall write guidelines specific to the needs of the Department pertaining to the performance areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service, which are consistent with the College/School and University’s mission statements.

8. Departmental Guidelines must be approved before they take effect.

a. To ensure College/School-level equity in Departmental Guidelines performance standards, the College/School Dean will convene a Committee of all Department Chairs in the fall semester to review all Departmental Guidelines and recommend changes or forward to the Dean and Provost for approval.

b. In the event there is disagreement concerning Departmental Guidelines content, the Provost will make the final decision.

c. Departmental Guidelines should be reviewed annually, but only updated if deemed necessary. If Departmental Guidelines are changed, the Chair must submit the current Departmental Guidelines and revised Departmental Guidelines, highlighting and explaining the rationale for any changes, to the College/School Committee of Department Chairs, the College/School Dean, and Provost for approval no later than March 1 of each year. The Provost may make revisions to such Departmental Guidelines.

(1) The revised Departmental Guidelines will be effective immediately for faculty hired in the next academic year.

(2) For tenure-track faculty members the revised Departmental Guidelines will be effective upon completion of their tenure review.

(3) For tenured faculty members the revised Departmental Guidelines will be effective upon completion of their next significant evaluation (i.e., promotion or post-tenure review) or immediately, if the next significant evaluation is more than three years away.

(4) Under extremely rare circumstances, changes can be made effective immediately (triggered, for example, by discipline-specific accreditation standards) if a majority of tenure-line faculty in an academic department and the relevant College/School Dean agree such changes are needed and reasonable.

E. Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities

1. Responsibilities common to each and every level of review:

a. Must maintain the strictest confidentiality of faculty portfolios:

Except as may be allowed by the open records law (Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.) §24-72-201, et seq.) or if granted permission by the faculty member, access to faculty Portfolios is limited to the candidate, the members of all recommending bodies, the President, the appropriate University staff, the Board of Trustees, and the University Appeals Committee as may be required;

b. Must show sensitivity when evaluating both the numerical SRIs and the subjective student comments (to the extent that they may be reviewed by individual reviewers) that may be related, explicitly or implicitly, to personal characteristics of faculty members. Any overt or subtle statements or other signs of racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism, genderism, or xenophobia must be completely ignored. In reviewing numerical SRIs, reviewers must ignore patterns that may emerge regarding scores for ‘Faculty Contribution to the Course’ which may reflect personal bias. Examples include SRI scores that appear lower (or higher) than other criteria of faculty evaluation might suggest (e.g., peer observations, faculty narrative, or supplemental materials supplied by students such as letters of appreciation). In reviewing subjective student comments, appropriate sensitivity must be maintained when observing even the slightest hint of bias about any personal characteristics of faculty members, as opposed to substantive comments that relate directly to the “Course as a Whole” and “Faculty Contribution to the Course”;

c. May ask for information not presented in the Portfolio by submitting a written request to the Provost with a copy sent to the faculty member at the same time. The faculty member will be provided copies of the correspondence to and from the Provost and have the opportunity to respond according to section II.C.1.b.(4)(a)(iv) of this Handbook. Such Provost-approved additional information shall become part of the faculty member’s Portfolio;

d. Shall review the Portfolio using departmental guidelines to determine the recommendations to be included in the Letter of Review;

e. Shall write a Letter of Review as defined in section II.C.1.b.(4) of this Handbook, and submit the Letter of Review to the candidate’s Portfolio no later than the first day of the next review level so that all previous review levels, the Faculty Candidate, and subsequent reviewers have access to it; and

f. Shall retain a record of procedures, actions, votes (in the case of review committees), recommendations, and comments until time limits for appeals have expired.

2. Responsibilities common to specific levels of review:

a. Faculty Candidates for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, or Post-Tenure Review

(1) Must maintain a Portfolio that contains information sufficient to permit evaluation of their performance for purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review;

(2) Must update Portfolios as required by Procedural Calendar deadlines;

(3) Shall update and submit the Portfolio to the first level of review, either the department chair or the Department/Peer Review Committee chair, in accordance with deadlines specified in the Procedural Calendar;

(4) May respond to any Letter of Review within seven calendar days of the deadline for submission of the evaluation letter as specified in the Procedural Calendar

(5) Faculty hired on joint appointments will select one Department at time of hire for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

b. Department/Peer Review Committee

(1) Shall comply with all responsibilities delineated in section II.E.1. of this Handbook;

(2) Shall determine all decisions based on a simple majority vote of Committee Members; and

(3) Shall elect a Chair from among members, who will:

(a) Record the Committee vote on the Portfolio Review Screen; and

(b) Prepare a Letter of Review reflecting the Committee’s recommendation (any Committee member may provide additional signed comments).

c. Department Chair

(1) Must review each faculty member’s Portfolio for accuracy and for compliance with the Guidebook for Portfolio Preparation, which is maintained on the Faculty Affairs webpage;

