

Departmental Bylaws

Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Denver

Approved:	May 15, 2013
Amended:	September 6, 2013
Amended:	May 20, 2015
Amended:	December 9, 2015

Contents

- Preamble** **6**

- I The Faculty** **6**
 - I.A Department Membership 6
 - I.A.i Administrators 6
 - I.A.ii Graduate Faculty 7
 - I.B Faculty Responsibilities 7
 - I.C Voting Rights of Constituencies 7
 - I.C.i Special Voting Members 7
 - I.C.ii Voting Faculty 7
 - I.C.iii Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty 7
 - I.C.iv Rostered Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Special Voting Members 7
 - I.C.v Graduate Faculty 8
 - I.C.vi Non-Rostered Faculty and Staff 8

- II Department Administration** **8**
 - II.A Chair 8
 - II.A.i Role and Function 8
 - II.A.ii Selection and Appointment/Reappointment 8
 - II.A.iii Suggested Term Length 8
 - II.A.iv Authority and Responsibilities 9
 - II.A.iv.a General 9
 - II.A.iv.b Specific 10
 - II.A.iv.c Budgetary 10
 - II.A.iv.d Supervisory 10
 - II.A.v Vacancy 11
 - II.A.vi Removal of Chair 11
 - II.A.vii Remuneration 11
 - II.B Associate Chair 11
 - II.B.i Role and Function 11
 - II.B.ii Selection and Appointment 11
 - II.B.iii Suggested Term Length 12
 - II.B.iv Authority and Responsibilities 12
 - II.B.v Remuneration 12
 - II.B.vi Reappointment 12
 - II.B.vii Review 12
 - II.B.viii Temporary Replacement 12

II.B.ix	In the Case of Removal or Absence of Chair	12
II.C	Director of Graduate Studies	12
II.C.i	Role and Function	12
II.C.ii	Selection and Appointment	12
II.C.iii	Remuneration	13
II.D	Director of Undergraduate Studies	13
II.D.i	Role and Function	13
II.D.ii	Selection and Appointment	13
II.D.iii	Remuneration	13
II.E	Director of the Math Clinic	13
II.E.i	Role and Function	13
II.E.ii	Selection and Appointment	13
II.E.iii	Remuneration	13
II.F	Service Course Coordinator	13
II.F.i	Role and Function	13
II.F.ii	Selection and Appointment	14
II.F.iii	Remuneration	14
II.G	Director of Mathematics Education Resource Center	14
II.G.i	Role and Function	14
II.G.ii	Selection and Appointment	14
II.G.iii	Remuneration	14
II.H	Executive Committee	14
II.H.i	Membership	14
II.H.ii	Selection	14
II.H.iii	Committee Chair	14
II.H.iv	Authority and Responsibilities	15
III	Department Operation	15
III.A	Department Meetings	15
III.A.i	General	15
III.A.ii	Conduct	15
III.A.iii	Meeting Announcements	15
III.A.iv	Quorum	16
III.A.v	Agendas	16
III.A.vi	Voting	16
III.A.vii	Minutes	17
III.B	Committees	17
III.B.i	The Undergraduate Studies Committee	17
III.B.ii	The Graduate Studies Committee	17
III.B.iii	Committees Outside the Department	18
III.B.iv	Merit Evaluation Committees	18
III.B.iv.a	The Tenured/Tenure-Track Merit Evaluation Committee	18
III.B.iv.b	The Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee	18
III.C	Special Programs, Appointments, and Affiliations	18
III.C.i	The Math Clinic	18
III.C.ii	Affiliations	18
III.C.iii	Other Special Programs	19

IV Personnel Policy	19
IV.A Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty	19
IV.A.i Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion	19
IV.A.i.a Primary Unit Criteria for Comprehensive Review	19
IV.A.i.b Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	19
IV.A.i.b.1 Teaching:	20
IV.A.i.b.2 Research:	21
IV.A.i.b.3 Service:	22
IV.A.i.c Primary Unit Criteria for Promotion to Professor	22
IV.A.i.d Primary Unit RTP Committee	23
IV.A.i.d.1 Membership.	24
IV.A.i.d.2 Augmenting the primary unit.	24
IV.A.i.d.3 Role of department chair.	24
IV.A.i.d.4 Voting privileges by type of action.	24
IV.A.i.d.5 Activities of subcommittees.	24
IV.A.i.d.6 Process.	25
IV.A.i.d.7 Dossier.	26
IV.A.ii Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	27
IV.A.ii.a General Procedure	27
IV.A.ii.b Differential Work Loads and Evaluation Weights	28
IV.A.ii.c Sabbaticals and Leaves	28
IV.A.ii.d Faculty Files	28
IV.A.ii.e Expectations	29
IV.A.ii.e.1 Teaching	29
IV.A.ii.e.2 Research	29
IV.A.ii.e.3 Leadership and Service	30
IV.A.ii.f Merit Rating Guidelines for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty	30
IV.A.ii.f.1 Teaching	30
IV.A.ii.f.2 Research	31
IV.A.ii.f.3 Leadership and Service	32
IV.A.ii.g Appeals	32
IV.A.iii Professional Plans	33
IV.A.iv Post Tenure Review	33
IV.A.iv.a Process	34
IV.A.iv.b Timelines	34
IV.A.iv.c Triggered Reviews and Performance Improvement Agreements	34
IV.A.iv.d Extensive Reviews	34
IV.A.v Sabbaticals	35
IV.A.vi Differentiated Workloads	36
IV.A.vi.a Methods of Designing a Differentiated Workload	36
IV.A.vi.b Guidelines	36
IV.A.vi.c Process for requesting, approving and implementing a differentiated workload agreement	37
IV.A.vi.d Impact on Merit Evaluation	38
IV.B Research Faculty	38
IV.B.i Initial Appointment	38
IV.B.i.a Procedures for Initial Appointment for Research Faculty	38
IV.B.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment to the Research Faculty	39

IV.B.ii Re-appointment of Research Faculty 39
 IV.B.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment of Research Faculty 39
 IV.B.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment to the Research Faculty 40
 IV.B.iii Promotion of Research Faculty 40
 IV.B.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion of Research Faculty 40
 IV.B.iii.b Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty 40
 IV.B.iii.b.1 Promotion to Research Associate Professor 40
 IV.B.iii.b.2 Promotion to Research Professor 41
 IV.B.iv Annual Evaluations and Expectations 41
 IV.C Clinical Teaching Track Faculty 41
 IV.C.i Procedures for Initial Appointment to the C/T 42
 IV.C.i.a Criteria for Initial Appointment to the C/T 42
 IV.C.ii Re-appointment within the C/T 42
 IV.C.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment within the C/T 42
 IV.C.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment within the C/T 43
 IV.C.iii Promotion within the C/T 43
 IV.C.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion within the C/T 43
 IV.C.iii.b Criteria for Promotion within the C/T 43
 IV.C.iii.b.1 Promotion to Associate Professor C/T 43
 IV.C.iii.b.2 Promotion to Full Professor C/T 44
 IV.C.iv Evaluation of Clinical Track Faculty 44
 IV.C.iv.a General Procedure 44
 IV.C.iv.b Expectations for Clinical Track Faculty 45
 IV.C.iv.b.1 Teaching 45
 IV.C.iv.b.2 Leadership and Service 45
 IV.C.iv.b.3 Research/Scholarship 45
 IV.C.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for C/T Faculty 45
 IV.D Instructors 47
 IV.D.i Initial Appointment 47
 IV.D.i.a Procedures for Appointment 47
 IV.D.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment 47
 IV.D.ii Re-appointment 47
 IV.D.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment 47
 IV.D.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment 47
 IV.D.iii Promotion to Senior Instructor 47
 IV.D.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Instructor 47
 IV.D.iii.b Criteria for Promotion 48
 IV.D.iv Annual Evaluations 48
 IV.D.iv.a Basic Procedure 48
 IV.D.iv.b Expectations 48
 IV.D.iv.b.1 Teaching 48
 IV.D.iv.b.2 Service 49
 IV.D.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for Instructors and Senior Instructors 49
 IV.D.iv.c.1 Teaching 49
 IV.D.iv.c.2 Service 49
 IV.E Evaluation of Classroom Teaching Effectiveness 49
 IV.E.i Expectations 50
 IV.E.ii Evaluation Criteria 50

IV.E.iii	General Procedure	50
IV.E.iv	Faculty Files	51
IV.E.v	Guidelines for Rating Classroom Teaching Effectiveness	51
V	Amendments	52
	Disclaimers	53
	Appendices	53
A	Policies and Procedures	54
A	Department Administration	54
A.i	Division of responsibilities between Chair and Associate Chair	54
A.i.a	Specific responsibilities of the Chair	54
A.i.b	Specific responsibilities of the Associate Chair	55
A.ii	Director of Graduate Studies	55
A.iii	Director of Undergraduate Studies	55
A.iv	Director of the Math Clinic	55
A.v	Service Course Coordinator	56
A.vi	Director of Mathematics Education Resource Center	56
B	Committees	56
B.i	The Undergraduate Studies Committee	56
B.ii	The Graduate Studies Committee	56
B.iii	The Tenured/Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee	57
B.iv	The Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee	57
B.v	Preliminary Examination Committees	57
B.vi	The Library Liaison Committee	57
B.vii	The Bylaws Committee	57
B.viii	Ad-hoc Committees	57
B.viii.a	Search Committee	58
C	Department Operation	58
C.i	Procedure for Nominating Department Chair	58
C.ii	Teaching Schedules	59
C.iii	Sabbaticals	60
C.iii.a	Eligibility	60
C.iii.b	Application process, including timelines	60
C.iii.c	Approval process	60
C.iii.d	Setting priorities when multiple faculty members apply	60
C.iii.e	Deferring sabbaticals	60
C.iii.f	Report of work and accomplishments during the sabbatical	61
C.iv	Procedure for proposing amendments to the bylaws	61

Preamble

These Bylaws are established by the faculty of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences (“Department”) of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (“College”) of the University of Colorado Denver (“University”), with the approval of the Dean, Provost, and Chancellor, to define for the Department responsibilities and organization, and procedures for the exercise of its responsibilities. These Bylaws provide a system of governance for the Department consistent with the principle of faculty responsibility and consistent with the laws of the State of Colorado, the rules of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado¹, and the CLAS Bylaws²

Article I

The Faculty

I.A Department Membership

Rostered Faculty refers to such faculty positions eligible to participate in college governance and/or serve on College and Department committees. The definition of rostered faculty is given in the CLAS bylaws³. All other faculty titles are used in accordance with the Board of Regents Policy⁴.

