

**UCCS Campus Guidelines
for Revision of Primary Unit (Department or College)
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria**

By the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, the regents have mandated that all departments will need to revise and have approved by the dean and provost their criteria and processes for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) so that they comply with recent policy revisions. These revisions maintain the distinction between the periodic RPT reviews and the annual merit reviews for salary setting. The campus is also examining several issues that should be considered, including the anticipated faculty vote on the report of the RPT Task Force (which, if adopted, would somewhat alter the structure under which the RPT process operates, but does not change the necessity of updating the primary unit criteria).

The faculty vote on the adoption of the RPT task force report is anticipated to take place in October or early November. Deans need to set internal deadlines that will give them an opportunity to review new criteria, and have a reasonable period to return them to departments for possible revision, in time to have them all to the provost no later than **March 20, 2009**. Individual deans may wish to set up internal review processes to assist them in evaluating departmental criteria. The new revised criteria will be applicable to all tenured and tenure-track faculty, except those on the tenure track who have completed comprehensive review, but have not yet completed tenure review, by June 30, 2009. Faculty members in the latter situation may request that the department apply the new criteria for their tenure reviews, as well.

Background considerations

The regents have made numerous changes to system policy that have implications for the RPT criteria and/or a department's procedures:

1. Criteria must (1) reflect appropriate and current standards of professional performance and (2) serve to ensure that faculty have the professional competence needed to achieve the goals of the department, college, campus and Board of Regents.
2. Primary units shall take into account information of "material bearing." This explicitly allows consideration of issues beyond teaching, research and service, such as campus/college/department strategic goals, at reappointment – but not at tenure.
3. Early tenure criteria are the SAME as normal tenure criteria.
4. Criteria must be reviewed at each Program Review (or no less frequently than every seven years).
5. The RPT criteria will now also address standards for post-tenure review.
6. RPT Criteria must be posted on web sites (department, college or campus).
7. Redacted summaries of external evaluators' letters need to be provided in writing to the candidate. This often already happens in the primary unit letter.
8. Candidates may exclude certain people from being external reviewers.

Last spring, the RPT Task Force convened by the provost issued a report proposing significant changes to the framework under which the criteria operate. More specifically, under this system, departments will be explicitly asked to decide whether or not to include professional practice as

an additional category in their criteria, how they will deal with a somewhat broader definition of scholarship (modeled after Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*), and how much variation individual faculty will be allowed in achieving a tenureable record (through the use of the Faculty Responsibility Statement). Campus adoption of this more flexible approach would not preclude an individual department from adhering to criteria that are essentially similar to those currently in use, but the intent is to allow those departments that find the existing framework limiting to more appropriately support and reward faculty work the department (and campus) values. The faculty vote on adopting this report's recommendations is scheduled for this fall.

The UCCS Strategic plan contains a number of strategies that departments might want to consider when determining departmental standards of professional competency.

Relevant Diversity Strategic Plan Recommendations:

1. UCCS will encourage departments to recognize diversity contributions within departmental criteria for the evaluation of research, teaching and service as appropriate to each academic discipline.
2. UCCS will value contributions to UCCS diversity strategies throughout the review process for promotion and merit reviews consistent with departmental criteria and regental standards.
3. UCCS will recognize the cultural and social impact of faculty research and scholarly activity in addition to its academic contribution.

Excerpts from the Academic Strategic Plan:

Integrate the roles of teaching, research, and service in the academic lives of faculty

- *Reward faculty appropriately for their work*
 - Revise RTP criteria to reflect expectations
 - Strengthen rewards for faculty service
 - Nurture innovation and entrepreneurship
 - Ensure that RTP criteria include professional development
 - Re-evaluate faculty work with regards to the 40-40-20 model
 - Broaden the definition of service to include community stewardship
 - Build support for participation in faculty governance
- *Make experiential, interdisciplinary, and integrative learning a hallmark of UCCS*
- *Empower and reward faculty to be excellent teachers*

Invest in responsible growth of research, scholarship, and creative work that serve the campus and the public good.