(2) Should suggest to the faculty member the addition of missing material and/or request clarification of material before the Portfolio leaves the department (NOTE: Any alterations made at this point to the Portfolio do not require approval by the Provost); and

(3) Shall meet annually with tenure-track faculty to review requirements for items included in the Portfolio and answer any questions raised by the candidate’s performance review.

d. College/School Review Committee

(1) Shall comply with all responsibilities delineated in section II.E.1. of this Handbook;

(2) Shall determine all decisions based on a simple majority vote of Committee Members;

(3) Shall elect a Chair from among members, who will:

(a) Record the Committee vote on the Portfolio cover sheet; and

(b) Prepare a Letter of Review reflecting the Committee’s recommendation; any Committee member may provide additional signed comments.

e. College/School Dean

(1) The College/School Dean has the authority to reappoint tenure-track faculty in years 1, 2, 4, and 5, and to make final decisions on post-tenure review candidates (subject to the appeal mechanisms described below.)

(2) Shall comply with all responsibilities delineated in section II.E.1. of this Handbook.

f. Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (FSRTPC)

(1) Shall comply with all responsibilities delineated in section II.E.1. of this Handbook;

(2) Shall determine all decisions based on a simple majority vote of Committee Members; and

(3) Shall elect a Chair from among members, who will: (a) Record the Committee vote on the Portfolio cover sheet; and

(b) Prepare a Letter of Review reflecting the Committee’s recommendation (any Committee member may provide additional signed comments).

g. University Appeals Committee

(1) Shall hear appeals, if requested by the faculty member, of any Post-Tenure Review cases in which the Dean assigns a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any area of evaluation;

(2) Shall hear appeals, if requested by the faculty member, of cases in which the Provost or President decline to recommend a candidate for tenure, as specified in Subsection H.5 below;

(3) Shall hear appeals, if requested by the faculty member, of cases in which the Dean or Provost decline to reappoint a faculty member to the next tenure track year, as specified in Subsection G.4 below;

(4) Shall comply with all responsibilities delineated in section II.E.1. of this Handbook;

(5) Shall determine all decisions based on a simple majority vote of Committee Members; and

(6) Shall elect a Chair from among members, who will:

(a) Record the committee vote on the Portfolio Review Screen; and

(b) Prepare a Letter of Review reflecting the Committee’s recommendation (any Committee member may provide additional signed comments).

h. Office of the Provost

(1) Shall provide written suggestions for the preparation of Portfolios in the Guidebook for Portfolio Preparation;

(2) Shall publish procedural timetables for reappointment, promotion, tenure review, post-tenure review, and emeritus status and distribute to faculty and academic administrators;

(3) Shall publish any forms and documents used in the reappointment, tenure review, promotion, post-tenure review, and emeritus status;

(4) Shall notify affected faculty of approved changes to Department Guidelines by the last day of classes each spring semester;

(5) Shall, in the sixth tenure-track year, indicate in writing to eligible faculty that the tenure process should be initiated;

(6) Shall archive each tenure Portfolio as part of the faculty member’s official records (NOTE: Reappointment, promotion, and post-tenure review Portfolios are the property of the faculty member, will not become part of the faculty member’s official records, and may be archived for the sole purpose of providing a copy to said faculty member in future years upon request); and

(7) Shall, in the event of an appeal of any retention, tenure, or post-tenure review decision, make available to relevant parties any relevant Portfolios until the appeal process is completed.

F. Review Process Steps

Depending upon whether the review is for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure, the review process may involve up to nine steps, which are:

1. Portfolio Submission

2. The Department Review Committee

3. The Department Chair (NOTE: In the case of a Department Chair being a candidate for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and/or post-tenure review, the recommendation of a Peer Review Committee, comprising at least three other Department Chairs appointed by the College/School Dean, will substitute for the recommendation of the Chair. In such cases, the Department Chair will still review the reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review portfolios for other candidates within that Department.)

4. The College/School Committee

5. The College/School Dean

6. The Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (FSRTPC)

7. The Provost

8. The President

9. Board of Trustees

G. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. General Policies

a. Reappointment policies and procedures are intended to support faculty in meeting the University criteria for tenure.

b. Tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually.

c. It is the responsibility of the faculty candidate to seek advice and assistance in efforts to achieve reappointment and prepare for the tenure evaluation.

d. A Portfolio is required for all reviews.

e. Portfolios will be due at a time set by the Procedural Calendar.

f. The faculty member must meet the contractual responsibilities defined in this Handbook and adhere to all policies and procedures set forth in this Handbook as a prerequisite to reappointment consideration.

2. Special Cases

a. Leaves of absence (medical leave or leave without pay):

(1) Faculty granted a leave of absence for less than a full semester will submit a Portfolio to evaluate their activity only during that part of the year in which they were fulfilling their responsibilities as a faculty member.

(2) Faculty on leave for one or more semesters will have no evaluation conducted during that time.