I.A.i Administrators

University and college administrators who are tenured in the Department, while rostered, shall for the purposes of these bylaws be considered as non-rostered faculty and shall not serve on Department Standing Committees nor, in general, have voting rights within the Department.

¹<http://www.cusys.edu/regents/Laws>

²<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/faculty-staff/Documents/policies/CLASbylaws.pdf>.

³<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/faculty-staff/Documents/policies/CLASbylaws.pdf>

⁴<http://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm>

I.A.ii Graduate Faculty

Rostered and special voting faculty (see I.C.i) holding appointments in the UC Denver Graduate School are considered graduate faculty.

I.B Faculty Responsibilities

The expectations and responsibilities of the Department members are given in the Personnel Policy (Article III.C.iii). (Article III.C.iii).

I.C Voting Rights of Constituencies

I.C.i Special Voting Members

The rostered faculty (see I.A) may confer upon a non-rostered faculty member or administrator (see I.A.i) the designation of special voting member. In general this will be reserved for department members who have served the Department for at least two years and have exhibited an ongoing interest in the Department's affairs. The designation remains in effect unless revoked by the rostered faculty. A special voting member shall have the same voting rights as a rostered non-tenure track faculty member (see I.C.iv).

I.C.ii Voting Faculty

All rostered faculty (except administrators, see I.A.i) and special voting members (see above) shall constitute the voting faculty for the purposes of these bylaws.

I.C.iii Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

For purposes of voting on issues pertaining to the Bylaws or general governance of the Department, and for electing members of its own constituency to committee membership each tenured and tenure-track faculty member as defined in these Bylaws shall be entitled to one vote.

I.C.iv Rostered Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Special Voting Members

After a positive vote of the faculty for initial appointment or re-appointment (see IV.D.i and IV.D.ii), rostered Non-Tenure-Track Faculty shall be entitled to one vote on issues pertaining to the general governance of the Department and for purposes of electing members of their own constituency to committee membership, with the following exceptions:

- personnel matters involving tenure track faculty, including hiring decisions, personnel policies, and related sections of the bylaws;
- matters involving the graduate program and graduate students, unless the faculty member is a member of the graduate faculty;
- amendments to the bylaws.

Special voting members shall have the same voting rights as rostered non-tenure track faculty upon obtaining the status of special voting member. All faculty members may be consulted on matters where they do not vote, as appropriate.

I.C.v Graduate Faculty

Graduate faculty (see I.A.ii) have the right to vote on matters concerning the graduate program of the Department.

I.C.vi Non-Rostered Faculty and Staff

Voting rights may be extended by the voting faculty to groups or individuals of non-rostered faculty and staff on an issue by issue basis.

Article II

Department Administration

II.A Chair

II.A.i Role and Function

The Chair is the Chief Executive Officer of the Department, and as such, works to advance the goals of the Department, and is responsible for implementing Department and College policy in the operation of the Department.

II.A.ii Selection and Appointment/Reappointment

1. The Chair is nominated by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track members of the Department and appointed by the Dean of CLAS.
2. A search and nominating process will be carried out by the faculty of the Department in accordance with Department procedures. The faculty will subsequently submit its recommendation to the Dean.

II.A.iii Suggested Term Length

While this is an at will appointment, to be consistent with article 4, Laws of the Regents, 1990, the Department Chair will serve for four-year terms. Department chairs are appointed on a fiscal

(12-month) year basis. Appointments may be made occasionally for other periods for specific reasons.

II.A.iv Authority and Responsibilities

II.A.iv.a General

1. The chair has the responsibility for providing leadership toward the achievement of the highest possible level of excellence in the teaching, research, and service activities of the Department. The chair is expected to articulate the goals of the Department, both within and without the Department, to articulate the Department's actions or requests in pursuit of these aims, and to maintain a climate that is hospitable to creativity and innovation. The chair has the responsibility to inform the Department of the stances and actions of the Dean and other administrators that might affect the Department.
2. In the larger framework of the college, the chair, as a faculty member, has a special responsibility in representing the Department in areas of formulation of educational policy and academic ethics, as provided in article 4, Laws of the Regents, 1990.
3. The chair should be receptive to questions, complaints, grievances, and suggestions from members of the Department, both academic and staff personnel, and from students. The chair has the responsibility to take appropriate action as required.
4. The chair is ultimately responsible for the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of both the academic and the staff personnel of the Department. In consultation with colleagues, and in consonance with the appropriate Departmental procedures, the chair recommends appointments, promotion, merit increases, and terminations. The chair has the explicit responsibility to ensure that faculty members are aware of the Departmental, college, and campus criteria prescribed for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and to make appraisals and recommendations in accordance with the procedures and principles stated in the Laws of the Regents. In the course of recruitment of new appointees or in relation to salary increases or advancement of incumbents, the Department chair shall make no formal commitment as to rank and salary until such action has received final approval of the appropriate administrative office. The chair has the responsibility to be familiar with the state personnel system, and to ensure that staff are aware of Departmental expectations and of state personnel system criteria for appointment, reappointment, job classification, and promotion.
5. In the performance of the duties listed in this section (II.A.iv.a), the chair is expected to seek the advice of departmental faculty colleagues in a systematic way, to provide for the conduct of Department affairs in an orderly manner through Department meetings and the formation of appropriate committees, and to keep Department members informed of his or her actions in a timely manner. The chair is also expected to seek student advice on matters of concern to students enrolled in the Department's programs.
6. The chair is assisted by the associate chair (section II.B), the director of graduate studies (section II.C), the director of undergraduate studies (section II.D), and an executive committee (section II.H) in the tasks involved in carrying out his or her responsibilities.

II.A.iv.b Specific

In addition to the above general responsibilities, the chair is responsible for each of the following:

- Assignment of teaching and other duties within the Department consistent with appropriate FTE levels, and consistent with the concept that the appropriate mix of teaching, research or creative work, scholarship, and service may differ from person to person, and from time to time in the career of an individual;
- Preparation of the schedule of courses and of times and places for class meetings;
- Arrangement and assignment of duty for counseling of students, and for training and supervision of teaching assistants and other student teachers and teacher aides;
- Recommendation of sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence to the Dean, and for ensuring that their scheduling is consistent with Departmental needs;
- Formation of standing and ad hoc committees;
- Scheduling and chairing faculty meetings;
- Making regular verbal or written reports to the faculty regarding administrative communications and decisions. Producing a public written annual report on Departmental activities, including raw data, about publications, funding, teaching, student enrollments, faculty service, etc.;
- Making emergency temporary appointments of duration no longer than an academic year with the advice of the Faculty.

II.A.iv.c Budgetary

The Department Chair is responsible for the preparation of the budget and administration of the financial affairs of the Department, in strict accordance with dollar and FTE allocations and in accord with University rules and procedures. The Department Chair makes a written annual report on the budget and financial affairs of the Department and presents it to the faculty in a timely fashion.

II.A.iv.d Supervisory

With respect to supervisory concerns of the Department, the Chair is responsible for the following:

- Supervision of Department staff personnel;
- Custody and authorized use of University property charged to the Department, and assignment of departmental space and facilities to authorized activities in accordance with University policy and campus rules and regulations;
- Departmental observance of proper health and safety regulations, in coordination with the campus environmental health and safety officer;
- Maintenance of records and of faculty and staff personnel files, and preparation of reports in accordance with the University and college procedures;

- Enforcement of the “one-sixth” rule regarding outside compensation for consulting in accordance with regent and campus regulations;
- Reporting to the Dean, or appropriate administrators any failure of an academic or staff member of the Department to carry out responsibilities, and making recommendations of appropriate remedial or disciplinary action whenever the problem cannot be expeditiously resolved at the departmental level;
- Promptly reporting the resignation or death of any member of the Department.

II.A.v Vacancy

In the event of a vacancy of the Department chair position (i.e., resignation, removal, etc.), the Dean of the college shall appoint an interim chair in consultation with the Department executive committee and initiate a search for a new chair in accordance with the procedures described in section II.A.ii The Associate Chair will serve as acting chair until such appointment is made.

II.A.vi Removal of Chair

Termination for just cause of an appointment of a Department chair prior to the expiration of a term of appointment may be recommended by either the Department faculty or the Dean, in accordance with the Laws of the Regents. Department recommendations for termination (for just cause as defined by the Laws of the Regents or otherwise) must comply with the following procedure: At a meeting of all the faculty, called with at least one week’s notice and chaired by a member of the faculty selected at this meeting (the chair pro tem), a written document must be produced which explains all the reasons for making the recommendation. After the document has been prepared, it must be approved by 2/3 of all rostered departmental faculty. The chair pro tem shall convey the document and the results of a successful vote to the Dean.