- *Provide professional development activities for research, scholarship, and creative works*
- *Continue to build the support infrastructure for sponsored research*

- *Develop a support infrastructure for unsponsored research, scholarship, and creative works*
- *Facilitate research and creative work collaboration among faculty, students, and the community*
 - Encourage the scholarship of teaching and learning
- *Promote an environment conducive to undergraduate and graduate research and creative work*
 - Create a reward structure for faculty who include undergraduate and graduate students in research
- *Develop and support the transfer of research ideas to application*
 - Reward faculty for viable invention disclosures

Mandated issues (must satisfactorily address these issues to be approved)***Tenure Decision:***

Under University policy, faculty must “demonstrate meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research or creative work.” Criteria need to make clear what constitutes “meritorious” and what constitutes “excellence” in each category (only “meritorious” required for service).

Post-Tenure Reviews:

Units must define Meeting Expectations for post-tenure reviews. Criteria need to be constructed so that they can accommodate differentiated workloads as practiced within the college.

Promotion to Full:

Under University policy, promotion to Professor requires “a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.” Criteria must provide sufficient guidance as to how the various components of faculty work relate to “a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent.”

Multiple Evaluations of Teaching:

The regents, recognizing the limitations of Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) as a means of measuring the quality and impact of teaching, require the use of multiple means of evaluating teaching. RPT criteria should specify at least two means of evaluating teaching beyond FCQs. There needs to be sufficient clarity to allow junior faculty to know how to assemble a strong case with regard to teaching.

Recommended areas of attention

General:

1. How are activities that seem to have clear application to more than one category (e.g., scholarship of teaching and learning, reports to community organizations, contributions to UCCS' goals [interdisciplinarity, diversity, student engagement, etc.]) "counted?"
2. Criteria should address the role of work accomplished at UCCS as opposed to the candidate's total career record.

Teaching:

1. Criteria should be clear about whether "teaching" includes curriculum development and revision, student advising, involvement in campus student engagement and other retention efforts, participation in outside-the-classroom activities with students, and educational activities in the community.
2. Criteria should recognize and value diversity contributions, including contributions to UCCS diversity strategies.
3. Criteria should be as clear as possible whether standards reflect a) outcomes or quality of teaching, b) quantity or overall contribution to college or department needs of teaching efforts, and c) investment being made with regard to professional development that impacts teaching.

Research:

1. Criteria should clarify what counts as "research." How do the criteria recognize, if at all, various forms of scholarship (such as those identified in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* or the RPT Task Force Report: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, scholarship of teaching and learning, and scholarship of creative works)?
2. Criteria should recognize the diversity, cultural and social impact of faculty research and scholarly activity, as appropriate to the academic discipline. Criteria should also consider the discipline-appropriate role that contributions to the local or regional external community should have.
3. Criteria should give sufficient guidance about the relative weight given to various forms of scholarly productivity (journal articles, presentations, monographs, book chapters, reports, exhibitions, grants, etc.). Special attention should be given to the importance attached to efforts to achieve funding.

4. Criteria should address the role of different levels of peer-review in determining the weight of different instances of scholarship. What weight, if any, is attached to activities that do not naturally generate peer-review and how will those activities be evaluated?
5. Criteria should give sufficient guidance on how co-authored, inter-disciplinary and collaborative work is considered.
6. The extent to which criteria allow faculty members in different parts of a given discipline, and who take different approaches to their scholarship, to demonstrate that their research is “meritorious” or “excellent” in ways that serve the department and campus well should be as clear as possible.

Service:

1. Criteria should delineate the roles of various kinds of service (e.g., departmental, university, professional, community), potentially at different levels of seniority.
2. Criteria should recognize and value diversity contributions, including contributions to UCCS diversity strategies
3. Special attention should be devoted to the roles of administrative service (such as serving as a department chair) and service in faculty governance.