(3) A faculty member on leave for one or more semesters in an academic year can choose whether to have that academic year counted toward eligibility for tenure. Within 30 days of the beginning of the semester following the conclusion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a written statement to the Department Chair and Dean indicating whether they want that academic year to count toward such eligibility. The Dean shall forward that statement to the Provost or Provost’s designee.

(4) The Provost may extend (at the Provost’s sole discretion) a faculty member’s tenure-track period toward tenure for an additional year if there are extenuating circumstances.

3. Criteria for Reappointment

Candidates for reappointment will be evaluated in the performance areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service as outlined in section II.C.3. above, and as further delineated in Departmental Evaluation Guidelines in section II.D. above.

4. Procedures for Reappointment

a. Portfolios for candidates for retention shall automatically progress to next review level; recommendations made at each level are not binding on any subsequent level.

b. The College/School Dean has the authority to reappoint tenure track faculty in years 1, 2, 4, and 5.

c. In tenure track years 1, 2, 4, and 5, if the Dean does not reappoint a faculty member to the next tenure track year, the faculty member may appeal that decision to the University Appeals Committee.

(1) Upon being notified that the Dean is not reappointing the faculty member to the next tenure track year, the faculty member will have seven calendar days to notify the Dean in writing that they are appealing that decision.

(2) After the faculty member has notified the Dean that they are appealing the decision, the Dean will have five business days to notify the University Appeals Committee of the appeal and to provide to the University Appeals Committee all materials pertaining to the faculty member’s retention portfolio.

(3) Upon being notified of the appeal, the University Appeals Committee will have 20 business days to complete their review of the portfolio and to submit their recommendation to the Provost.

(4) The recommendations of the University Appeals Committee, along with the candidate’s portfolio, will be reviewed by the Provost, who will make the final decision regarding reappointment within 20 business days. In such cases, the Provost’s decision is final and is not appealable.

d. The Provost has the authority to reappoint tenure track faculty in year 3.

e. In tenure track year 3, if the Provost does not reappoint a faculty member to the next tenure track year, the faculty member may appeal that decision to the University Appeals Committee.

(1) Upon being notified that the Provost is not reappointing the faculty member to the next tenure track year, the faculty member will have seven calendar days to notify the Provost in writing that they are appealing that decision.

(2) After the faculty member has notified the Provost that they are appealing the decision, the Provost will have five business days to notify the University Appeals Committee of the appeal and to provide to the University Appeals Committee all materials pertaining to the faculty member’s retention portfolio.

(3) Upon being notified of the appeal, the University Appeals Committee will have 20 business days to complete their review of the portfolio and to submit their recommendation to the President.

(4) The recommendations of the University Appeals Committee, along with the candidate’s portfolio, will be reviewed by the President, who will make the final decision regarding reappointment within 20 business days. In such cases, the President’s decision is final and is not appealable.

f. Review committee members are obliged to vote for or against recommending retention of each application before the committee.

g. Review procedures for reappointment will differ as stated below.

(1) First Year - During the Spring Semester of year one, as defined in the Procedural Calendar:

(a) Each tenure-track faculty member will, for review by the Department Chair and College/School Dean for purposes of reappointment, submit:

(i) Annotated Curriculum Vitae; and

(ii) All Student Ratings of Instruction.

(2) Second Year - In the Fall Semester of year two:

(a) Each tenure-track faculty member will, for review by the Department Chair and College/School Dean for purposes of reappointment, submit a:

(i) Annotated Curriculum Vitae;

(ii) All Student Ratings of Instruction;

(iii) A Narrative Statement (1-3 pages in length);

(iv) Previous review letters by the levels of review from year one and any relevant responses by the faculty member; and

(v) All reassigned time evaluations and reports, if relevant.

(3) Third Year - In the Fall Semester of year three:

(a) Each tenure-track faculty member will submit a Portfolio, consisting of the following materials for review:

(i) Annotated Curriculum Vitae;

(ii) All Student Ratings of Instruction,

(iii) A Narrative Statement, two-to-five pages in length;

(iv) All previous review letters by the levels of review for reappointment and any relevant responses by the faculty member;

(v) All reassigned time evaluations and reports, if relevant; and

(vi) Selected additional materials for review (a minimum of four items and a maximum of nine items).

(b) These items will be reviewed by the Department/Peer Review Committee; Department Chair; College/School Review Committee; College/School Dean; the FSRTPC; and the Provost for purposes of reappointment.

(4) Fourth Year - In the Fall Semester of year four:

(a) Each tenure-track faculty member will, for review by the Department Chair and College/School Dean for purposes of reappointment, submit a:

(i) Annotated Curriculum Vitae;

(ii) All Student Ratings of Instruction;

(iii) All previous review letters by the levels of review for reappointment and any relevant responses by the faculty member;

(iv) All reassigned time evaluations and reports, if relevant;

(v) If the review letters for year three indicate specific areas of concern that may prevent a successful tenure application, relevant documentation addressing progress on such areas should be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio for year four.

