

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION AND TENURE**



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND EXERCISE SCIENCE

(Revision February 15, 2007)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	<u>Page</u>
	TABLE OF CONTENTS 2
I	INTRODUCTION 3
II	PROCEDURES 4 Procedures for Annual Review of Non-Tenured Faculty (Reappointment)..... 4 Procedures for Comprehensive Midpoint Review of Non-Tenured Faculty..... 5 Procedures for the Granting of Tenure..... 5 Procedures for Advancement in Rank (Promotion)..... 6 Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty..... 7 Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty 7 Grievance 10 Revocation of Tenure 11
III	PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE 12 Expectations for Each Rank 12 Teaching, Advising and Mentoring..... 13 Teaching, Advising and Mentoring Indices 13 Teaching, Advising and Mentoring Criteria 13 Research and other Creative Activity..... 14 Research and other Creative Activity Indices 14 Research and other Creative Activity Criteria 15 Service/Outreach 15 Service/Outreach Indices 16 Service/Outreach Criteria 16 APPENDICES A. Time Table for Submission of Materials for Reappointment..... 18 B. Annual Reappointment Application Instructions & Form..... 19 C. Tenure and Promotion Application Instructions 22 D. Instructions for Obtaining External References 23

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The function of this manual is to specifically outline policies and procedures used by the Department of Health and Exercise Science for reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review. This document provides a means by which faculty members can monitor their professional growth and progress toward promotion and/or tenure as well as serving as a vehicle by which the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the department head can objectively evaluate faculty candidates seeking reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as faculty requiring post-tenure review.

This document contains more specific information than both the University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual (hereafter referred to as the AFAPM), or the College Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Related Policies manual. However, the policies and procedures outlining reappointment, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review and related policies contained herein conform to, and are in agreement with the guidelines enumerated in both of those manuals. Therefore, the present manual is not only consistent with University and college policy, but it provides additional information specific to our Department.

The guidelines for reappointment, promotion and tenure contained in this manual are binding (as delineated in the Departmental Code) to all departmental faculty who are presently in a tenure track position. This document, although comprehensive, will need to be updated on a regular basis as University, college and departmental expectations for faculty evolve and change. Faculty should always check with the department head and the Office of the Provost Webpage to assure they are following the most recent guidelines for submitting materials for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

SECTION II

PROCEDURES

Procedures for Annual Review of Non-Tenured Faculty (Reappointment)

1. Each year the probationary faculty member will submit their progress towards tenure report to the Tenure and Promotion Committee as indicated in the timetable issued by the Provost. The report must reflect the Performance Criteria in this document and be submitted as directed in the instructions and format contained in Appendix B. This committee will review the faculty member's development and progress toward the granting of tenure. A written summary of the committee evaluation will be forwarded to the department head and later forwarded unedited to the dean.

Committee Membership:

- a. Tenure and Promotion Committee: all tenured department faculty members or a duly elected committee of tenured faculty members. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in the AFAPM Section K.12.a) of more than half time is eligible to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The committee shall elect a chairperson for a three-year term beginning in the Fall semester. The department head shall not be a member of this committee.

2. The department head and probationary faculty member must jointly discuss (at least once annually) the faculty member's development and fitness for the position involved and prospects for eventually acquiring tenure. The department head will provide the faculty member and dean a written summary of the evaluation at the time of conference. The unedited summary evaluation from the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will also be included in this correspondence.

3. The department head shall make every effort to encourage and assist the faculty member to fulfill the conditions which will qualify him/her for tenure. After consulting with the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, the department head shall also inform the faculty member in writing, in each year of their appointment, of any perceived problems with their performance that might jeopardize their prospects for tenure.

4. The department head is responsible for making explicit at the time of employment to the faculty member the conditions which normally must be met for the acquisition of tenure, the procedures and timelines by which tenure is awarded, denied, terminated, or withdrawn, and the procedures by which the faculty member may challenge such decisions.

5. A complete file (consistent with the Provost Application Form) should include documentation presented in APA style/format. Because there are aspects of the tenure application that are not relevant for annual reappointment evaluations, specific instructions for both the Annual

Reappointment Application (Appendix B) and the Tenure and Promotion Application (Appendix C) are enclosed. As a general rule however check with the department head and the Office of the Provost Webpage for updated submission guidelines before submitting any applications for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

Procedures for Comprehensive Midpoint Review of Non-Tenured Faculty

1. A comprehensive performance review of tenure track faculty shall be conducted at the midpoint of the probationary period at Colorado State University. This review shall be conducted by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee. External letters of reference may be required at the discretion of the department head. In this event, the candidate is referred to the guidelines for obtaining external references in Appendix D. The department head shall not be a member of this committee. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee shall be provided to the faculty member, the department head, the dean and the Provost. The report shall include one of the following possible outcomes:
 - a. The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation from the Department;
 - b. There are deficiencies that, if satisfactorily corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure, or;
 - c. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the tenure committee recommends against further contract renewals.
2. The report shall include any written comments provided by the department head, dean and Provost, as well as the faculty member. A final comprehensive performance review is required prior to recommendations concerning tenure as per the AFAPM.