Appendices

The appendices include examples of criteria, as well as some other useful statements, in each of the major areas to assist departments in their deliberations. None of the example criteria included capture all of the relevant considerations, and are not intended as literal models or comprehensive best practices. Instead, they represent unusually good attempts by particular departments to address some of the considerations raised above and thus may be useful as starting points for departments in their considerations of how best to capture their own intentions.

Teaching:

The Teaching Excellence Council has been discussing recognition of "Continuous Improvement" of teaching. This would allow rewarding faculty who expand their repertoires, try new teaching pedagogies, document what they've learned about the challenges of teaching today's students, and ultimately work toward continuously improving their teaching. They might document their efforts, for example, by:

1. Attending X number of Teaching and Learning Center faculty development events per year.
2. Teaching Freshman Seminar on load as faculty development
3. Inviting members of a TLC trained cadre of teaching award winners to observe their teaching and provide input (peer review)
4. Inviting the TLC to conduct a Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) See for example, <http://www.ntlf.com/html/pi/9705/sgid.htm>
5. Submitting evidence of mid-course assessment and subsequent modifications
6. Participating in an early alert program to flag students in academic difficulty and working one-on-one with these students
7. Submitting original and revised syllabi to show learner-centered improvements
8. Providing students with an opportunity to diagnose their learning styles and develop strategies to learn particular course content based on their own learning profiles. See for example, the free online instrument at <http://www.vark-learn.com/english/index.asp>
9. Team teaching a course to learn new pedagogies from a colleague(s)
10. Engaging in a focused mentorship project with a senior faculty member with recognized teaching expertise

Examples of UCCS criteria:

Example # 1: The candidate must be judged to be a meritorious teacher by peer evaluations and student evaluations. Being meritorious can be reflected in faculty evaluations that are average to above average in student and peer evaluation. Excellence in teaching is regarded as being above the norm of the department and the college in student and peer evaluations, as well as being rigorous in teaching quality and expectations. Continuous efforts at improvement and creative instructional development should be evident in the personal statement and supporting materials. The candidate must also demonstrate merit as a teacher outside the classroom, including student mentoring/advising and involvement in curriculum development and revision. In addition,

candidates may demonstrate development and implementation of courses and programs to provide interdisciplinary, service-learning, outreach and distance models of education.

Example # 2: The faculty member must be able to illustrate an ability to impart knowledge to students concerning theory and/or practice, and must view teaching as an important element of his or her responsibilities. The faculty member should be able to demonstrate meritorious proficiency or sustained improvement to the level of meritorious teaching performance (including advising) during the pre-tenure period, on the following dimensions:

- Effective classroom instruction and assessment, such that students obtain knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their careers based on current knowledge, theory, research and practice;
- Effective guidance and instruction to enhance students' knowledge and professional growth outside of classroom settings (for example: advising; participation in advanced seminar projects, theses or dissertations; enhancing student learning through research and community service learning projects, internships, and facilitation of student participation in actual policy or management processes).
- Effective contributions to department curriculum and policies related to teaching and learning.
- Evidence of Attainment: Below is a list of possible examples of evidence of attainment of teaching that would be deemed meritorious or excellent. It is not expected that all faculty will have generated all these different forms of evidence during a given review period.
 - Performance in classroom instruction and assessment may be demonstrated by:
 - Course syllabi reflecting current knowledge, concepts and principles in the relevant subject areas;
 - Course evaluations, in particular items indicating students' assessment of their learning;
 - Assessment measures or assignments given in the classroom and examples of student performance;
 - Innovative course activities or exercises designed to help students attain specified learning outcomes;
 - A pattern of course standards, assessments, and grading that reflects appropriate standards for the level of course being taught;
 - Evaluation of classroom performance by outside observers (e.g., other faculty, staff from the Center for Faculty Development);
 - Recognition or awards for distinguished teaching;
 - Surveys, letters or other documents from former students or alumni.
 - Effective guidance and instruction to students outside of the traditional classroom setting may be demonstrated by:
 - Effective performance as a chair or reader on advanced seminar, thesis and dissertation committees and/or supervision of independent studies, or internships, as indicated by numbers of such activities and the quality of final products;
 - Student advising;
 - Organizing or actively participating in other activities that encourage student learning (e.g., working with students on research or community-related projects, mentoring PhD students for research, organizing student activities for professional growth).