(5) Fifth Year - In the Fall Semester of year five:

(a) Each tenure-track faculty member will, for review by the Department Chair, and College/School Dean, for purposes of reappointment submit:

(i) Annotated Curriculum Vitae;

(ii) All Student Ratings of Instruction;

(iii) All previous review letters by the levels of review for reappointment and any relevant responses by the faculty member;

(iv) All reassigned time evaluations and reports, if relevant;

(v) If the review letters for year four indicate specific areas of concern that may prevent a successful tenure application, relevant documentation addressing progress on such areas should be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio for year five.

H. Tenure

1. General Policies

a. An award of tenure is not a right, but a privilege, which must be earned on the basis of performance during a tenure-track period, as evaluated by peers, appropriate administrators (as defined herein, e.g., Academic Dean, Provost, etc.), the President and the Board of Trustees.

b. Tenure is not acquired automatically by length of service.

c. An award of tenure can only be granted or revoked by the Board of Trustees.

d. An award of tenure shall begin with the first day of the subsequent academic year contract.

e. Eligible faculty may submit an application for tenure during their fourth, fifth, or sixth tenure-track year.

f. Tenure applications submitted during the fourth or fifth tenure-track years shall be considered in accordance with the same Handbook and institutional criteria, policies, procedures, and timetables applicable to other tenure applications submitted during the sixth tenure-track year.

g. A faculty member on leave for one or more semesters in an academic year can choose whether to have that academic year counted toward eligibility for tenure. Within 30 days of the beginning of the semester following the conclusion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a written statement to the Department Chair and Dean indicating whether they want that academic year to count toward such eligibility. The Dean shall forward that statement to the Provost or Provost’s designee.

h. Temporary contracts and contracts for less than a full academic year shall not be counted in determining eligibility for consideration for tenure.

i. Faculty who are denied tenure in the sixth tenure-track year will be offered a one-year terminal contract for the following academic year. The President may, at his or her discretion, offer additional one-year contracts to any such faculty member.

j. In all cases, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to apply for tenure. Failure to apply for tenure by the sixth-year deadline will result in an offer of a terminal seventh year contract for the next academic year, followed by automatic non-renewal at the end of that terminal contract. A faculty member could be hired into a non-tenure/non-tenure track position after the termination of the tenure-track employment contract. However, this would be accomplished with a separate employment agreement.

k. An application by an Assistant Professor for tenure also will constitute an application for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The Portfolio must be submitted to the Department/Peer Review Committee Chair to begin the review process for promotion.

2. Eligibility for Tenure

a. Only Category I faculty who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor, may acquire tenure.

b. Candidates applying for tenure in their fourth or fifth tenure-track year may withdraw their applications at any point without prejudice.

c. When a faculty member applies for tenure in the fourth or fifth tenure-track year, each level of review must submit a recommendation regarding reappointment as well as tenure. This recommendation shall be included in the tenure evaluation letter submitted by the review level and included in the votes recorded by that review level in the electronic portfolio review system.

d. Candidates applying for tenure in their sixth tenure-track year who withdraw their applications for tenure will receive a one-year terminal contract and will not be eligible for tenure review at the conclusion of the terminal year.

e. Except as provided herein, administrators, non-instructional personnel, athletic coaches, and faculty on temporary contracts (whether full- or part-time) are not eligible for tenure.

3. Criteria for Tenure

a. Candidates for tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service as defined above and as may be further delineated by Department Guidelines.

4. Procedures for Tenure

a. Portfolios for candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall automatically progress to the next review level; recommendations made at each level are not binding on any subsequent level.

b. In the Fall Semester of the academic year, candidates for tenure must submit a Portfolio, consisting of the following materials for review:

(1) Annotated Curriculum Vitae;

(2) All Student Ratings of Instruction;

(3) A Narrative Statement, three-to-eight (3-8) pages in length;

(4) All previous review letters by the levels of review for reappointment and any relevant responses by the faculty member;

(5) All reassigned time evaluations and reports, if relevant; and

(6) Selected additional materials for review (a minimum of four items and a maximum of nine items).

c. These items will be reviewed by the Department/Peer Review Committee; Department Chair; College/School Review Committee; College/School Dean; and Faculty Senate Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee. NOTE: In the case of a Department Chair being evaluated for tenure, the recommendation of a Peer Review Committee, comprising at least three other Department Chairs appointed by the College/School Dean, will substitute for the recommendation of the Chair. The Department Chair will still evaluate the portfolios of other members of the Department undergoing retention, tenure, or promotion reviews.

d. A majority of members eligible to vote at each of the Department/Peer Review, College/School or University Committees must vote in favor of awarding tenure in order for tenure to be recommended at that level. Review Committee members are obliged to vote for or against recommending approval of each application before the Committee. Failure to recommend tenure shall not preclude a faculty member’s application for tenure from proceeding to the next level of the review process.

e. Role of the Provost in the tenure/promotion to Associate Professor review process:

(1) Upon review of the recommendations made by prior levels of review, the Provost will decide whether to recommend to the President that the candidate be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

(2) If there is disagreement in the recommendations for tenure at any previous level of review, the Provost shall convene a reconciliation meeting. Participants shall include individual reviewers—e.g., Department Chair and College/School Dean—and the Chairs of the Department, College/School, and FSRTP Committees.