II.A.vii Remuneration

The Chair will receive an administrative stipend, course releases, and other accommodations negotiated between the Dean and the Chair.

II.B Associate Chair

II.B.i Role and Function

The Associate Chair’s primary administrative role is to share the Departmental responsibilities of the Chair.

II.B.ii Selection and Appointment

The Associate Chair is appointed by the Chair from the tenured faculty of the Department after consultation with the Department members.

II.B.iii Suggested Term Length

As this is an at will appointment, the length of term shall be negotiated with the Chair.

II.B.iv Authority and Responsibilities

The Associate Chair assists the Chair with the day-to-day operations of the Department and serves as acting Chair when the Chair is absent. Specific responsibilities of the Associate Chair are detailed in the Policies and Procedures document. However, specific responsibilities may change depending on the combination of expertise of the Chair and Associate Chair and are to be agreed upon at the beginning of the term by the Chair and Associate Chair.

II.B.v Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.B.vi Reappointment

Eligibility for reappointment is determined by the Chair in consultation with the faculty.

II.B.vii Review

An annual performance review including confidential written input shall be solicited from the faculty, as well as the Dean's staff as appropriate. This information will be compiled by the Chair and the Chair will give written and oral feedback to the Associate Chair.

II.B.viii Temporary Replacement

In case of a sabbatical or leave of any sort, an interim Associate Chair shall be appointed by the Chair.

II.B.ix In the Case of Removal or Absence of Chair

If the Chair is no longer able to serve as Chair, the Associate Chair will become the acting chair until the Dean of CLAS appoints either an interim chair or a new chair.

II.C Director of Graduate Studies**II.C.i Role and Function**

The Director of Graduate Studies serves on the Executive Committee (Section II.H) and provides leadership and oversight for the graduate committee (Section III.B.ii).

II.C.ii Selection and Appointment

The Director of Graduate Studies must be a tenured member of the Graduate Faculty and is appointed by the Chair of the Department in consultation with appropriate members of the Department. This is an at-will appointment and there is no term limitation.

II.C.iii Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.D Director of Undergraduate Studies**II.D.i Role and Function**

The Director of Undergraduate Studies serves on the Executive Committee (Section II.H) and is responsible for providing leadership for the Undergraduate Studies Committee (Section III.B.i.).

II.D.ii Selection and Appointment

The Director of Undergraduate Studies must be a tenured member of the Department and is appointed by the Chair of the Department in consultation with appropriate members of the Department. This is an at-will appointment and there is no term limitation.

II.D.iii Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.E Director of the Math Clinic**II.E.i Role and Function**

The Director of the Mathematics Clinic is responsible for the development and leadership of the Mathematics Clinic as an integral part of the educational and research mission of the Department. Specific responsibilities of the Math Clinic Director are detailed in the Policies and Procedures document.

II.E.ii Selection and Appointment

The Director of the Mathematics Clinic is selected and appointed by the Chair of the Department in consultation with appropriate faculty members. This is an at-will appointment and there is no term limitation.

II.E.iii Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.F Service Course Coordinator**II.F.i Role and Function**

The service course coordinator is responsible for the content and instruction of 1000 and 2000 level courses that are primarily populated by non-math majors. Specific responsibilities are detailed in the Policies & Procedures document.

II.F.ii Selection and Appointment

The Service Course Coordinator is appointed by the Chair of the Department in consultation with appropriate members of the Department. This is an at-will appointment and there is no term limitation.

II.F.iii Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.G Director of Mathematics Education Resource Center**II.G.i Role and Function**

The Director of the Mathematics Education Resource Center is responsible for the operation of the Mathematics Education Resource Center to service the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences. Specific responsibilities are detailed in the Policies and Procedures document.

II.G.ii Selection and Appointment

The MERC Lab Director is appointed by the Chair of the Department in consultation with appropriate members of the Department. This is an at-will appointment and there is no term limitation.

II.G.iii Remuneration

Remuneration is negotiated with the Chair of the Department and/or the Dean of the College.

II.H Executive Committee**II.H.i Membership**

The executive committee consists of the Department Chair, the Associate Chair, the Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, and two tenured or tenure-track members of the faculty elected by the voting faculty for “off-set” two-year terms.

II.H.ii Selection

Elections for the members of the Executive Committee will be held at the end of the spring semester. Any member of the faculty may self-nominate themselves and run for these positions. Elections are conducted by written ballot and officiated by the Department chair.

II.H.iii Committee Chair

The Department chair shall chair the Executive Committee and call its meetings. Any two members of the executive committee may require the chair to call a meeting.

II.H.iv Authority and Responsibilities

The Executive Committee's responsibilities will include:

1. serving as an advisory board for the Department chair;
2. dealing with ethics and bylaws violations in the Department (misconduct in research, teaching, fiscal matters, etc.). In any matter of this nature brought before the executive committee, any member of the executive committee who is perceived to have a conflict of interest in the case must recuse themselves from the discussions/actions involved with the case. Also, strict confidentiality shall be observed in all such matters; and
3. functioning as a faculty appeals and grievance committee. Formal procedures for making an appeal or grievance shall be determined by the executive committee and made known to all members of the Department. In the case of an appeal of a merit review evaluation, the executive committee shall make a decision on the appropriateness of the appeal and any action to be taken in response to the appeal based on the written appeal of the faculty member and the written response to that appeal by the Merit Review Committee. Any member of the executive committee who is perceived to have a conflict of interest in the case must recuse themselves from this process.

Article III

Department Operation

III.A Department Meetings

III.A.i General

The Department shall establish a regular monthly meeting time each semester and shall meet at least once each month during the fall and spring semesters.

III.A.ii Conduct

Meetings shall be conducted according to the latest edition of Roberts Rules of Order.

III.A.iii Meeting Announcements

Timelines and requirements for calling regular meetings and additional meetings shall be convened as determined by the Chair, or upon petition of at least three voting members of the faculty.

III.A.iv Quorum

A quorum of tenured/tenure-track faculty must be present to approve new or revised policies, to approve new or revised graduation requirements, or to make decisions on personnel matters except for promotion and tenure decisions (see appendix on personnel matters). A quorum is defined as 2/3 of the tenured/tenure track full time faculty of the department (rounded down). Department members who are on leave (for any reason) will not be counted in the calculation of the quorum number unless they are physically present at a meeting. In situations of exigency, a mail or e-mail vote may be taken, in which case, 2/3 of the voting faculty (see Section III.A.vi below) must respond for the vote to be binding. Whether decisions are made in meetings or by mail, a demonstrable attempt must be made to give all voting members prior notice of consideration of the issue. Analogous principles apply to decisions made within committees.

III.A.v Agendas

The agenda (as well as the location and time) of all faculty meetings shall be distributed to the faculty at least two business days in advance of the meeting (except in the case of emergencies).

III.A.vi Voting

Voting members are those department members with voting rights who may vote on specific issues as outlined in this section, as well as those department members that have been granted voting privileges on a specific issue. See I.C

- Any motion brought before the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences and seconded, shall be decided by a simple majority of the voting members present (or those giving a proxy).
- New and revised policies, operating procedures and degree requirements often originate in the committees and are brought to the full Department as approved recommendations, and as such do not require a second.
- Decisions and recommendations on the hiring, reappointment, tenure and promotion of faculty members require a simple majority vote of the appropriate voting members (see Article III.C.iii - Personnel Policy). A secret written vote is required in all personnel matters and may be requested by faculty on other matters.
- Decisions about the graduate program may only be voted on by voting members having a graduate faculty appointment.

Proxy Voting In the event of justified absence (including, but not limited to, travel, illness, or scheduling conflicts), a voting member may vote on a specific well defined important issue either by delivering a written vote in absentia to the meeting chair prior to the meeting or by asking another voting member to serve as a proxy. To designate a proxy, the voting member must inform the meeting chair prior to the meeting of who the proxy is, the reason for the absence, and the issues for which the proxy may vote.

- A proxy may vote on nonprocedural motions and amendments made during the meeting according to conditions specified by the person being represented. Proxies should not make

decisions for the person they are representing; instead, the proxy should vote only as they believe that person would vote. A proxy cannot vote on procedural motions.

- A proxy vote cannot be “abstain”; if a proxy vote is not cast, it shall not be counted in determining the majority for the issue. Proxy votes and written votes in absentia do not count toward the quorum.
- A voting member may serve as a proxy only for one other voting member and only on issues for which he/she already has voting rights. A proxy assignment shall be valid for one meeting only, but may be renewed.
- The chair of the meeting shall give all voting members a prior timely notice of votes on any important issues in order for proxy arrangements to be made. Prior to a meeting the chair of the meeting shall notify the faculty at the meeting about all written votes in absentia delivered to the chair.

Analogous principles of proxy votes and written votes in absentia apply to decisions made within committees.

III.A.vii Minutes

Reporting Minutes of all faculty meetings shall be kept and shall be distributed within one week of the conclusion of a meeting to all members of the faculty. The minutes shall record the names of those faculty in attendance. The minutes of the meeting shall be approved by a faculty vote at the next meeting.

III.B Committees

Much of the action, decision- and policy-making of the Department will originate in its committees. Members of both the standing and ad hoc committees are generally rostered faculty members, Department staff members and students. Standing committees are formed and their chairs are appointed by the Department Chair in a consensual process before or at the beginning of each academic year. The following standing committees are central to the decision making and governance of the department. Additional committees are described in the Policies and Procedures document.