- Participation in curriculum design and policies regarding teaching and student learning may be demonstrated by:
 - Documents reflecting participation in program planning and curriculum design;
 - Positive judgments by colleagues on curriculum committees, task forces, etc. on the candidate's contribution to committee work (e.g., letters of support);
 - Collaboration or sharing of teaching approaches and materials with other faculty;
 - New course syllabi that address identified student needs.

Example # 3: Teaching involves a complex and inter-related set of duties, obligations and opportunities. Evaluation of teaching must be sensitive to the many dimensions of the instructional process, including:

COURSE CONTENT: Content should be current, comprehensive and appropriate to the level of course.

COURSE TYPE: Teaching goals and objectives, as well as style and strategy, should be responsive to class size, whether the class is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, fulfilling general education or departmental major requirements, and other factor that influence the "context" in which instruction occurs.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: The emphasis in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is on how much students learn and how well they learn it, as opposed to how much material was presented. Good teachers produce students who are well-prepared for further course work and who value the course and what they have learned from it, which may be evidenced by enrollment in subsequent courses, level of performance of the student in later coursework, or decisions to major in the discipline, pursue graduate work, choose the instructor as an advisor, and so on.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM: Each professor is expected to contribute to the instructional program of the department, which includes such things as teaching appropriate and mutually desired courses, being available for advising, working to develop and enhance the curriculum, creating and generating new courses, and working with students in clubs, groups and organizations. Part of this effort might also include involvement in faculty teaching workshops, team teaching, mentoring and mentor relationships, classroom visitations, and other activities to promote competence in instruction. Supervision of individual students in areas of independent study, guided readings, and field experience is also a valued contribution to the departmental program, as are efforts to improve the teaching environment in the college or on campus.

COMMUNICATION: Teaching is often facilitated by clarity in communicating expectations and providing an orderly structure for learning, which may be demonstrated by copies of course outlines, bibliographies and maintaining posted office hours.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND OPINIONS: All faculty must obtain and review student opinions via use of the Faculty Course Questionnaire (as required by the regents). Since it is statistically impossible for all faculty to be above average, and because there is the possibility of confusing the assessment of style with that of content, the department will interpret the FCQ scores as one significant source of information on classroom performance. Consistently low scores across teaching contexts may be taken as evidence of the need to change and improve some dimensions of teaching performance. Faculty who fail to respond to such low evaluations

through substantial efforts at improvement in classroom performance will be deemed to be unsatisfactory in this area.

Conversely, consistently high scores across different teaching contexts on the FCQ will be interpreted as evidence that one is an excellent classroom teacher. All faculty are expected to routinely study FCQ scores and written comments for each of their classes in order to identify personal areas of strength for emphasis and areas of weakness that need attention or remediation, and to make good faith efforts to respond constructively and creatively to this information.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH: It is assumed in the department that teaching and research are not mutually exclusive nor in any manner contradictory. Research findings should be incorporated into teaching and enhance the quality of instruction, while students should be involved in the research process through work with professors as appropriate and possible. Supervising research projects, serving on thesis committees, and working intensively with graduate and/or honors students are some additional ways to demonstrate acceptable performance in the area of teaching.