(a) This meeting shall take place within seven days after the designated deadline for the candidate to respond to the Faculty Senate RTP Committee.

(b) The candidate shall not be a part of this meeting.

(c) The purposes of the meeting will be twofold:

(i) To understand the reasoning behind the differing evaluations; and

(ii) To attempt to resolve differences before the Provost decides whether to recommend the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

(3) If the Provost recommends the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the portfolio, along with the Provost’s recommendation, will be forwarded to the President;

(4) If the Provost does not recommend the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the portfolio will not be forwarded to the President;

(5) The Provost’s decision to not recommend tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is appealable. Procedures for such appeal are detailed in Subsection 5, below.

f. Role of the President in the tenure/promotion to Associate Professor review process:

(1) Of the candidates recommended by the Provost for tenure, the President shall decide whom to recommend to the Board of Trustees for tenure.

(2) Only candidates recommended by the President for tenure will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

(3) The President’s decision to not recommend tenure is appealable. Procedures for such appeal are detailed below in Subsection 5.

(4) Among candidates granted tenure by the Board of Trustees, the final responsibility for awarding promotion to Associate Professor rests with the President.

g. Role of the Board of Trustees in granting tenure: The final responsibility for award or denial of tenure rests with the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the President.

5. Appeal of Tenure Denial

a. A candidate in the sixth tenure-track year who receives notice that he or she will not be recommended by the Provost to the President and Board of Trustees for an award of tenure may request reconsideration.

(1) Basis for reconsideration shall be limited to direct evidence of a procedural or substantive error in the review process. The candidate must appeal to the Chair of the University Appeals Committee within 10 working days of receiving notice of the denial.

(2) The University Appeals Committee will review the information submitted according to its most current procedures.

(3) The candidate will have the opportunity for a hearing in front of the University Appeals Committee should the University Appeals Committee determine it is warranted and other resolution is not reached.

(4) Within 20 business days of receiving the request for reconsideration, the University Appeals Committee must submit a written recommendation and rationale to either uphold or reconsider the Provost’s decision to not recommend the faculty member for tenure. The University Appeals Committee recommendation shall be shared with the Provost and the appellant and forwarded along with the Provost’s recommendation to the President.

(5) Within 20 business days of receiving the recommendations of the Provost and University Appeals Committee, the President will make the final decision regarding the appeal. If the President upholds the appeal, the President will recommend the candidate for tenure to the Board of Trustees. Only positive decisions will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.

(6) If the President denies the candidate’s appeal, the candidate’s application for tenure is denied, and the candidate’s application will not be presented to the Board of Trustees for consideration. Faculty who are denied tenure in the sixth tenure-track year will be offered a one-year terminal contract for the following academic year. The President may, at his or her discretion, offer additional one-year contracts to any such faculty member.

b. A candidate in the sixth tenure-track year who, after having been recommended for tenure by the Provost, receives notice that s/he will not be recommended for tenure by the President may request reconsideration.

(1) Basis for reconsideration shall be limited to direct evidence of a procedural or substantive error in the review process. The candidate must appeal to the Chair of the University Appeals Committee within 10 working days of receiving notice of the denial.

(2) The University Appeals Committee will review the information submitted according to its most current procedures.

(3) The candidate will have the opportunity for a hearing in front of the University Appeals Committee should the University Appeals Committee determine it is warranted and other resolution is not reached.

(4) Within 20 business days of receiving the request for reconsideration, the University Appeals Committee must submit a written recommendation and rationale to either uphold or reconsider the President’s original decision to not recommend the faculty member for tenure. The University Appeals Committee recommendation shall be shared with the President and the appellant.

(5) Within 20 business days of receiving the recommendations of the Provost and University Appeals Committee, the President will review the recommendation of the University Appeals Committee, and make a decision regarding whether to alter his/her original decision. If the President decides to reverse his/her original decision, the candidate will be recommended for tenure to the Board of Trustees.