III.B.i The Undergraduate Studies Committee

This committee is charged with introducing, reviewing, modifying and interpreting policies related to the undergraduate mathematics curriculum, as detailed in the Policies and Procedures document.

III.B.ii The Graduate Studies Committee

This committee is charged with introducing, reviewing, modifying and interpreting policies related to the Master’s and the Ph.D. programs as detailed in the Policies and Procedures document.

III.B.iii Committees Outside the Department

The Department strives to have strong representation on committees at the College, Campus and University levels. Members of the Department serving on outside committees which make individual personnel decisions must recuse themselves from any discussion and/or vote concerning members of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, whether or not the outside committee's bylaws require this.

III.B.iv Merit Evaluation Committees

III.B.iv.a The Tenured/Tenure-Track Merit Evaluation Committee

This committee consists of at least four tenured or tenure-track faculty members chosen by the Department Chair, with consultation with the faculty, to give an appropriate representation of the Department by rank and discipline. If possible, at least one member of the committee shall be selected from amongst those who served on the previous year's committee, but at least two members shall not have served on the previous year's committee, with priority given to faculty members who have not often served on the Merit Evaluation Committee (TT-MEC). Normally, the chair of the TT-MEC in the current year will be a continuing member of the TT-MEC from the previous year.

The committee is responsible for performing a complete and careful evaluation of each TT faculty member, primarily for the purpose of salary adjustments for the next academic year. The committee is also responsible for evaluating research faculty who are paid all or in part by departmental funds.

III.B.iv.b The Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee

This committee is responsible for performing the annual merit evaluations of instructors, senior instructors and CT faculty members. The committee consists of the Associate Chair and at least two rostered non-tenure track faculty members. The chair of the NTT-MEC will be the Associate Chair.

III.C Special Programs, Appointments, and Affiliations

III.C.i The Math Clinic

The Mathematics Clinic is a standing program within the Department that is designed to expose students to the application of mathematics to real-world problems through a regularly offered course. Each clinic is devoted to specific problems that are provided by business or government sponsors, often in the greater Denver area. Leadership of this program is provided by the Math Clinic Director (see Section II.E).

III.C.ii Affiliations

The Department may affiliate itself with other organizations compatible with its role and mission. Such affiliations are governed by negotiated written agreements which detail the roles and responsibilities of each party of the agreement. Examples of such affiliations are the Center for Computational Mathematics and the Center for Computational and Mathematical Biology.

III.C.iii Other Special Programs

Other programs sponsored by the Department, such as the Statistical Consulting Service, are governed by written agreements negotiated at the time the program is initiated. Such governing documents may be modified by mutual agreement, but the Department reserves its right to withdraw its sponsorship at any time with the approval of the voting faculty.

Article IV

Personnel Policy

IV.A Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

IV.A.i Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

The Laws of the Regents contain criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) decisions throughout the University of Colorado system. This section interprets these general criteria for the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences of the University of Colorado Denver. The interpretations are necessarily subjective, but highlight the typically required achievements that contribute to reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions in this department.

IV.A.i.a Primary Unit Criteria for Comprehensive Review

The principal purpose of a comprehensive review is to evaluate the candidate's progress toward tenure. The comprehensive review provides internal and external feedback to improve the record for the tenure case. If there is not a realistic prospect for a successful tenure review, then the candidate should not be reappointed. Additionally, the program requirements of the department shall be considered at the time of reappointment.

IV.A.i.b Primary Unit Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Regents' criteria are as follows:

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

Associate Professor: Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and promising accomplishment in research.

IV.A.i.b.1 Teaching: Tenure-track faculty members are expected to effectively teach their assigned courses and to participate in mentorship and training of students outside the classroom. A *meritorious* rating in teaching requires that the candidate is at least meritorious both in classroom teaching and in mentorship and training of students according to the criteria detailed below. An *excellent* rating requires excellence in both categories. Other teaching related activities and accomplishments may further strengthen the case for excellence.

Classroom Teaching: Classroom teaching is understood as planning, preparation, instruction, and assessment of students in regularly assigned courses including online courses.

- **Meritorious:** A *meritorious* rating requires a consistent record of effective teaching in assigned undergraduate and graduate courses. Teaching a variety of courses can help strengthen the case for a meritorious rating. Characteristics of effective teaching include competence in the material taught; quality course design consistent with the course description; satisfactory student evaluations and peer reviews; effective organization and use of class time; thoughtful student assessment through suitable assignments and timely feedback; availability, accessibility and helpfulness during office hours; respectful treatment of all students; a fair and consistent grading scheme in accordance with departmental standards; and compliance with any other department, college and university policies.
- **Excellent:** An *excellent* rating requires a sustained record of highly effective classroom teaching, which is characterized by strong student learning; high quality lectures, assignments, course organization and content; ability to adapt teaching styles to reach students at all levels in a variety of situations; high levels of classroom interaction; successful implementation of innovative teaching techniques; and high student satisfaction.

Mentorship and Training: Mentorship and training of students is understood as dedicated support of their professional development. This includes supervision of or collaboration with students in honors projects, Master's projects or theses, or Ph.D. dissertations. It also includes more general student training through independent studies, readings courses, industrial or other internships, modeling competitions, summer workshops, or mentorship or training of teaching assistants.

- **Meritorious:** A *meritorious* rating requires a record that demonstrates dedication and ability to effectively work with students outside the classroom.
- **Excellent:** An *excellent* rating requires a strong record of successfully working with multiple students and demonstrated readiness to supervise doctoral students. Other indicators, which may strengthen the case for excellence include student research awards; successful placement of students in competitive positions in academia, industry, or government institutions; and joint publications with a clear contribution from students as lead or co-authors.

Additional Indicators of Excellence in Teaching: Additional indicators that may strengthen the case for excellence in teaching include teaching awards; general curriculum development; the design of new courses; outreach to public schools and teachers; educational work with other organizations; publications related to the general scholarship and the practice of teaching and learning; and educational grants.

IV.A.i.b.2 Research: Pre-tenured faculty members are expected to develop an active research program and to publish their work in high quality refereed journals. For the purpose of tenure, research is understood as the scholarship of discovery.

To earn tenure, a candidate must have produced a sustained record of accomplishment in the mathematical and statistical sciences that is of sufficient quantity and quality to demonstrate that

1. the candidate has established a productive research program with a clear plan of sustained research productivity after tenure;
2. the candidate's work is of high quality and is respected by leading scholars;
3. the candidate has become an independent researcher who has grown substantially beyond the PhD.

The candidate's research record is considered *meritorious* if it satisfies the above three criteria. It is considered *excellent* if, in addition, it demonstrates that

1. the candidate has built a strong reputation and is well-known in his/her field; and
2. the candidate has established a strong research program producing impactful results.

To satisfy the above criteria, the overall contribution, visibility, significance, and impact of the research will be judged as a whole. The following evidence will be used to assess the research record.

1. Quantity and quality of refereed publications.
 - (a) The number of quality publications should be sufficient to establish that the productivity of the candidate's research program compares favorably with that of other researchers with similar training and experience in their field. Papers in conference proceedings will be considered for this purpose only if they are rigorously refereed and of journal quality. Papers published prior to employment at CU Denver will be considered for this purpose, provided the candidate maintains a high level of productivity at CU Denver; however, greater emphasis will be given to work produced at CU Denver.
 - (b) In cases of co-authorship, the weight of the candidate's contributions relative to the other collaborators will be considered.
 - (c) To demonstrate independence, a significant component of the record should consist of either i) publications with several different researchers or research groups, ii) papers co-authored only with students, or iii) singly authored papers.
2. External review letters. External review letters from leading scholars in the candidate's field are required to assess how the candidate's research record is perceived and how the candidate's impact and productivity compares with other researchers in their field who have recently obtained tenure at research universities. For a meritorious rating, the letters should

indicate that the candidate is producing high quality work and is well respected by leading researchers. For an excellent rating, the letters should indicate that the quality and impact of the candidate's research are excellent by the standards of the research community and that the candidate has established a strong reputation.

3. Grant activity. External research funding provides strong evidence of the quality and potential impact of the research and that the candidate's research record is well respected. Strong reviews of unfunded proposals will also be considered. The role of grants and proposals will be evaluated in the light of the criteria set by the funding agencies and in the calls for proposals, and the success rate.
4. Other indicators of excellence. The following evidence may strengthen the case for excellence by providing additional indicators of quality, impact, or reputation: citations of research results; honors and awards; invitations to visit other institutions or to speak at important conferences, particularly invited plenary lectures; the use of one's work in the academic, public, or private sectors; or significant professional service activities indicating a strong reputation (e.g. membership on respected editorial boards).

IV.A.i.b.3 Service: The criteria for evaluating service are intended to encourage junior faculty to be involved and conscientious citizens of the department and of their professional community. The department generally avoids making large service demands of tenure-track faculty so that they can focus their energies on their research and teaching activities. For tenure, a meritorious rating in service is characterized by

1. solid service to the Department as an involved and conscientious faculty member, including attendance at faculty meetings, service on committees, and competent execution of all assigned responsibilities; and
2. some professional service (for example, refereeing or reviewing papers).

Demonstrated leadership in service is not part of the criteria for tenure, and is not expected.

IV.A.i.c Primary Unit Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The Regents' criteria are as follows:

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

Promotion to full professor is based entirely on demonstrated growth and accomplishment, not potential. The overall criterion is leadership, becoming an individual looked to by others, which constitutes a substantial step beyond the expectations for an associate professor; for an individual granted tenure after some service as an untenured associate professor, growth during the entire period as an associate professor is considered. Thus, an important part of the stature of a full professor is the ability to set one's own goals, and to reach them at a level that will be

acknowledged by peers, internally and externally, as representative of professional excellence and leadership.