EVALUATION: The department is committed to the importance of the use of multiple methods for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Methods to be used in evaluating teaching effectiveness include (1) the extent to which the faculty member pays serious attention to FCQ (or similar) course evaluations and includes student perceptions, as appropriate, in continuing efforts to improve teaching effectiveness, (2) evidence of student learning obtained through the embedded evaluation strategy of the departmental assessment program, (3) assessment by the reviewing faculty of the breadth and quality of the contributions to the departmental program of instruction, which includes such factors as willingness to teach needed courses, (4) assessment by the reviewing faculty of the integrity of the content of the course and the competence in and command of the subject matter as illustrated by course syllabi and outlines, (5) use of teaching technologies, command of particular pedagogy appropriate to the subject matter, and other matters related to effective communication, (6) commitment to instruction and students, as indicated by successful involvement in advising, sponsoring student clubs, programs and activities, coordinating programs and curriculum development, and (7) sustained efforts to improve the competence of instruction as illustrated by participation in teaching workshops and seminars, peer evaluation programs, team teaching, and the willingness to engage in experimental and developmental programs of instruction.

Research:

Excerpts from:

Expanding Research Horizons

Concepts for a Campus Strategic Plan for Research
Developed by the Campus Faculty Research Council

Research Council Members:

Drs. Robert Camley, PES; Zbigniew Celinski, PES; Jenenne Nelson, Beth El; Karen Newell, Biology; Dorothea Olkowski, Philosophy; Tom Pyszczynski, Psychology; ; Rodger Ziemer, ECE; Michael Larson, Engineering; Terry Boulton, CS; Forest Tierson; Anthropology, Lindy Crawford, and Ms. Sue Byerley, Library.

Goal:

The campus must maintain, and if possible accelerate its recently realized momentum in pursuing and obtaining externally sponsored programs.

Background:

- Research is fundamental to a university. It involves the creation of knowledge.
- Research and teaching are inexorably intertwined. Plus, having students directly involved in research enhances the student's educational experience (e.g., it makes them better problem solvers)
- Sponsored research helps fund graduate and undergraduate education, funds laboratory expansion, and helps cover many real costs of campus operation.

Principles:

- The pursuit of sponsored programs will be consistent with the educational role and mission of the campus -- pursuit of funding merely for the sake of money is not the goal.
- All research contributions, whether funded or not, are valued.

Components of the Plan:

1. Strengthen the research culture of the faculty and the administration
 - a. Promotion and Tenure process and criteria
 - i. Expand the discussion beyond sponsored research
 - ii. Encourage far-reaching dialog on research activities valued through the P&T process
 - iii. Promote P&T criteria that do not undervalue the pursuit of appropriate research funding.
 - iv. Use the discussion of the task force report and the required revision of criteria to promote department discussions of role of research in P&T
 - b. New policies to be considered
 - i. Course buy out (encourage college discussions)
 - ii. P&T criteria (as in 1.a above)
 - iii. Enable hiring new tenure-track faculty on soft moneys
 - iv. Revise dean's merit evaluations to include research promotion activities in their college.
 - v. New hires should fit into the College and University research mission.
 - c. Mechanisms to recognize non-funded research
 - i. Expand campus CRCW research awards
 - ii. Support small summer research stipends, perhaps funded by ICR
 - iii. Faculty participation in the new Austin Bluffs Center for R&D -- open to all.
 - iv. Use ICR dollars to fund newly hired tenure track faculty start-up packages.
2. Leverage critical capabilities
 - a. Increase research capacity of grant-active faculty
 - i. Enable grant-funded hiring of instructors
 - ii. Develop appropriate system of differentiated workload allowing greater emphasis of research or instruction.
 - b. Hire more senior grant-experienced faculty to increase extramural funding
 - c. Continue mentoring program for faculty -- especially new faculty
 - d. Expand and strengthen graduate programs, especially in areas of high grant potential.
 - e. Develop a mechanism to include undergraduate and graduate students into faculty research
 - f. Mentor and off-load new faculty to allow establishment of their research programs.
 - g. Encourage interdisciplinary research between Colleges.
3. Provide high-profile leadership
 - a. Involve Chancellor's office appropriately
 1. Make case for broad-based (ie, funded and non-funded) research initiative
4. Position campus for opportunities
 - a. Identify and pursue funding targets of opportunity - Review federal funding agency initiatives
 - b. Define campus research strengths - Assessment of faculty research
 - c. Match faculty research strengths to external research opportunities
 - d. Develop and articulate integrated research plan - "connecting the dots"