Procedures for the Granting of Tenure

1. The faculty member applying for tenure shall notify the department head (in writing) of the desire to submit materials for committee review no later than the final day of the spring term of the academic year prior to the year the faculty member desires to apply for tenure (See instructions in Appendix C).
2. Consideration for tenure is initiated by the department head, but remains a tenured faculty decision.
3. Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership: all tenured department faculty members, including any tenured departmental faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in AFAPM Section K.12.a) of more than half-time who will not be involved in the tenure decision above the departmental committee level. The Chairperson of the Committee will be elected by the Committee for a three year term.

The process for considering tenure decisions requires the following steps:

1. A written recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure by the departmental tenured faculty or committee thereof; consisting of a majority vote (for or against the granting) by secret ballot.
2. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the department head.
3. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the college dean.
4. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the Provost.
5. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

All procedures regarding the granting of tenure are contained in the AFAPM.

Procedures for Advancement in Rank (Promotion)

1. The faculty member applying for promotion shall notify the department head (in writing) of the desire to submit materials for committee review no later than the final day of the spring term of the academic year prior to the year the faculty member intends to apply for promotion/tenure (See instructions in Appendix C). In rare cases faculty may be tenured and promoted early. Faculty seeking early tenure and/or promotion should discuss this issue with the department head by the beginning of the spring term in the academic year prior to the year in which the faculty member desires to apply.
2. Consideration for promotion is initiated by the department head, but remains a decision of tenured faculty at that rank or above.
3. **Promotion Committee Membership:** Tenured department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration or a duly elected committee thereof, including any tenured departmental faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in AFAPM Section K.12.a) of more than half-time who will not be involved in the promotion decision above the departmental committee level. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty of higher rank cannot be constituted, the promotion committee shall include all tenured faculty of higher rank and as many additional member/s drawn by lot by the department head from the faculty of higher rank on promotion committees within the college as necessary to constitute a three member promotion committee. If the promotion committee cannot be constituted in either of these ways, the eligible faculty of the Department shall develop procedures for promotion decisions. The chairperson will be elected by the committee. The department head shall not be a member of this committee.

The process for considering promotion decisions requires the following steps:

1. A written recommendation for or against promotion by the departmental tenured faculty or committee thereof;
2. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the department head.
3. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the college dean.
4. A written review (either endorsement or opposition) by the Provost/Academic Vice President.

The Promotion Committee will vote by secret ballot for or against promotion to the faculty member being considered. A promotion recommendation shall be by majority vote of the Promotion Committee. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view.

All procedures regarding promotion are contained in the AFAPM.

Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty

1. Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty shall be conducted by the department head at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five year review period (AFAPM). A Phase I Review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure, an updated curriculum vitae, a self-analysis by the faculty member, and a statement of goals and objectives. The department head shall provide an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance. Evaluation must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution and performance weighted in each area of responsibility. The criteria used by the department head for Phase I Review shall be consistent with the guidelines for the annual performance evaluation outlined in the Department Code, Appendix A. These minimum standards will be used as a template; however, the overall contribution (teaching, research and service) of the individual during the review period will be most important. These standards are designed to reflect the overall mission of the Department and are sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with a variety of responsibilities and effort distributions. The evaluations should identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. If a faculty member has deficiencies that, in the opinion of the department head, may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, will prepare a specific professional development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations. As part of this plan, the faculty member's effort distribution in each of these areas of responsibility may be adjusted to focus on the faculty member's strengths, interests, demonstrated performance, and needs of the Department. This plan may include resources, assistance, and opportunities to be made available to the faculty member, and include a time frame by which the department head will monitor progress toward achieving the planned goals. If the evaluation from a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review is unsatisfactory, a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty

1. Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are initiated when the department head determines that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the Phase I Review (AFAPM). A Phase II Review Committee of at least three peers at the same or higher rank shall be selected to conduct a comprehensive performance review according to the performance guidelines established in Section IV of this manual. The initiation of a Phase II review is not grievable by the faculty member. This review shall be conducted by peers within the Department or by a group from the same college as explained below. The department head shall not be a member of this committee.
2. The Phase II Review committee shall normally be comprised of three tenured departmental peers at the same rank or higher. In order to assure impartiality of the Phase II review committee; first, one member of the Phase II Review committee shall be selected by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee from a pool of three qualified Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee members nominated by the faculty member under review. Next, two of the three committee members shall be elected by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee from qualified members within that committee. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty of equal or higher rank cannot be constituted from within the Department, additional tenured faculty at the same rank or higher will be recruited by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee from other departments within the College. The faculty member under review must select the pool of three nominees from within the Department if five departmental peers of equal or higher rank are available. If five departmental members of equal or higher rank cannot be constituted from within the Department, the faculty member under review may select one or all three of their nominees from other departments within the College. No faculty member under Phase II post-tenure review will be eligible to serve on a concurrent Phase II Post-tenure review committee in the Department.
3. Challenges to candidate selection for Phase II post-tenure review must be made within the guidelines described in the preceding paragraph (#2 above). Thus, while challenges may be forwarded to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the challenges that are not based on the guidelines for seating a Phase II post-tenure review committee set out in #2 above, or those challenges that would result in a committee that does not meet the guidelines set out in #2 above, will not be heard. Both the faculty member under review and the Tenure and Promotion Committee may forward challenges. The final Phase II committee selection, including challenges by both the faculty member under review and by the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be completed within 10 business days after the initial selection and solicitation of Phase II committee candidates. The faculty member under review must submit a written challenge to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee stating the basis for the challenge of the selection of a proposed member(s) of the Phase II post-tenure review committee. In a case where the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee is under a Phase II review, or is being challenged, the challenge will be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for review. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee must respond in writing. If the challenge is accepted, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will forward an alternate candidate to both the faculty member under review and the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and subsequent challenges, if applicable, are subject to the same timeline as the initial challenge, i.e., the Phase II committee will be seated within 10 business days after the initial selection and solicitation of Phase II committee candidates. Similarly, the Tenure and Promotion Committee can forward challenges to the proposed nominee(s) made by the faculty member under review. The committee must submit a written challenge within 5 business days to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee stating the

basis for the challenge of the nomination of a proposed member(s) of the Phase II post-tenure review committee by the candidate under review. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee must respond in writing within 5 business days. If the challenge is accepted, the candidate under review must forward an alternate candidate(s) to the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

4. The criteria used by the Phase II Review committee shall be consistent with the standards (for the given rank of the individual under review) outlined in the Performance Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. (Table 1) of this document. These minimum standards will be used as a template; however, the overall contribution (teaching, research and service) of the individual during the review period will be most important. These standards are designed to reflect the overall mission of the Department and are sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with a variety of responsibilities and effort distributions.

5. The types of information submitted by the faculty under the Phase II Review shall be consistent with the guidelines established in this document and should include as a minimum, a current curriculum vitae, annual reports for the past 5 years, and annual evaluations for the past 5 years. Additional evidence of scholarship, service and teaching may be submitted. Additionally, review materials shall include summary reports of any previous Phase I and II Reviews, including any professional development plans and outcome statements by the faculty member and department head.

6. As a result of Phase II Reviews, a majority of the committee must decide on one of four possible outcomes. No further actions are necessary if:

- a. the faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by the Department; or
- b. the deficiencies are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.

Further action is required if:

- a. there are substantial and chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied; or
- b. the committee concludes that the conditions set forth in the AFAPM appear to be present.

7. In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the peer review committee, must be remedied, the department head and faculty member will design a professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and set time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. Such development plans must be approved by the dean of the College. In the event that conditions set forth in AFAPM regarding disciplinary action and tenure revocation are present, the committee will recommend the initiation of procedures that may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation. For each outcome, the committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have a reasonable opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the department head, and at successive steps, to the

dean, and the Provost. Recommendations of the department head and dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost shall make the final decision regarding action.