(6) If the University Appeals Committee recommends the candidate be considered for tenure yet the President upholds the original decision, the candidate’s application for tenure will be presented to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees will review all previous levels of review and make a final decision based on best practices. Faculty who are denied tenure in the sixth tenure-track year will be offered a one-year terminal contract for the following academic year. The President may, at his or her discretion, offer additional one-year contracts to any such faculty member.

c. Tenure applications submitted during the fourth or fifth tenure-track years shall be considered in accordance with the same Handbook and institutional criteria, policies, procedures, and timetables applicable to other tenure applications submitted during the sixth tenure-track year. If a candidate is not successful in the fourth or fifth years he or she may still apply for tenure in the subsequent year(s).

d. Unsuccessful candidates for tenure during the fourth or fifth tenure-track years may be reappointed according to the normal policies and procedures articulated in this Handbook.

e. There is no appeal for the denial of tenure for candidates in the fourth or fifth tenure-track years.

6. Granting Year(s) of Credit toward Earning Tenure

a. Year(s) of credit toward earning tenure must be offered in writing at the time of initial appointment toward tenure-track status. The candidate must accept or reject the service credit offer no later than December 15 of the appointment year for a fall appointment or no later than May 15 of the appointment year for a spring appointment.

b. Years of credit may be awarded for tenure track faculty service at a four-year accredited institution of higher education, or comparable experience (e.g., faculty who served in full-time positions at institutions of higher education which do not offer tenure).

c. A year of service for faculty in an academic year position is two consecutive semesters, or the equivalent. A year of service for faculty in a 12-month position is 12 months of full-time employment. A maximum of two years credit may be offered.

7. Tenure Upon Appointment/Immediate Tenure - Tenure may be granted to a faculty member upon appointment subject to the following:

a. Upon a request of a Chair or a Department Search Committee that a faculty candidate be awarded tenure upon appointment, a majority of the tenured faculty of the affected Department must recommend to support such a request. Any such candidate must meet the following criteria:

(1) The appointee was previously tenured at a regionally accredited, baccalaureate-granting institution of higher education; or

(2) The appointee has achieved recognized, outstanding distinction in public service or the private sector.

b. If the tenured faculty members of the Department recommend that tenure upon appointment be awarded, that recommendation shall be reviewed by the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost, who shall each make a recommendation to the President.

c. After review of the prior recommendations, the President may recommend to the Board of Trustees that a candidate be appointed with tenure.

d. Per section II.H.4.g. above, the Board of Trustees retains the final decision-making authority regarding the conferring of tenure.

8. Faculty Tenure for Academic Administrators

a. The President may recommend to the Board of Trustees that an academic administrator be awarded tenure upon appointment as an academic administrator if:

(1) The administrator has been previously tenured at a regionally accredited, baccalaureate-granting institution of higher education; or

(2) The administrator has achieved recognized, outstanding distinction in public service or the private sector.

(3) The immediate supervisor of the academic administrator, as well as the chair and tenured faculty in the affected department, shall be consulted and shall be provided an opportunity to vote and make a written recommendation.

b. Normally, individuals appointed to an academic administrative position should negotiate for tenure rights at the time of hire; the President may make an exception based on consultation with the relevant Department Tenured Faculty and Chair, College/School Dean, and the Provost.

c. Rights of an Academic Administrator with Tenure

(1) An academic administrator awarded tenure will have the rights of a tenured faculty member upon returning to faculty status.

(2) Up to one year of service as an interim administrator may count toward seniority as a faculty member.

(3) Tenure is a relevant, but not a dispositive, factor if there is a reduction in force within a program.

(4) Academic administrators may not use the appeal process available to terminated faculty to appeal termination of their administrative positions.

d. Tenure for the President will be governed by procedures established by the Board of Trustees.

I. Promotion

1. Candidates for promotion will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service as indicated above and as further delineated in Departmental Evaluation Guidelines.

2. In addition, candidates for promotion must:

a. Meet the performance expectations defined in this Handbook;

b. Adhere to all applicable policies set forth in this Handbook as a prerequisite to promotion; and

c. Have met the following minimum time-in-rank to be eligible for promotion to a higher rank, regardless of discipline:

(1) Instructors—no requirement.

(2) Assistant Professor—no requirement.

(3) Associate Professor—a minimum of six years total in rank as Assistant Professor at a regionally accredited baccalaureate-granting institution of higher education, two of which must have been at MSU Denver; the six-year minimum may be relaxed for faculty seeking the award of tenure and simultaneous appointment to the rank of Associate Professor during the fourth or fifth tenure-track year.

(4) Professor—a minimum of four years in rank as Associate Professor at a regionally accredited baccalaureate-granting institution of higher education, two of which must have been at MSU Denver.

d. In determining years in rank, the current year (year in progress) during which application for promotion is made is counted as a year of service toward the requirement for time in rank.

e. A faculty member on leave for one or more semesters in an academic year can choose whether to have that academic year counted toward eligibility for promotion. Within 30 days of the beginning of the semester following the conclusion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a written statement to the Department Chair and Dean indicating whether they want that academic year to count toward such eligibility. The Dean shall forward that statement to the Provost or the Provost’s designee.

3. For promotion to Professor, there is an expectation for a record of significant accomplishment in all three areas of evaluation.