From University of Memphis Faculty Handbook:

Scholarship

Scholarship is a discipline-based, multidisciplinary activity that advances knowledge and learning by producing new ideas and understanding. Scholarly contributions include peer-evaluated, discipline-appropriate works such as books, articles, chapters, films, paintings, performances, and choreographic or theatrical design. Scholarship can be divided into five subcategories: application, creative activity, inquiry, integration, and the scholarship of teaching. Each department, considering its relevant discipline or disciplines, may emphasize contributions in some subcategories more than others, as described in its mission statement and other relevant departmental documents. Individual faculty are not expected to contribute in all five subcategories of scholarship. Some overlap in the meaning of the five subcategories is inevitable, and a particular scholarly contribution may fall under more than one subcategory. These subcategories are:

- **Creative activity** should be fully accepted as scholarship in departments where such work is appropriate to both professional specialization and teaching. It includes, but is not limited to, choreography and dance performance; creative writing; direction and design of plays; exhibitions of visual arts such as paintings, sculpture, and photography; direction of film and video; and musical composition and performance.
- **Inquiry** involves rigorous investigation aimed at the discovery of new knowledge within one's own discipline or area of study; it often serves as the basis for other forms of scholarship and may result in scholarly publications, funded research, and presentations at professional meetings.
- **Integration** makes meaningful connections between previously unrelated topics, facts, or observations, such as cross-disciplinary synthesis or an integrative framework within a discipline that results in a publication or presentation in a suitable forum.
- The scholarship of **teaching** focuses on transforming and extending knowledge about pedagogy, including appropriate textbooks or educational articles in one's own discipline. Innovative contributions to teaching, if published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum, also constitute scholarship of teaching. The "*scholarship of teaching*" is **not** equivalent to teaching. Classroom teaching and staying current in one's field are **not** relevant criteria for evaluating faculty on the "*scholarship of teaching*."
- **Engaged scholarship** now subsumes the scholarship of application. It adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to collaborative problem-solving with urban, regional, state, national and/or global communities and results in a written work shared with others in the discipline or field of study. Engaged scholarship conceptualizes "community groups" as all those outside of academe and requires shared authority at all stages of the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the research, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer evaluation. Departments should refine the definition as appropriate for their disciplines and incorporate evaluation guidelines in departmental tenure and promotion criteria.

Examples of UCCS Criteria:

Example #1: The candidate must have significant articles or creative work that make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form in refereed journals or juried showings/reviews of creative works. Scholarly materials accepted in final form or published by a reputable academic or commercial press can be used to provide evidence of scholarly acclaim. Unrefereed articles and unjuried creative work provide secondary evidence of scholarly achievement. Self published work must be externally reviewed. Edited research works, collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications will be considered on their scholarly merits. In all cases, it is the scholarly quality and contributions to the theoretical and applied fields of the discipline, not merely its quantity, which shall guide the evaluation of the faculty member's work. In every case where quantitative volume is not high, it is understood that under unusual circumstances the standards may be adjusted to reflect regular teaching loads in excess of 9 hours per semester, extraordinary service to the department and university, and work of exceptional quality as evidenced by professional recognition. The discipline is highly applied and interdisciplinary by nature. In recognition of these unique features, both theoretical and applied research/creative work are highly valued and are of equal importance in their contribution to the field, as are collaborative research and publications.