Different individuals will attain or exceed excellence in different areas, as they compile “a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent.” The standard applies to teaching, research, and service as a whole, so that required or sufficient criteria in any one area cannot be specified. For example, teaching that goes beyond excellent, to truly outstanding, could be combined with research that falls a bit below excellence and service that shows strong leadership to make a successful case for promotion; as another example, the analogue with teaching and research reversed could also occur. In such considerations, teaching and research each carry greater weight than service. As a guide, it is appropriate to discuss what could contribute to excellence in each area in the view of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences.

Teaching: At the full professor level, the criteria for excellence in teaching are similar to those at the tenure level; however, factors other than classroom teaching and student mentorship can play a larger role in establishing a record of excellence. For example, strong contributions to the teaching mission of the department through curriculum development; design of new courses; educational grants; publications related to the scholarship and practice of teaching and learning; or outreach to public schools might offset a record of student mentorship that falls slightly below excellent as defined in the tenure criteria.

Research: To demonstrate excellence at the full professor level in research, the overall issue is evidence of a strong scholarly reputation, in which one’s work has impact in one’s field and is cited, used, or built upon by others. This represents leadership in research. Very strong letters from leading scholars are necessary and especially important. Publications in highly respected outlets are also necessary, on a sustained, long-term basis. Other indicators can provide additional evidence of excellence, such as high productivity, high rates of citations by other researchers, use of one’s work in the academic, public, or private sectors, invitations to speak at important conferences, significant external funding, honors and awards, and other visible professional activities, e.g., membership on respected editorial boards, organization of major conferences, and invitations to visit other research institutions.

Service: For excellence in service, the most important achievement in a general sense is self-initiated leadership that makes significant contributions to the department, college, campus, and/or system; and being an individual looked to by others for guidance. This may take the form of major responsibilities in the department, mentorship of students or younger colleagues, substantial roles on committees at higher levels, and so on. Also important are leadership roles in the professional community, such as officer in a professional society, organizer of a conference, member of an editorial board, and professional service to community organizations; and outreach to the Denver community, including civic duties related to mathematics and science education.

IV.A.i.d Primary Unit RTP Committee

RTP Committees are formed at the department level to perform the department review of faculty members. These committees usually consist of faculty members above the rank of the faculty member under review.

IV.A.i.d.1 Membership. For each candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the department chair appoints three 3-member subcommittees to carry out an evaluation in the areas of teaching, research and service. The candidate may object to the inclusion of some faculty members, and if the matter cannot be resolved with the department chair, a final resolution will be made by the executive committee.

IV.A.i.d.2 Augmenting the primary unit. On occasion it may be deemed necessary to invite a person outside the department to serve on a subcommittee. Such a person should have the credentials to carry out an evaluation in the area the subcommittee is examining. Selection of such outside evaluators is made by the department chair in consultation with the candidate. Outside evaluators may vote within their subcommittee, but are not allowed to vote in any departmental vote on the candidate, unless the department agrees to extend voting privileges to these evaluators. In the case that there are fewer than 3 rostered professors in the department and external professors are required in a promotion to professor action, these external professors will be allowed to vote with the department.

IV.A.i.d.3 Role of department chair. The department chair may not be a member of any subcommittee, but will facilitate the functioning of the subcommittees. The department chair will write a separate evaluation of the candidate to be sent with the Department's evaluation to the Dean of the College. The department chair may not vote in any departmental vote on the candidate. If the department chair is the candidate or is unable to perform the duties outlined in this section, the most senior professor in the department shall take over the duties of the department chair with regard to the RTP process.

IV.A.i.d.4 Voting privileges by type of action. There are no voting restrictions within a subcommittee. In any departmental vote on the candidate, only those members of the department at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring may vote on the candidate (except for the chair, who may not vote).

IV.A.i.d.5 Activities of subcommittees. The subcommittee's role is to perform a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate in one of the three areas, write a report of the evaluation and make a recommendation to the department on a rating of "not meritorious," "meritorious," or "excellent" of the work. The evaluation is based on the materials in the dossier in the light of departmental records and publicly available information. Any such sources should be summarized in the subcommittee reports. The written report is to be signed by all members of the subcommittee and a signed minority report may be included. In cases of reappointment and early tenure, suggestions for how a candidate's rating could be improved may also be included. The subcommittee chair (or designee) presents the written report and gives a verbal summary to the department at a special meeting. The department discusses the report and can either accept it or return it to the subcommittee for revision. Upon acceptance of the report (by consensus, unless this can not be achieved) the department proceeds to vote (by secret ballot) on the candidate's work as being "not meritorious," "meritorious," or "excellent." The report and this final vote are then forwarded to the Dean of the College by the chair of the Department.

In carrying out their charge, each subcommittee is responsible for certain actions dependent on the area being evaluated. The teaching subcommittee must visit the candidate during a class

period in which the candidate is actively involved with teaching and must prepare a written summary of the visit, which is included in the dossier. The teaching subcommittee shall also evaluate any written material provided by the candidate.

The research subcommittee is responsible for evaluating both the quality and quantity of the candidate's research record. Outside letters help evaluate the quality of a candidate's research. The research subcommittee must assess the areas of expertise and possible biases of the writers of these outside letters. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest. All letters received are included in the candidate's file. These letters must be treated as confidential; they shall not be shared with the candidate, though a redacted summary of the evaluation, prepared by the subcommittee, shall be shared in writing with the candidate. Other factors that may be considered are outlined in the primary unit criteria (Sections IV.A.i.a, IV.A.i.b, IV.A.i.c). Such factors must be clearly identified with the weight attached to them in the subcommittee's report. If these other factors are forms of measurement, an indication of why they are unbiased shall be included.

The service subcommittee is responsible for evaluating both the quality and quantity of the candidate's service record. While the quantity and types of service activity vary with the rank of the candidate, quality does not. The subcommittee shall solicit evaluations of service done outside the department if they have not already been obtained by the candidate. These evaluations will be included in the file and given to the candidate, who will be given the opportunity to respond prior to any vote on the subcommittee report. Service done within the department is evaluated by the candidate's direct supervisor for the activity.

IV.A.i.d.6 Process. The timelines for comprehensive review and tenure review and promotion review are determined by the college. The timeline for comprehensive review is very short and the process should be started in the Spring term prior to the Fall term review. Candidates who wish to stand for promotion to professor or early tenure must inform the chair of the department of their intention before the end of the Spring semester preceding the semester of evaluation and will thereafter follow the timeline for other RTP cases. Such candidates may withdraw this request for consideration at any point prior to the submission of the dossier to the Dean of the College (including after the departmental vote). As soon as an RTP candidate has been identified, the process of obtaining external letters is initiated. The candidate may submit a list of outside evaluators and may also indicate specific scholars to exclude to the department chair. The department chair, with appropriate consultation, draws up a larger list of prospective external reviewers, respecting any exclusions of the candidate. The chair then solicits external reviewers from these lists until sufficiently many have agreed (3 for comprehensive review, 6 for tenure review and 7 for promotion to professor). The final make up of the set of external reviewers may contain no more than 1/3 drawn from the candidate's list. After the candidate has submitted their list of external reviewers and the necessary documents to send to the reviewers, they must start preparing their dossier. A checklist of what must be included will be given to the candidate by the department chair (but the candidate is not limited to these items). At least 6 weeks prior to the college's deadline for submitting files¹, the department chair will appoint the RTP subcommittees and select a chair for each (who must be tenured). The subcommittees have 4 weeks to complete their evaluations. When the subcommittee reports are ready, a special meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote on a candidate will be called by the department chair. At this meeting the subcommittee reports will be discussed and voted upon. If any report is sent back to the subcommittee for revision, a follow-up special meeting will be called the following week. When all the reports have been accepted, a final vote on the department's recommendation will be taken by secret ballot. When the department

recommendation is ready, the reports and votes will be given to the chair to forward to the Dean. The chair prepares an independent recommendation that also goes to the Dean. In the cases of reappointment and promotion to professor, the department may take into account other factors that have a material bearing on the appointment, such as program requirements. However, the merit of the candidate is the only consideration for tenure cases. If, for any reason, the case is sent back to the department from any level, another special meeting will be called to deal with the concerns and new votes will be taken in all areas.

IV.A.i.d.7 Dossier. The following documents shall be included in the candidate's dossier if available:

General:

- Current CV
- Professional Plan
- Faculty Reports on Professional Activities for the previous five years.
- Merit ratings and summaries from previous 5 years.

Teaching:

- Teaching statement, summarizing philosophy, activities and accomplishments.
- Course information for each course taught for the previous five years.
 - Syllabus.
 - Final grade distribution.
 - Copy of final exam and summary of raw scores on the exam.
- FCQs
- Reports of all classroom observations performed over the previous five years by observers designated by the chair, including observations performed by the teaching subcommittee.
- Summaries of student feedback received by the chair or associate chair, or obtained during exit interviews, if applicable, unless the chair determines that this input is unsubstantiated, prejudicial, inaccurate, or inappropriately biased.
- Additional statements by students in written form.
- Letters from alumni within 2-5 years of graduation.
- Results of departmental assessments of student learning if available and applicable to the candidate. For example, comparative analyses of student performance on uniform finals or in subsequent courses.
- Enrollment data and DFW rates.

Research:

- Research statement, summarizing accomplishments and plans.
- Annotated bibliography of all publications. For each paper, the candidate should provide a brief description of the research contribution. For coauthored papers, an explanation of the candidate's contribution should be included.