8. Timeline for conduct of Phase II Post-Tenure Review:

- a. If the department head determines that a faculty member's Phase I review is unsatisfactory, then the department head shall notify (within 10 business days) both the faculty member and the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee that a Phase II review will be conducted.
- b. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, once notified by the department head, shall convene the Tenure and Promotion Committee (within 10 business days) to select 2 members of the Phase II committee and solicit a candidate pool from the faculty member under Phase II review.
- c. The final Phase II committee selection, including challenges by both the faculty member under review and by the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be completed within 10 business days after the initial selection and solicitation of Phase II committee candidates.
- d. Upon final constitution of the Phase II committee, the faculty member under review must submit all materials (current curriculum vitae, annual reports for the past 5 years, and annual evaluations for the past 5 years, additional evidence of scholarship, service and teaching, and summary reports of previous Phase I and II reviews, including any professional development plans and outcome statements by the faculty member and department head) within 20 business days.
- e. Upon receipt of the faculty member's materials, the Phase II committee must submit its written report (within 20 business days) to both the department head and the faculty member under review.
- f. Upon receipt of the Phase II committee's report, the faculty member under review must submit his/her written response to the department head within 20 business days.
- g. The department head must submit his/her recommendation to the dean, with an accompanying copy to the faculty member under review, within 10 business days.
- h. All of the previous timelines will apply to the entire calendar year, and are not restricted to the academic year.

Grievance (AFAPM)

The faculty member shall have recourse to the provisions in the grievance section of the AFAPM, except where otherwise prohibited, once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendation or decision made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II Review may be the basis for a complaint under the AFAPM.

Revocation of Tenure

The AFAPM describes the grounds and procedures for revocation of tenure. Faculty should familiarize themselves with this section. The department head is responsible for maintaining documentation on faculty performance and communicating performance evaluations to each faculty in writing. Failure to resolve declining faculty performance may result in a recommendation for revocation of tenure.

SECTION III

PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT , PROMOTION AND TENURE

Expectations for each Rank

In line with both University and college policy, expectations are higher for persons at higher academic levels. When an individual has a large proportion of workload in a given area, expectations for performance to achieve each qualitative rating (superior, exceeds expectations, etc.) will increase.

Table 1. Expectations for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure for each of the Academic Ranks

Assistant Professor

Reappointment (yrs 1 &2)	At least “meets expectations” in research and in one of the two categories (teaching and service) with no “unsatisfactory” performances in any category.
Reappointment	(Comprehensive midpoint review and beyond) At least meets expectations in all three categories.
Tenure	(Not normally to occur at this level unless promoted)
Promotion to Associate Professor	At least “exceeds expectations” in research and teaching and at least “meets expectations” in service.

Associate Professor

Reappointment	At least “exceeds expectations” in research and teaching and at least “meets expectations” in service.
Tenure	At least “exceeds expectations” in research and teaching and at least “meets expectations” in service.
Promotion to Professor	“Superior” in research and at least “exceeds expectations” in teaching and service.

Professor

Reappointment	“Superior” in research and at least “exceeds expectations” in teaching and service.
---------------	---

Tenure “Superior” in research and at least “exceeds expectations” in teaching and in service.

Teaching, advising and mentoring

In this document, teaching is used as a generic term referring to the systematic transfer of knowledge and skills to others. It includes extension teaching and programming, classroom instruction, and curricular development. Most of the examples of teaching in the following sections refer to resident instruction, but with modest translation, these examples can also apply to the instructional/informative activities of faculty with extension appointments. Advising is defined as the process of facilitating student academic and professional development.

Teaching, advising and mentoring indices

Superior (S) Excellent teaching and advising is evident in sustained high quality performance on several of the teaching and advising duties as listed in the criteria with evidence of in depth knowledge and special success and creativity in transmitting knowledge to students or the public and in facilitating student academic and professional development.

Exceeds Expectations (EE) Good teaching and advising is evident in high quality performance on some combination of the teaching and advising duties as listed in the criteria of teaching and advising.

Meets Expectations (ME) Accepts and performs teaching duties as listed in the teaching and advising criteria. Participates on thesis /dissertation committees, performs necessary administrative functions, provides students with the appropriate course materials, prepares for classroom instructional activities, and is available for student consultation.

Needs Improvement (NI) Student course evaluations are below average for the unit. The faculty member may be ineffective in achieving course objectives. Course materials and student input indicate a failure to demonstrate proper preparation for and delivery of instruction. Frequently, the faculty member is ineffective in some aspects of advising as described in ME. Additionally, performance is characterized by low quantity and/or quality of graduate student research mentoring.

Unsatisfactory (U) Teaching, and/or advising and mentoring are inferior relative to peers. For example, there may be negative input from students, faculty and staff; failure to meet classes as assigned; low involvement with graduate student mentoring and poor student advising evaluations compared to faculty peers.