Example #2: As a rule of thumb, the candidate should have approximately five articles which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form in reputable journals since beginning a full-time tenure-track position at UCCS. Article-length contributions to edited books will be evaluated in the same fashion as journal articles. Presentations, textbooks and other publications will be considered on their scholarly merits. Grants for research activity will also count as evidence of scholarly achievement and of favorable review by the scholarly community. In all cases, it is the scholarly merit of the work reviewed, not merely its quantity, which shall guide the evaluation of the faculty member's work. In every case where quantitative standards are not met, it is understood that the standards may be adjusted to reflect work of exceptional quality.

Example # 3: The department asserts that continuous and substantial involvement in research and scholarly activity is an inherent, and necessary, dimension of academic practice. It is as fundamental to the definition of the role of professor as is teaching and is synergistic with it. The discipline recognizes more than one style of research and more than one definition of scholarly activity. The department is strengthened by diverse skills and abilities of its members across these different approaches. Evaluation is based on competence and quality in research and scholarly work, not on style, type or quantity of production alone and includes consideration of many of the dimensions of generating, testing, confirming or disputing knowledge.

RESEARCH: The quality of research is determined by the competence with which appropriate methods are used to test ideas and generate knowledge, and the extent to which ideas and knowledge are appropriate and significant objects of inquiry (i.e., which increase understanding; reflect advancement in the substantive and/or theoretical substance of the discipline; or aid in the formulation and evaluation of public policy and programs). The arbitrary distinctions by which research is categorized and differentially valued by some as pure, applied, policy, evaluations, etc. is not recognized by the department.

CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY WORK: Writing texts, interpreting and advancing the discipline, developing theoretical positions through historical or bibliographic research, submitting proposals for funding of research projects, and other such work are equally as important and functionally equivalent to research as described above.

METHODS: Research competence is demonstrated by the (a) selection of the most appropriate or applicable method for a specific research project; (b) proper development and implementation of the research strategy; and (c) complete and correct application of the methods and interpretation and presentation of the research findings.

KNOWLEDGE BASE: Research projects should demonstrate a clear relationship to and understanding of the relevant literature and recent findings in the area of investigation.

PUBLICATION AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS: The department endorses the obligation of researchers and scholars to present research findings for review, publication, criticism and possible correction. Publication of findings in refereed journals or by an academic press is one procedure which certifies competence, and in some instances, the more “prestigious” the journal or press, the greater the competence. The department also recognizes the right, if not the duty, for faculty to present findings in the public forum that is most appropriate for the nature of the research and scholarly work in which they are engaged. Monographs, policy guides, technical reports and papers, presentations at local regional and national associations of professional associations, editing a journal or collection of papers, or participating in campus or community-based forums and seminars are all methods of presenting findings that may fulfill the obligation for the presentation of research and scholarly activity. The determination of the competence, quality and importance of these “non-refereed” materials resides with the members of the department. Collaborative research and joint authorship are encouraged, and credit for such work will be granted according to the level of participation (i.e., equal co-authorship; first or second author; assistance only in writing only in research; etc.).

EVALUATION: The department expects and requires the on-going involvement of faculty in scholarly and creative work, most often in the form of projects leading to publication. It is also expected that this work will be of high quality, as this is defined in the preceding discussion. Both the quality and the quantity of research and publications (including reports, presentations in appropriate forums, etc.) will be evaluated by the departmental faculty within the traditions and practices of the discipline. It is expected that by the time of consideration for promotion and or the award of continuous tenure, a faculty member will have produced a body of work sufficient to demonstrate competence in and commitment to the area of research and scholarly work.