4. Procedures for Promotion

a. Reviews for promotion to Professor include: The Department RTP Committee, Department Chair, School/College RTP Committee, School/College Dean, FSRTPC, and Provost. NOTE: In the case of a Department Chair being evaluated for promotion, the recommendation of a Peer Review Committee, comprising at least three other Department Chairs appointed by the College/School Dean, will substitute for the recommendation of the Chair. The Department Chair will still evaluate the portfolios of other members of the Department undergoing promotion.

b. Portfolios for candidates for promotion to Professor shall automatically progress to the next review level; recommendations made at each level are not binding on any subsequent level.

c. If there is disagreement in the recommendations for promotion to Professor at any previous level of review, the Provost shall convene a reconciliation meeting. Participants shall include individual reviewers—e.g., Department Chair and College/School Dean—and the Chairs of the Department, College/School, and FSRTP Committees.

(1) This meeting shall take place within seven days after the designated deadline for the candidate to respond to the Faculty Senate RTP Committee.

(2) The candidate shall not be a part of this meeting.

(3) The purposes of the meeting will be twofold:

(a) To understand the reasoning behind the differing evaluations; and

(b) To attempt to resolve differences before the Provost decides whether to award the candidate promotion to Professor.

d. The decision by the Provost to not award a candidate promotion to Professor is not appealable.

5. Portfolios for Promotion shall include the following:

a. Promotion to Associate Professor

(1) Faculty seeking the award of tenure may submit the same Portfolio for simultaneous promotion to Associate Professor.

(2) Faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor without application for tenure shall include the same documentation items as delineated below for Portfolios for promotion to Professor.

b. Promotion to Professor

(1) Narrative Statement: 3-8 pages in length

(2) Annotated Curriculum Vitae

(3) Student Ratings of Instruction and student comments since the date on which the tenure portfolio was submitted.

(4) Letters of review and faculty responses (if any) since the date on which the tenure portfolio was submitted.

(5) Reassigned time reports and evaluations, when relevant, since the date on which the tenure portfolio was submitted.

(6) Selected additional materials for review—a minimum of four and a maximum of nine.

(7) Supplementary documentation and other official and relevant information as determined by the Provost.

c. There is no appeal for a denial of promotion.

d. A faculty member who is denied promotion may apply for promotion in any subsequent year.

e. A majority of members voting at each of the Department, College/School or University Committees must vote in favor of awarding promotion in order for a promotion to be recommended at that level. Review committee members are obliged to vote for or against recommending approval of each application before the committee. Failure to recommend promotion shall not preclude a faculty member’s application for promotion from proceeding to the next level of the review process.

6. Promotion of faculty serving in administrative positions: Faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor who serve in administrative positions have the right to apply for promotion to Professor upon meeting the eligibility requirements specified in this Handbook, section II.I.

In order for the time spent in the administrative position to count toward the promotion time-in-service criterion, the administrator must:

1. Teach at least three credits per year (fall, spring or summer);

2. Engage in scholarly activities as specified in Department guidelines; and

3. Engage in service activities as required in Department guidelines.

The faculty member should negotiate these arrangements with the appointing authority, in consultation with the Chair of the faculty member’s home Department, prior to the administrative appointment. This negotiation shall result in a memorandum that articulates: 1) the teaching expectations for the candidate, with regard to advising obligations, assigned courses, and course scheduling; and 2) the type and quantity of service activities the candidate would need in order to meet Departmental standards.

Faculty serving in administrative positions have responsibilities and time constraints inherent to their administrative duties. These constraints and duties must be given appropriate consideration by all reviewers involved in making decisions on the administrator’s promotion portfolio. Department RTP Committees and Department Chairs will, in their review letters, address specifically how the candidate has met Departmental standards within the context of the candidate’s administrative responsibilities.

When a faculty member in an administrative position applies for promotion to Professor, reviewers will evaluate the faculty member according to the same Department guidelines as any other faculty member.

Compensation associated with promotion will be determined by Human Resources policies and procedures.

The evaluation process for the promotion of a faculty member in an administrative position will follow the same steps and procedures as those outlined in this Handbook, section II.F. Reviewers will include:

1. The Department RTP Committee from the administrator’s home department;

2. The Chair of the administrator’s home department;

3. The College/School RTP Committee from the administrator’s home college/school;

4. The Dean of the administrator’s home college/school (NOTE: In the event that the candidate is a Dean, a peer-committee comprised of at least a majority of the other Deans will conduct the Step 4 review);

5. The Faculty Senate RTP Committee; and

6. The Provost.

J. Post-Tenure Review

1. General Policies

a. Post-tenure review is a comprehensive evaluation of the performance of tenured faculty, conducted on a five-year cycle.

b. Where appropriate, faculty may submit a Portfolio for promotion in lieu of a Post-Tenure Review if both reviews occur in the same academic year and if time in rank warrants it.

c. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio according to the appropriate five-year cycle. Failure to submit a Post-tenure review portfolio constitutes a violation of contractual obligations.