Additional information may be obtained and evaluated by the subcommittees as justified or as specified by departmental policy. A written summary of this information shall be included in the dossier and given to the faculty member, and the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a written response prior to any votes on the subcommittee reports.

IV.A.ii Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**IV.A.ii.a General Procedure**

1. Each TT faculty member will be evaluated annually by the TT-MEC. The committee will assign a numerical performance rating in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service. Guidelines for determining the performance ratings are given in Section IV.A.ii.f. A weighted average of these three ratings determines an overall numerical rating.
2. The TT-MEC will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members. The committee shall also report to the faculty a summary of the anonymous raw scores.
3. The TT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.
4. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each TT faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.
5. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee's comments should fairly reflect the evidence.
6. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years. The TT-MEC will take into account a faculty member's role when evaluating their performance. Thus, faculty members who have been hired in special areas will be evaluated in accordance with those circumstances.
7. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g.

8. If a tenured faculty member receives an overall rating of “below expectations” or “failing to meet expectations”, a triggered post tenure review will be conducted (see Section IV.A.iv.)

IV.A.ii.b Differential Work Loads and Evaluation Weights

The merit ratings in teaching, research, and leadership and service will be averaged with respect to a set of individual weights. The baseline weights are the weights determined by the faculty member’s contract: either the standard weights (40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service), or the weights determined by the workload distribution specified by the faculty member’s differentiated workload agreement (see Section IV.A.vi). However, in cases of a temporary workload adjustments (for example, a course buyout funded by a research grant, or a course release for a major service responsibility), the baseline weights will be adjusted by 10% for each additional course reduction or increase.

The weights for a faculty member on sabbatical or on leave will be the same as the weights from the previous year unless the dean approves different weights.

IV.A.ii.c Sabbaticals and Leaves

The merit committee does not evaluate a faculty member’s performance in teaching or leadership and service for any semester in which the faculty member is on sabbatical or leave. Instead, the faculty member is given default merit ratings in each category for the period of the sabbatical or leave. The default ratings in teaching and leadership and service are determined by averaging the faculty member’s ratings over the most recent two years that were actually evaluated by the committee. If a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave for only one semester of the calendar year, the merit committee will evaluate his or her performance for the other semester and average the resulting scores with the default ratings to determine the final ratings for the year.

IV.A.ii.d Faculty Files

Each faculty member is responsible for assembling his or her file with sufficient information so that the merit committee can evaluate his or her progress accurately. The TT-MEC could, but is not required to, contact the faculty member for clarification of the submitted documents. The file should include the following materials:

1. A thoughtful, concise summary (usually, no more than two pages) for each of the three areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service. This is usually the principal item used by the merit committee to evaluate the faculty member. It should include a self-evaluation of how the faculty member views his/her performance within the context of the faculty member’s Professional Plan and should indicate the overall impact the faculty member has made.
 - (a) The research summary statement should include
 - A vision for the development of the faculty member’s research program as well as a statement on research activity and positive impact on the researcher’s field.
 - The current status (appeared, accepted, submitted, or in preparation) of papers and what type of publication (refereed journal, refereed proceedings, non-refereed proceedings, edited book chapters, etc.) should be given.
 - A listing of ongoing research grants, research grants submitted, research awards, and invited or contributed presentations.

- (b) The teaching summary statement should include
- Summary of classes taught, FCQs for each course, number of students in each course, and an indication of whether the course was taught for the first time.
 - Written account of how each course was conducted, as described in Section IV.E.iv.
 - Summary of mentoring and training activities.
 - Summary of other contributions related to teaching.
 - Summary of efforts to improve teaching.
- (c) The leadership and service statement should list the service activities and indicate the impact of service at all levels (departmental, college, campus, university, or professional community).
2. Current CV.
 3. Faculty Report on Professional Activities for each of the previous 3 years.
 4. Professional Plan
 5. Materials required for evaluation of classroom teaching, as specified in Section IV.E.iv.

IV.A.ii.e Expectations

This section defines minimum expectations for TT-faculty members with respect to research, teaching and leadership and service. In all of these areas, faculty members are expected to perform their duties ethically and professionally. It should be noted that expectations vary according to individual faculty member's roles within the department and their professional rank. It is also emphasized that meeting or exceeding these expectations is not necessarily sufficient for earning tenure or promotion.

IV.A.ii.e.1 Teaching Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to effectively teach a variety of courses (as defined in Section IV.E) and to participate in the mentorship and training of CU-Denver students outside of assigned classes.

Expectations for mentoring students vary according to the faculty member's rank and role in the department. Tenured faculty members are normally expected to serve as thesis or project advisors for PhD or MS students, or to supervise undergraduate honors projects. In the event there are no available students whose research interests align with those of a particular tenured faculty member, then that faculty member would be expected to make other contributions to the professional development of students, such as independent studies, readings courses, modeling competitions, summer workshops, or mentoring/training of teaching assistants).

In contrast, untenured TT faculty members are not necessarily expected to advise graduate students early in their careers; however they should be working to demonstrate both an openness and ability to advise students whose research interests align with their own (for example, by serving on student committees; or by designing special topics and/or readings courses to educate students in research areas of interest to the faculty member).

IV.A.ii.e.2 Research Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain an active program of research and or scholarly activity and to regularly disseminate their work in reputable peer-reviewed venues. Ratings above "meeting expectations" require regular refereed

publications in reputable peer-reviewed journals and/or conference proceedings. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are also expected to share their expertise with other members of the department to promote a strong research community for the department. For example, it is expected that all tenured and tenure-track faculty members participate in department seminars and thesis/dissertation committees when feasible and appropriate.

IV.A.ii.e.3 Leadership and Service Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that contribute to the mission of the department and University. The minimal expectation is to competently and collegially carry out a fair share of departmental service assignments, and to assist in the administration of the department's affairs. Additionally, faculty members are expected to contribute their disciplinary expertise to address issues of importance to the community at large. Particularly important are contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member's area of expertise.

IV.A.ii.f Merit Rating Guidelines for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

The following 5 point numerical scale will be used to evaluate each tenured or tenure-track faculty member in each of the categories of teaching, research and leadership and service:

- Outstanding (4.5-5.0),
- Exceeding Expectations (3.5-4.25),
- Meeting Expectations (2.5-3.25),
- Below Expectations (1.5-2.25),
- Failing to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.25).

IV.A.ii.f.1 Teaching The main factors determining the teaching rating for TT faculty members are 1) classroom teaching, 2) mentorship and training of CU-Denver students, and 3) other contributions.

Classroom Teaching: Classroom teaching performance will be evaluated according the criteria described in Section IV.E.

Mentorship and training of CU Denver students¹ This category is defined as

1. Supervision of or collaboration with students in honors projects, master's projects or theses, or Ph.D. dissertations.
2. More general student training through independent studies, readings courses, seminars, internships, REUs, modeling competitions, workshops, or mentorship or training of teaching assistants.

The ratings in this category will be based on the faculty member's contributions over the last 3 years according to the following guidelines:

¹CU Denver students include anyone taking a course or enrolled in a degree program at CU Denver.

- **Exceptional:** A record that demonstrates significant contributions and high involvement that substantially exceeds the expectations described in Section IV.A.ii.e.1. Some examples of such a record follow:
 - Strong record of successfully supervising multiple students.
 - A consistent record of supervising students along with other major contributions toward mentoring or professional development of students (such as frequently offering readings courses, leading summer workshops or REUs, or providing a leadership role in the mentorship or training of teaching assistants).
- **Fair Share:** A mentoring record consistent with the expectations described in Section IV.A.ii.e.1.
- **Minimal:** Little or no mentoring activity.

Other contributions: Faculty members are encouraged (but not required) to engage in activities that advance the broader teaching missions of the Department and the University. Some examples include participation in STEM related educational activities, curriculum development, development of online courses, mentorship of non CU-Denver students, teaching outside the University, educational grants, or publications related to the general scholarship and practice of teaching and learning. Contributions in this category will be evaluated by the merit committee to determine an increment to the baseline teaching rating described below

Overall Teaching Rating: The final numerical rating will be determined by the merit committee using the following table as a guide. This table specifies a baseline score determined by the two categories of classroom teaching and mentorship and training of CU Denver students. This baseline score represents the minimum score the faculty member should receive. Other teaching contributions will be evaluated by the committee to determine an increment to the baseline rating.

Baseline ratings (without other contributions)

Classroom Teaching	Mentorship and Training		
	Minimal	Fair share	Exceptional
Exceptional	4.0	4.75	5.0
Highly Effective	3.25	4.25	4.75
Effective	2.25	3.25	3.75
Deficient	1.25	1.75	2.25
Problematic	0.0	0.5	1.0

IV.A.ii.f.2 Research The descriptions below list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member’s research accomplishments. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member’s performance.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding. Highly productive research program typically characterized by some combination of the following

- Large number of publications in high quality journals.

- Significant research grant funding.
- Large number of citations, or other indicators of impact.
- Awards, major invited talks.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding expectations. Strong research program typically characterized by some combination of the following

- Frequent publications in high quality venues.
- Regular submission of quality research grant proposals.
- Invited talks at conferences.
- Citations of recent work or other evidence of impact.

2.5-3.25 Meeting expectations. Active research program typically characterized by

- Regular publications in peer-reviewed venues.
- Presentations at conferences, workshops, seminars and/or colloquia.

1.5-2.25 Below expectations. Weak research program characterized by

- Occasional publications in low quality venues.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations. Inactive or problematic research program characterized by

- no publishing activity, or
- evidence of deficiencies in professional integrity.