Service:

Examples of criteria:

Example #1: In addition to meeting his or her obligations within the department, college and university, the candidate should also demonstrate service within the discipline and to the community. Service to the discipline may include reviewing journals or research proposals, serving as editor for a journal, participation in professional conferences, and leadership within professional organizations. Service to the community may include consulting, membership on boards of organizations or agencies, presentation of professional information through the media, and/or professional presentations to lay audiences. Service should apply to the candidate’s

professional expertise and activities should help promote a positive relationship with UCCS and/or promote professional or public well-being. Clinical practice and consultation in the candidate's specialty area is valued by the college as an important service contribution to the community and public sector (candidate needs to specify paid versus volunteer work).

Example #2: Candidates are expected to participate fully in the life of the department, including regular attendance at faculty meetings, sharing in the department's decision-making process, and participating in activities that contribute to the department's well-being. In addition to department service, the candidate's record should show development in making extra-departmental contributions. These might include service on college and university committees, election to office in the Faculty Assembly, speaking to the media or community groups, or volunteer work in the community. In some cases, consulting work, whether compensated or not, may have a service component, if these activities enhance the reputation of the university or enrich the community.

Example #3 [promotion to full professor]: At the level of consideration for promotion to full professor, different faculty will have found very different niches. Any of the three areas may be more important in a particular faculty member's career at this point than the other two. In general, the biggest contrast to promotion to Associate Professor is that the service component should be more pronounced....

3) Service at this level is a very important part of the faculty member's contribution. At a minimum, the candidate should demonstrate a continued commitment to service both inside and outside the department. Some service activities, such as acting in an administrative capacity within the university (e.g., serving as department chair) or engaging in extensive community activities may be much appropriate now than at earlier levels.

Summary of the Proposal for Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Evaluation criteria are developed by each primary unit for tenure, promotion to associate and full ranks, and for post-tenure review using the Regental requirements of "meritorious" and "excellent." The purpose of this proposal is:

- 1) to broaden the "research" category to include different types of scholarship and to introduce a "professional practice" category where appropriate, and
- 2) to introduce the faculty responsibility statement (FRS).

Scholarship

All tenured/tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship. All five forms of scholarship listed below were patterned after the Boyer report (Scholarship Reconsidered) and carry equal weight if done with equal rigor, communication, and peer review.

1. ***Scholarship of Discovery*** – this is what most now view as basic research.
2. ***Scholarship of Integration*** – this is where meaning is given to facts across disciplines in the larger context. It may mean working with non-specialists in collaboration or consultation.
3. ***Scholarship of Application*** – this is where we use our expertise in our special fields of knowledge and apply that expertise to real-world problems.
4. ***Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*** – this is the rigorous study of teaching and learning that evolves into the sharing of pedagogical research.
5. ***Scholarship of Creative Works*** – this is the artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

The scholarship category will be a yearly average of a minimum of 40% before tenure. Under special circumstances or where a faculty member's required "professional practice" effort is large, a lower level of scholarship is understood. Similarly there will to be a minimum of 20% after tenure.

Professional Teaching

The quality of teaching is a major factor in the evaluation. The "Professional Teaching" category is a minimum of 30% before tenure and a minimum of 20% after tenure. In addition to the Faculty Course Questionnaire, other evidence may demonstrate pedagogical abilities.

Professional Practice

Professional practice means the engagement of faculty using their professional skills to provide direct service in the discipline, solve problems, disseminate information, or improve the campus or community. This work should be specified in the FRS for faculty who have professional practice responsibilities.

Service

Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university. Other types of service for the community or discipline, for example, are acceptable as part of the service component.

Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS)

The FRS identifies the proportion of effort by the faculty member in 1) professional teaching; 2) scholarship; 3) professional practice, and 4) service. This statement is agreed to by the individual and the department/unit chair and approved by the dean of the individual's college/school.

Faculty Responsibility Statements are generally short documents - usually a single page – that specify the breakdown of what the faculty member is responsible for within the needs of the department/unit. The proportion of an evaluation may be specified as percentages but other methods may be preferred by the department/unit. Departments have the discretion to use a standard template for their faculty members if they prefer.