2. Post-Tenure Review Policies

a. Faculty undergoing Post-Tenure Review will be evaluated in the performance areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service as outlined in section II.C.3 above, and as further delineated in Departmental Evaluation Guidelines defined in section II.D.

b. No later than the deadline specified in the Procedural Calendar and every fifth year after the last comprehensive evaluation, the tenured faculty member shall prepare and submit a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio (*see* section II.J.2.d. below).

c. A faculty member on leave for one or more semesters in an academic year can choose whether to have that academic year counted toward eligibility for Post Tenure Review. Within 30 days of the beginning of the semester following the conclusion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a written statement to the Department Chair and Dean indicating whether they want that academic year to count toward such eligibility. The Dean shall forward that statement to the Provost or the Provost’s designee.

d. Post-Tenure Review Portfolio shall include the following:

(1) Portfolio Review Screen

(2) Narrative Statement—1-3 pages in length

(3) Annotated Curriculum Vitae

(4) All Student Ratings of Instruction since the last comprehensive evaluation.

(5) All Reassigned Time Evaluations since the last comprehensive evaluation.

(6) Letters of Review from the most recent comprehensive evaluation, e.g., tenure, promotion, or post tenure review.

e. Following faculty submission of a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio, reviews shall be conducted by the following:

(1) The Department Review Committee

(2) The Department Chair. NOTE: In the case of a Department Chair being evaluated for Post-Tenure Review, the recommendation of a Peer Review Committee, comprising at least three other Department Chairs appointed by the College/School Dean, will substitute for the recommendation of the Chair. The Department Chair will still evaluate the portfolios of other members of the Department undergoing PTR.

(3) The College/School Dean. If the College/School Dean determines that the faculty member has successfully met standards for PTR, the review process will be complete, and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle starting at the beginning of the next fall semester.

(4) The University Appeals Committee: In the event that the Dean determines that a faculty member needs improvement, the faculty member may appeal to the University Appeals Committee.

(a) Upon being notified that the Dean has determined that a faculty member needs improvement, the faculty member will have seven calendar days to notify the Dean in writing that they are appealing that decision.

(b) After the faculty member has notified the Dean that they are appealing the decision, the Dean will have five business days to notify the University Appeals Committee of the appeal and to provide to the University Appeals Committee all materials pertaining to the faculty member’s Post-Tenure Review portfolio.

(c) Upon being notified of the appeal, the University Appeals Committee will have 20 business days to review of the portfolio and submit a written recommendation, along with the candidate’s PTR portfolio, to the Provost.

(d) Upon receipt of the recommendation of the University Appeals Committee, the Provost will have 20 business days to make the final determination. In such cases, the Provost’s decision is final and is not appealable.

3. Post-Tenure Performance Improvement Plan: If it is determined that a faculty member needs improvement in any performance area, a post-tenure performance improvement plan (the “Plan”) will be designed to raise the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level using the following process:

a. The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member and the department review committee, will develop a proposed Plan within 90 days of the final decision by the Dean or Provost (in cases of a review by the University Appeals Committee.).

b. The Plan must address the following:

(1) Establish specific goals and requirements, based upon post-tenure review criteria and Department Guidelines, designed to assist the faculty member achieve satisfactory performance;

(2) Specify that the Plan’s goals be met by a specific evaluation date, not to exceed three years from the date the Plan is approved by the Provost with the concurrence of the Dean; and

(3) Describe specific actions to be taken by the faculty member that are designed to help the faculty member achieve the goals.

c. The Chair will review the proposed Plan with the faculty member and submit it to the Dean with the faculty member’s comments.

d. The Dean, after consultation with the Chair and the faculty member, will approve the Plan as presented, or modify the Plan and provide copies of the final Plan to the Chair and the faculty member.

e. A faculty member who is dissatisfied with the Plan as approved or modified by the Dean may appeal to the Provost by submitting written objections to the Plan within seven calendar days of receiving the Dean’s decision. The Provost may modify the Plan, after consultation with the Dean and the Chair.

f. Any continuous service requirement of the Plan will be adjusted to the extent necessary to accommodate exceptional circumstances that are inconsistent with such a requirement, including cases in which the faculty member qualifies for forms of extended leave such as sick leave, family leave, or disability leave.

g. Performance Under the Improvement Plan

(1) The Dean, in consultation with the chair of the Department Review Committee, will review the faculty member’s performance under the Plan, and the Dean will make a final determination whether the faculty member has satisfied the terms and conditions of the Plan.

(2) The faculty member shall begin a new five-year cycle of periodic comprehensive evaluations after achieving a satisfactory evaluation of the Improvement Plan.

(3) A faculty member who fails to satisfy the terms and conditions of the Plan with respect to any performance area may be disciplined or placed on a revised plan.

(4) A faculty member who is under a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) remains subject to generally applicable criteria, guidelines, and expectations of performance.