IV.A.ii.f.3 Leadership and Service The descriptions below list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member's contributions in leadership and service. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member's performance.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Major contributions to the department, college, university, or mathematics community. Indication of leadership or positive impact of service.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding expectations; significant contributions at some level.

2.5-3.25 Meeting expectations; solid, reliable service.

1.5-2.25 Below expectations; limited service and contributions.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations; unwillingness or inability to accept service responsibilities in the department, lack of collegiality or behavior that negatively impacts the department.

IV.A.ii.g Appeals

Faculty members may appeal their merit evaluations by submitting a written justification (not to exceed two pages) to the chair within 5 business days after receiving their evaluation from the chair.

1. The written appeal will be reviewed by an appeals committee, which consists of the executive committee, excluding any members of the merit committee. The faculty member has the right to veto the sitting of any one member of the appeals committee. If needed, the chair will appoint additional members to the committee to ensure that it has at least three members.
2. The appeals committee will consider the written appeal and will either uphold the original merit rating, or will forward the appeal to the merit committee, which must provide a written response. In the latter case, the appeals committee will determine whether to uphold the original rating or to recommend a change to the rating.
3. If the appeals committee recommends a change in the rating, the chair will reconsider the case to determine the final rating for the faculty member.
4. If the chair assigns a different rating than is recommended by the appeals committee, both the chair's rating and the recommendation of the appeals committee will be communicated to the dean.
5. If not satisfied with the result at the departmental level, the faculty member may pursue the appeal at each subsequent level following the process established in the College and Campus Bylaws.
6. For tenured faculty, if a "below expectations" or "failing to meet expectations" rating is sustained after the appeals process is completed, a triggered post tenure review will be conducted.

IV.A.iii Professional Plans

Each tenured or tenure-track member of the department must have a Professional Plan on file in the department office after their first year of appointment. The plan outlines a 5-year forecast of the faculty member's activities in research, teaching and service. The Professional Plan form is available from the college. These plans can be amended at any time to take into account unforeseen changes. The plans must be reviewed and resubmitted at least once every five years, in particular, just prior to a post tenure review (see below).

IV.A.iv Post Tenure Review

Every tenured faculty member will undergo a post tenure review at five year intervals starting five years from the date at which tenure is awarded or the date of the last promotion (whichever is the most recent). This is known as regular post tenure review. Under special circumstances a special post tenure review (triggered or extensive) will be called for outside of this five year cycle (see below).

The post tenure review committee (PTRC) shall consist of three tenured members of the faculty appointed by the department chair. Ideally, there should be no overlap of membership with the current year's MEC committee and no one who is undergoing a review should be asked to serve. As these constraints may be impossible to satisfy, the membership may be extended to four and members who are under review must recuse themselves while their case is considered.

IV.A.iv.a Process

In the Spring semester of each academic year, following the annual merit evaluation process, the post-tenure review committee will review the post tenure cases for that year. This review consists of examining the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, the faculty member's summary of these, including the FCQ's, peer review of teaching and any other type of teaching evaluation, the curriculum vitae, and the faculty member's Professional Plan(s) from that PTR cycle. In addition, the faculty member will provide the PTRC with an updated Professional Plan for the next five years. The PTRC will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize the committee's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present), meeting the department's standards, and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research and service. A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member. The report will be forwarded to the Dean and a copy will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. In the case that the PTRC evaluation is not "meeting expectations," the faculty member may appeal the evaluation according to the procedure given in Section IV.A.ii.g. If the evaluation is sustained through the appeals process, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement.

IV.A.iv.b Timelines

After the annual merit evaluation process is completed in the Spring semester, each faculty member undergoing regular post tenure review will submit to the PTRC (via the department chair) an updated Professional Plan and any other documentation they wish to be considered in this review. All regular reviews should be completed by the end of the Spring semester in order to be reported to the Dean's office by their deadline in August.

IV.A.iv.c Triggered Reviews and Performance Improvement Agreements

In the event that a faculty member receives a "below expectations" rating in the Annual Merit Evaluation process, or a "below expectations" evaluation in a regular post tenure review, and after any appeals are completed, the PTRC will immediately convene a triggered post tenure review session in which the PTRC will assist in the drafting of a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). The faculty member develops a PIA that includes specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. The PIA must be endorsed by the PTRC and by the department chair, and must be approved by the Dean. Usually, PIA's will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant longer, the PIA may be set up for two years. The campus administration shall designate an advisor or resource office to provide advice to the faculty member and to the PTRC on best practices and models for PIA's and appropriate benchmarks. The next annual merit evaluation (conducted by the Merit Evaluation Committee) following the term of the PIA shall address whether the goals of the PIA have been met. If the goals of the PIA have been met, the faculty member continues in the current five year post tenure review cycle. If the goals of the PIA have not been met an extensive review shall be initiated.

IV.A.iv.d Extensive Reviews

Faculty who have received two "below expectations" ratings in the Annual Merit Evaluation process within the previous five years or whose PIA did not result in an evaluation of "meeting expectations"

or better will undergo an Extensive Review. For extensive reviews, the department chair will be an ex-officio member of the PTRC. As with triggered reviews, extensive reviews carried out by the PTRC may be preceded by an appeal procedure for the ratings triggering the extensive review. Faculty members who believe that the appeal board's determination is mistaken may continue their appeal of the rating through established grievance procedures in the college. No action will be taken to begin an extensive review until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date the second "below expectations" rating is received. Failure by the faculty member to participate in developing or implementing the extensive review is considered to be insubordination and dereliction of duty by the administration and will be subject to sanctions, which include the possibility of termination of employment. In an extensive review the PTRC will examine:

- the five previous annual performance evaluation reports;
- the FCQs from those five years, peer evaluations, and at least one other form of teaching evaluation;
- evidence of research productivity;
- the faculty member's previous Professional Plan (and any amendments to the plan and differentiated workload agreements, where present);
- the faculty member's self-evaluation of performance as it relates to the Professional Plan(s);
- record of service activities; and
- any other material the faculty member would like the unit to consider.

The PTRC prepares an evaluative report of the faculty member's teaching, research and service based upon its review of the materials and information covering the period in question. If there is disagreement about the faculty member's performance in research, or if the faculty member or PTRC so requests, the review will also include evaluations from qualified persons external to the University. In this case, the faculty member and the PTRC shall jointly develop a list of external reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the faculty member's performance in research. As an extensive review is analogous to an initial tenure review, the time taken to complete it should approximate the time needed for an initial tenure review.

The result of an extensive review is the joint production of a development plan. A development plan is similar to a PIA, but more extensive. The evaluation of the success of a development plan is the responsibility of the same members of the PTRC who helped to produce the plan (even if they are no longer members of the PTRC.) The evaluation of the development plan is reported to the Dean of the college. Ordinarily, in cases where the Development Plan has not produced the desired results, the faculty member will have his/her tenure revoked and be dismissed. Under certain circumstances, other sanctions may be imposed. Possible sanctions include: suspension of pay, salary reduction and demotion in rank.

IV.A.v Sabbaticals

Any tenured faculty member will normally be eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave after having been continuously employed in a tenured or tenure track position for six years since their last sabbatical. Such a sabbatical could include full pay for one semester or half pay for an academic year. The application and approval process for sabbaticals is detailed in the Departmental Policies and Procedures Document.

IV.A.vi Differentiated Workloads

The Differentiated Workload Policy allows tenured or tenure-track faculty members to renegotiate goals, expectations and workloads in the areas of teaching, research and service in order to devote more time to an area at which they excel. The differentiated workload agreement changes the weighting vector used for annual merit evaluations, and also impacts expectations of performance. However, by CLAS and Regents' policy, differentiated workloads do not alter promotion and tenure criteria.

IV.A.vi.a Methods of Designing a Differentiated Workload

- DW-R (Differentiated workload for research). Faculty members with records of scholarly excellence, as indicated by annual evaluations of exceeding expectations or outstanding in this area, or by external research funding for a course buyout, may re
- DW-T (Differentiated workload for teaching). Faculty members with records of teaching excellence, as indicated by annual evaluations of exceeding expectations or outstanding in this area, may request a reduction in research obligations by adding one or more courses to their teaching load or by undertaking substantial and measurable duties in the areas of program and/or curriculum development.
- DW-S (Differentiated workload for service). Faculty members asked to perform exceptionally demanding service or administrative obligations may request to alter the proportions of teaching, research, and service to reflect the increased service responsibilities and a commensurate reduction in effort in another area.

In rare cases, differentiated workloads may be negotiated for reasons other than those specified above. Such agreements fall outside of this policy statement, and are made by mutual agreement between the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean.

IV.A.vi.b Guidelines

1. Differentiated workloads are negotiated between the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean. Such agreements are made for a limited period of time, up to four years.
2. A DW will include at least 10% effort in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Teaching will not exceed 60% of a tenured/tenure-track faculty member's workload.
3. The promotion of all faculty members, including those with a differentiated workload, follow the existing University of Colorado RTP protocols. As such, untenured faculty should be aware of possible negative impacts of a differentiated workload in their progress toward achieving their tenure and promotion goals. Thus, special care must be taken in crafting and executing the workload agreements of untenured faculty.
4. The differentiated workload should not impair the ability of the Department and College to meet instructional needs.
5. The differentiated workload program should be budget neutral for the College and the Department. In particular, the costs associated with a reduction in teaching load must be offset by savings elsewhere. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to:

- Internal redistribution of student credit hour generation in the Department. For example, by adding additional seats to other courses in the department.
- Alterations in frequency and pattern of course offerings.
- Funded course reductions for sponsored research.
- Funded course reductions for service.