Teaching, advising and mentoring criteria: (not necessarily in rank order, or required, nor comprehensive)

1. Quality of student evaluations of teaching.
2. Quality of course materials (syllabi, reading assignments, exams, AV and other instructional aids, handouts, laboratory and other manuals, etc.)
3. University or college wide awards for teaching excellence
4. Evaluation by peers based on classroom or advising visits
5. Development of new course(s)/curriculum
6. Major revisions of existing courses(s)
7. Quality of student independent study projects

8. Quality and quantity of undergraduate and graduate advising and counseling
9. College/University wide advising and counseling honors or awards
10. Quality of student advising evaluations
11. Attendance/participation in related conferences and workshops
12. Association with other departments or Universities as related to teaching
13. Videotapes of lectures
14. Willingness to take on challenging teaching assignments
15. Overall value to the Department as a teacher as evidenced by a formal letter from the department head
16. Quality of completed master's theses and/or doctoral dissertations as either chair or member of the supervisory committee
17. Student demand for courses taught by the faculty
18. Comments by alumni who have taken the faculty person's course
19. Positive mentoring feedback on the graduate student exit interview questionnaire
20. Mentored projects presented at professional meetings and/or published by students
21. Other

Research and other creative activity

The term research, scholarly and creative activities in these guidelines includes the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. All institutions of higher education are involved in the transfer of knowledge, but universities also have a major societal role in the discovery of knowledge. It is the latter function, often called research, that differentiates a university from a community or four-year college and which should be reflected in faculty performance. Research can be either basic or applied. A major criterion for an activity to be included in the research activity category is whether it has been judged by peers to be an addition to knowledge. Peer review is made primarily on the end product -- the published paper. Thus, even though research is a process that extends over time, the rewards for faculty come primarily at the end of the process when the work is finished and judged to be important by peers. The product itself need not be directed towards peers i.e., it can be designed for students or the public, but to be classified as research, it must be evaluated by academic peers and adopted or used by them for their work. All faculty, no matter what their funding, are expected to devote a significant portion of their effort to research in this broad sense. Furthermore, although previous research is important, it is essential that faculty members maintain a recent research program as part of their overall record. However, quality of the research product is more important than quantity at all levels.

Research Indices

Superior The candidate has made sustained, significant contributions to the body of knowledge through the activities associated with the listed criteria and is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis. Evidence of extensive continuing scholarly activity is present. The record should include a substantial number of refereed publications or juried works.

Exceeds Expectations Evidence of continuing research activity is present. The candidate has made high quality contribution through activities associated with the criteria of research competence. One or more areas of emphasis in the candidate's research activities are emerging and

the candidate has made significant contributions in those areas through the activities listed under the criteria. A record of external funding, awards, honors and citations strengthens the case.

Meets Expectations Evidence of on going research activity is present. Consistently publishes, presents, and/ or participates in developing and disseminating scholarly work associated with the criteria of scholarly competence. Evidence of actively seeking external funding to support research (procurement of external funding strengthens the case).

Needs Improvement Research activity is sporadic and inconsistent. Frequently, the research contributions are submitted only locally (state/regional refereed publications). Often, the work is not brought to complete fruition via publication in high quality peer reviewed journal articles, but rather is only published as an abstract and/or a proceeding. No attempt is made at obtaining external research funding and funding attempts may be limited to submission of internal research grants.

Unsatisfactory The faculty member is not actively engaged in research/scholarly activity. For example, there are few or no full- length publications, few or no refereed research presentations, few or no external grants awarded or submitted to an agency.

Research Criteria: (not necessarily in rank order, or required, nor comprehensive)

1. Publication of refereed articles in high quality scholarly journals (*)
 2. Published abstracts of refereed and non-refereed original research
 3. Published books, book chapters and monographs
 4. Completed technical reports
 5. External funding of grants for research and/or training projects.
 6. External funding of research contracts
 7. Presented papers at professional meetings
 8. Scholarly contributions in non-journal media such as computer programs, audio-visual productions, slide/cassette strips, films, etc.
 9. Published articles in non- refereed proceedings and journals
 10. Publication of book or monograph reviews
 11. Non funded proposals for research and/or training projects
 12. Submission of grant progress reports
 13. Evidence of the impact of published research such as the number of citations (Citation Index) for a published article
 14. Publication of refereed proceedings
 15. Research honors and awards
 16. Other
- (*) Note: Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) indicators (impact factor, immediacy index, and cited half-life) of the citation record of journal articles over time, along with article acceptance rates and other measures may be used to indicate a journal's quality within the context of the applicable subject area.

Service/Outreach

Service advances the interests of the institution and the professions. Outreach advances the capabilities of constituents outside the University and offers knowledge, skills, and advice to the local, state, national, and international community. Service refers to activities that fall into one of

the following categories: (1) professional activities, (2) department-school/college/University service. Professional activities include membership in and attendance at professional meetings, and especially such active roles as being an officer, president, board member, presenter, reviewer, etc. University Service includes campus committee assignments, club sponsorships, and administrative duties. Outreach refers to activities in which faculty members use their professional expertise to enhance a public/community effort. Speaking to community groups and serving on an advisory board are examples. Service rendered in one's professional capacity as a citizen of the community is commendable and can be evaluated as appropriate faculty activity.

Service/Outreach Indices

Superior Provides leadership in service/outreach activities. The faculty member is well known locally, regionally, and/or nationally for professional service/outreach. For example, he/she may be an officer or committee leader in an association at one or more of these levels serving the academic community for the greater public good. He/she may be an organizer of meetings, a spokesperson for academia, an officer of a professional organization, or consultant to government or industry, thus providing significant service to these groups.

Exceeds Expectations Exhibits leadership within the Department, college, University, or community with regard to service/outreach activities. His/her influence is often felt in the development and /or implementation of service/outreach activities. The faculty member is also known locally, regionally or nationally, for professional service/outreach contributions. He/she makes noteworthy contributions at one or more of these levels, serving the academic community for the greater public good.

Meets Expectations Accepts and performs those duties constituting a faculty member's average share of service/outreach activities in the department, college, University, profession and community. While this standard allows for declining to serve when the faculty member feels ill suited or sufficiently burdened without additional assignments, his/her share of service/outreach activities must be maintained.

Needs Improvement Service is limited to committee work in department or community work related to profession.

Unsatisfactory This level of service is characterized by meager contribution. Frequently, there is failure to attend departmental committee meetings and the faculty member makes no/minimal contribution to professional activity.

Service/Outreach Criteria (not necessarily in rank order)

1. Department, college and/or University administrative work
2. Chair of department, college and/or University committees
3. Involvement as an officer, board member, committee member, or a member of state, regional, national or international professional organizations
4. Invited lectures
5. Chair or coordinator of conventions or professional meeting sessions at state, regional or national level
6. Member or chair of external evaluation teams
7. Appointed consultant in area of expertise
8. Member of departmental, college and/or University committees

9. Public service participation (radio talks, news paper articles, television appearances, etc)
10. Participation in editorial review process for refereed journals
11. Membership on editorial board of professional journals
12. Participation in review process for grant proposals
13. Providing high quality-innovative service/outreach programs to the public
14. Contributing discipline based newspaper articles for local and national media
15. Publishing a discipline based newsletter for the public
16. Providing discipline based community lectures
17. Active member of discipline based community coalitions and boards
18. Providing external evaluations of candidates for promotion and tenure at other institutions
19. Other

APPENDIX A

Time Table for Submission of Materials for Reappointment

<u>Year of Appointment</u>	<u>Materials to T & P Committee</u>	<u>Re-appointment Deadline date</u>	<u>Appointment Year</u>
First yr	Feb 1	Mar 1	next year
Second yr	Nov 15	Dec 15	next year
	April 10	May 10	yr after, next yr
>Second yr	April 10	May 10	yr after, next yr

Appendix B

Annual Reappointment Application Instructions & Format

Materials presented to the Tenure and Promotion Committee should include the following:

1. Cover sheet;
2. Complete curriculum vitae (clearly designate senior authorship when applicable on refereed journal articles; list the JCR impact factor for each publication)
3. Copy of original appointment letter;
4. Copy of all previous annual evaluations from department head;
5. Copy of all progress toward tenure evaluations;
6. Copy of all previous Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Activity Reports
7. One page personal summary/self-evaluation of: a). teaching/advising/mentoring activities; b). research, scholarly, and creative activities; and c). service. This summary is meant to highlight noteworthy accomplishments/activity that may not have been covered on the CV, or previous summary activity reports.
8. Documentation/evidence to support data contained in CV/Summary Activity Report/summary & self-evaluation. Specific examples of such evidence are listed below. Please keep in mind that not every item from these lists is applicable to all faculty members. However, the rule of thumb is that anything a faculty member refers to in sections 1-7 of the Annual Reappointment Application should be documented in section 8.

A. Documentation of teaching/advising/mentoring

Include any or all of the following in the documentation relevant to the prior year:

- ___ Copies of all student survey forms for all classes.
- ___ Course materials (syllabi, reading assignments, exams, AV and other instructional aids, handouts, laboratory and other manuals, etc.)
- ___ University or college wide award letters for teaching excellence
- ___ Evaluations by peers based on classroom visits
- ___ Development of new course(s)/curriculum
- ___ Major revisions of existing courses(s)
- ___ Examples of student independent study projects
- ___ Evidence of undergraduate and graduate advising and counseling
- ___ College/University wide advising and counseling honors or award letters
- ___ Student advising evaluations
- ___ Attendance/participation in teaching effectiveness conferences and workshops
- ___ Evidence of collaboration with other departments or universities as related to teaching
- ___ Quality of completed master's theses and/or doctoral dissertations as either chair or member of the supervisory committee
- ___ Student demand for courses taught by the faculty
- ___ Comments by alumni who have taken the faculty person's course
- ___ Additional evidence not described above.

B. Documentation of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

Include any or all of the following in the documentation relevant to the prior year:

- ___ Copies of refereed articles in scholarly journals (*)
- ___ Copies of published abstracts of refereed and non-refereed original research
- ___ Copies of published books, book chapters and monographs
- ___ Copies of completed technical reports

- ___ Copies of submitted grants for research and/or training projects.
- ___ Copies of award letters for funded grants and contracts
- ___ Copies of abstracts of presented papers at professional meetings
- ___ Copies of scholarly contributions in non-journal media such as computer programs, audio-visual productions, slide/cassette strips, films, etc.
- ___ Copies of published articles in non- refereed proceedings and journals
- ___ Copies of published book or monograph reviews
- ___ Copies of non-funded proposals for research and/or training projects
- ___ Evidence of work in progress and submitted manuscripts
- ___ Number of citations (Citation Index) for a published article
- ___ Additional evidence not described above.
- (*) Note: Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) indicators (impact factor, immediacy index, and cited half-life) of the citation record of journal articles over time, along with journal acceptance rates and other measures may be used to indicate a journal's quality within the context of the applicable subject area.

C. Documentation of Service/Outreach

Include any or all of the following in the documentation relevant to the prior year:

- ___ Department, college and/or University administrative work
- ___ Chair of department, college and/or University committees
- ___ Involvement as an officer, board member, committee member of state, regional, national or international professional organizations
- ___ Membership in professional society/organization
- ___ Invited lectures or presentations to community groups, professional organizations, etc.
- ___ Chair or coordinator of conventions or professional meeting sessions at state, regional or national level
- ___ Member or chair of external evaluation teams
- ___ Appointment as a consultant in area of expertise
- ___ Member of departmental, college and/or University committees
- ___ Public service participation (radio talks, news paper articles, television appearances, etc.)
- ___ Participation in editorial review process for refereed journals
- ___ Membership on editorial board of professional journals
- ___ Participation in review process for grant proposals
- ___ Additional areas of service not described above.

ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT APPLICATION FORM

COVER SHEET

Date of Original Appointment _____

Date of Present Rank _____

Title _____

I hereby certify the accuracy and completeness of all information reported by me on this form.

Candidate's Signature

Date

APPENDIX C

Tenure and Promotion Application Instructions

The Tenure and Promotion Application should be submitted to the department head in the following format in a binder: (pages should be numbered consecutively, excepting the cover page. The candidate's name should be placed in the upper right hand corner of each page. Major "parts" should be separated by tab dividers; do not use plastic covers for pages)

Cover Page

Part I: Recommendations (See University Tenure and Promotion Instructions)

Tenure and Promotion Committee

Department head (new page)

Dean (new page)

Copy of candidate's appointment letter

Copy of Tenure and Promotion criteria/expectations in the unit

Part II: Curriculum Vitae (See University Tenure and Promotion Format Instructions)

Part III: Evidence of Teaching & Advising Effectiveness (See University Tenure and Promotion Instructions)

Part IV: Candidate Responses to Evaluations/Recommendations (optional)

Part V: Record of Other Evaluations

Copies of annual evaluations/progress reviews for the past 3 yrs by department head and Tenure and Promotion Committee, as appropriate.

Copy of Progress toward Tenure Review

Copy of most recent periodic comprehensive review (if applicant is tenured)

Part VI: External Evaluation Letters

Copy of letter sent to outside evaluators

Description of how evaluators were selected and their expertise in evaluating the candidate

Copies of external evaluators letters

Part VII: Appendices (See University Tenure and Promotion Instructions)

Please note that this is presented as a general guide only. The format of the Tenure and Promotion application CAN CHANGE from year to year, and it is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for tenure to be certain that the document is in the proper format. The latest University Tenure and Promotion application form and instructions are available in departmental offices and the office of the Provost webpage. Any questions about current format should be directed to either the chair of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, or the department head.

REMINDER: The faculty member must notify the department head of the intent to apply for Tenure/Promotion by the final day of the spring term in the academic year prior to the year in which the faculty member plans to apply. In rare cases faculty may be tenured and promoted early. Faculty seeking early tenure and/or promotion should discuss this issue with the department head by the beginning of the spring term in the academic year prior to the year in which the faculty member desires to apply.

Appendix D

Instructions for Obtaining External References

Reviews from experts external to the University must be part of the evaluation process. A candidate may not have access to external letters of evaluation; such letters may otherwise be disclosed only as permitted by law.

Letters from 5-7 scholars who are qualified to judge the credentials of the candidate are required for all tenure and promotion recommendations. Peer review scholars should be included who represent institutions with similar (or higher) standards for tenure and promotion and who are qualified to make such recommendations in their own institutions. Selection of evaluators from industry or governmental agencies who have appropriate scholarly credentials is acceptable. While it is appropriate for the candidate to suggest persons familiar with his/her work, the majority of external evaluations must come from referees suggested by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the department head. Letters from colleagues/collaborators who might stand to benefit from the success of the candidate or who are known to be close personal friends are not allowed. The list of potential reviewers from a candidate and from the Tenure and Promotion Committee should be long enough so that confidentiality of a source is maintained. The candidate has no privilege of vetoing external reviewers, but may indicate individuals whom he or she considers to be inappropriately biased. The head or committee chair should contact reviewers to assure they feel qualified and are willing to provide letters of evaluation.

The qualifications of all outside reviewers should be provided in the tenure and promotion document. External review letters should be sent directly to the department head and must be made fully available for review by all members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee prior to their final recommendation. These letters are to remain confidential and not available to the candidate unless required by law. Neither the source nor direct quotes from reference letters are to be conveyed to the candidate. The content of these letters is not to be discussed other than in the meeting of the committee. The head or committee chair should paraphrase key points in the letters and provide them to the candidate for response.

External evaluators should be asked a well-considered set of questions. Examples of crucial questions are:

- How has a candidate's work impacted the discipline, and what is the contribution to the discipline?
- Has a candidate demonstrated the ability to work independently?
- Has the candidate demonstrated leadership or leadership potential in their field?
- Is the candidate creative? Does he/she have unique ideas, yet present solid and reliable work?
- To what extent is the candidate making progress toward being known at the state, regional, national, or international level in her/his areas of emphasized excellence? This may vary with the discipline of the candidate.
- What impact does the scholarly and creative activity of the candidate have on society?

A copy of the letter requesting evaluation sent to external evaluators should be included with the reviewers' responses. Whenever possible, copies of the works of a candidate should be provided to the outside evaluators. The committee and/or department head should provide a separate analysis of the letters of reference and evaluators. The analysis should assess reviewers' knowledge of the candidate's field, familiarity with details of the candidate's work, areas addressed by their expertise, relationship of the evaluator to the candidate (previous supervisor, collaborator, etc.), and evidence of bias or direct competition. Heads and deans may choose to comment on the external letters.

Process for Selecting External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

1. Five to seven external reviewers are required for input on the candidate's credentials. Reviewers are to be at the associate or professor rank for associate professor reviews and professor for professor reviews. Reviewers should be from research institutions, with special emphasis on Colorado State University peer institutions. Peer institutions change over time therefore candidates should check annually for updates to these lists.

CCHE Peer institutions (2005):

North Carolina State University	Oregon State University
Michigan State University	Oklahoma State University
Purdue University	Iowa State University
Washington State University	Ohio State University
University of California, Davis	Texas A & M University
University of Illinois, Urbana	

Internal Peer Group (2005)

North Carolina State University	Oregon State University
Michigan State University	Oklahoma State University
Iowa State University	Washington State University
Texas A & M University	University of Georgia
Kansas State University	University of Missouri, Columbia
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Virginia Tech

2. Candidate can provide up to three names, and the department head and Tenure and Promotion Committee provide the remainder of names of potential reviewers for a total list of ten names. This helps provide confidentiality for the final list of seven names. The candidate can review the extended list of ten names to identify any inappropriate reviewer, but does not have veto power. The candidate cannot name previous or current co-investigators, mentors or close friends on their list, and must identify such conflicts on the extended list.

3. The final list of five to seven confidential names is selected by the department head and Tenure and Promotion Committee chair. The department head corresponds with the final reviewers to ascertain willingness to perform these duties, and then submits the required materials and receives the confidential reviews. The department head submits the final review responses to the P&T Committee via the committee chair.