For internally funded course reductions (such as indirect cost recovery or salary savings), the cost per course release is the nominal lecturer replacement cost (currently, \$4,000). In that case, the faculty member is normally expected to generate sufficient funds as the faculty member's share, but the department may consider a partial matching if the faculty member's share is not sufficient.

IV.A.vi.c Process for requesting, approving and implementing a differentiated workload agreement

1. A tenured or tenure track faculty member with a record of excellence in teaching or research may submit a request for a differentiated workload to the Department Chair. A differentiated workload may also be requested for a faculty member by the Department Chair or CLAS Dean.
2. The Chair will evaluate the faculty member's research, teaching, and service record to determine whether the faculty member is eligible for the differentiated workload.
3. If the faculty member is deemed eligible, the Chair will evaluate the proposed differentiated workload within the context of departmental resources and will advise the faculty member about any implications for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
4. If the Chair supports the request, the chair will help the faculty member prepare a differentiated workload agreement for submission to CLAS Administration that specifies:
 - (a) Proposed workload adjustments.
 - (b) Expected outcomes as defined by a set of benchmarks that must be achieved within a mutually agreed upon timeframe.
 - (c) Formal process for documenting and reporting the benefits of the differentiated workload each academic year; and
 - (d) Time limit of the agreement.
 - (e) Financial plan for covering the expenses of the differentiated workload.
5. Following discussion between the faculty member, Chair, and CLAS Administration, the Dean will notify the faculty member and Chair of her/his decision, including any revisions to the proposed plan.
6. Upon approval, the faculty member will submit a revised Professional Plan to the Dean's office.
7. The differentiated workload agreement will be evaluated annually by the Chair. The agreement may be terminated if the Chair determines that the faculty member has not satisfactorily met the requirements of the agreement.
8. At the end of the DW agreement, faculty workload will revert to the standard 40/40/20 split, although the faculty member may submit another DW request.

IV.A.vi.d Impact on Merit Evaluation

- The weighting vector used for merit evaluation is determined by the workload distribution specified in the DW agreement, adjusted by 10% for each additional course reduction or increase according to its purpose.
- Performance expectations in each category should be adjusted to reflect changes in effort. For example,
 - For an increase in research time, a higher level of productivity would be expected to achieve the same merit rating. However, the evaluation needs to take into account the time lag between when the research is performed and when the papers are accepted for publication. (This should be spelled out in the request for the DW-R).
 - For increases to the teaching load, a larger number of classes would be expected, but the standards of performance for classroom teaching do not change.
 - For an increase in service workload, a proportionally larger amount of service contributions is expected.

IV.B Research Faculty

Research faculty are faculty members whose primary duties are in research. Research faculty will have comparable ranks to tenured/tenure track faculty: Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Assistant Professor. All holders of a research faculty appointment must have an earned Ph.D. in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. A research faculty appointment is an “at will” appointment with a time/effort distribution of at least 40% research and may also include teaching and service responsibilities. Research faculty are non-rostered faculty and are not eligible for tenure.

Research faculty generally are not voting members of the department. However, in some cases, research faculty may become special voting members of the department through the procedure specified in Section I.C.i of the Bylaws.

In so far as it is possible, the normal departmental procedures and structures shall be used for Research faculty. Differences, due to the nature of this type of appointment, shall be explicitly stated in this personnel policy. Research faculty may not participate in any activities related to hiring, evaluation, promotion, or dismissal of tenured/tenure track faculty. The procedures outlined below are in addition to any policies for Research faculty specified by the College, Campus, and University.

IV.B.i Initial Appointment

IV.B.i.a Procedures for Initial Appointment for Research Faculty

Appointments at the rank of Research Assistant Professor can be made upon the recommendation of the Department Chair in accordance with appropriate college and university policies for initial appointment of research faculty.

Appointments at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require a vote of the tenured, tenure-track and voting research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above. Appointments at the rank of Research Professor require an additional vote of the Professors and voting Research Professors. A candidate should submit an application packet consisting

of, at a minimum, the following: curriculum vitae, statement of research philosophy, and letters of recommendation. For the rank Research Associate Professor, there must be three letters, including at least one of which is from outside of the department. For the rank of Research Professor, five letters are required, at least two of which are from outside the department. These letters will be solicited by the Department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate. The application packet will be reviewed by the tenured, tenure-track and voting Research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above, who will vote on a written recommendation to the Chair for appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor. For appointment at the rank of Research Professor, a separate vote of the Professors and voting Research Professors will be taken.

After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation(s), the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean and appropriate college and university level policies for initial appointment will be followed thereafter.

IV.B.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment to the Research Faculty

Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor requires a Ph.D. in the Mathematical Sciences. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor requires in addition a demonstrated record of research excellence, which meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Professor requires an outstanding record of research achievement, which meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of Professor.

IV.B.ii Re-appointment of Research Faculty

IV.B.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment of Research Faculty

Contracts for research faculty are not automatically renewed. If funding is available to extend the contract, a reappointment review will be conducted prior to reappointing a research faculty member. The research faculty member seeking reappointment will submit a dossier to the Chair. This dossier shall include, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment with the exception of letters of recommendation. The dossier shall also include a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of research activities, and, if applicable, summaries of teaching and service activities.

For reappointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, the chair will review the dossier and make a written recommendation, which will be forwarded to the Dean's office. Appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

For reappointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the chair will appoint a review committee consisting of at least three departmental members chosen from the tenured, tenure-track and voting research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above. At least half of the membership of this committee should be tenured or tenure-track faculty. For reappointment at the rank of Research Professor, all members of this committee must hold either the rank of Professor or the rank of Research Professor. The candidate's dossier will be reviewed by the committee, and a written recommendation will be made to the TT faculty and voting research faculty of appropriate rank, who will then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair. In the case of reappointment at the rank of Research Professor, only faculty at the rank of Professor or Research Professor will review and vote on the recommendation. After reviewing the application

packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make their own written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean and appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

IV.B.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment to the Research Faculty

In order to be reappointed at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, a research faculty member must, at minimum, earn a rating of “meeting expectations” in each previous annual performance evaluation. For reappointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the candidate should demonstrate a record of continued excellence in research.

IV.B.iii Promotion of Research Faculty

IV.B.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion of Research Faculty

To be eligible for promotion to Research Associate Professor, a candidate must have spent at least three years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Research Assistant Professor. Additionally, the candidate should have undergone at least one successful reappointment review prior to applying for promotion. To be eligible for promotion to Research Professor, a candidate must hold the rank of Research Associate Professor.

A candidate seeking promotion must inform the Chair of this intent by the end of the spring semester preceding the semester of evaluation and will thereafter follow the timeline specified by CLAS policies. The Chair will solicit external letters following the procedures specified for promotion of tenure-track faculty. (See Section IV.A.i.d.6). The Chair will appoint one to three subcommittees (depending on the workload distribution of the candidate) to evaluate the candidate’s record in research, teaching and/or service. Each subcommittee consists of three tenured, tenure-track or voting research faculty of the appropriate rank (Associate Professor or Professor for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for promotion to Professor).

The candidate shall submit a dossier to the Chair that includes, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment (including three letters of recommendation) along with a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of research accomplishments, and if applicable, a summary of teaching activities (including course evaluations) and service activities.

This dossier will be evaluated by the promotion subcommittee(s), which will present a written recommendation(s) to the faculty. The faculty of appropriate rank will vote on the written recommendation(s), and will also vote on a recommendation for or against promotion. After reviewing the dossier and the faculty recommendations, the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean, and appropriate college and university level policies for promotion of research faculty will be followed thereafter.

IV.B.iii.b Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty

IV.B.iii.b.1 Promotion to Research Associate Professor To be promoted to the rank of Research Associate Professor, an individual must demonstrate a record of research excellence that meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of tenure-track faculty to the rank of Associate Professor. Additionally, Research Faculty with teaching and service responsibilities

must also have a meritorious record in these areas, taken in proportion to their workload distribution.

IV.B.iii.b.2 Promotion to Research Professor To be promoted to the rank of Research Professor, a Research Associate Professor must have a) a record that, taken as a whole in relation to the workload distribution of the individual, is judged to be excellent; b) an outstanding record of research achievement, which meets or exceeds the criteria for research excellence defined in the Department's criteria for promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of Professor (see Section IV.A.i.c).

IV.B.iv Annual Evaluations and Expectations

Expectations for research faculty vary and should be specified in their employment contract. This is particularly true of research expectations. For example, a research faculty member hired to work on a grant will have expectations specifically associated with the grant, which will not necessarily involve publishing their work. In contrast, research professors and research associate professors will usually be expected to disseminate their research in reputable peer-reviewed venues. Research faculty members who have time allocated to teaching must comply with the expectations described in Section IV.E.i for classroom teaching; Research faculty with service responsibilities will be expected to competently and collegially perform these duties.

The performance of research faculty members will be evaluated annually in relation to the expectations specified in their employment contracts. Research faculty members who are paid entirely out of a research grant will be evaluated by the principal investigator of the grant. Research faculty members who are paid all or in part by departmental funds will be evaluated by the TT-MEC following the procedure outlined in Section IV.A.ii, adjusted appropriately for differing expectations and workload distribution. In particular, the teaching evaluation will be based primarily on classroom teaching performance, which is evaluated according to the policy described in Section IV.E (Evaluation of Classroom Teaching Effectiveness), using the following numerical scale: Exceptional (4.5 - 5.0), Highly Effective (3.5-4.25), Effective (2.5-3.25), Deficient (1.5-2.25), Problematic (0-1.25).

IV.C Clinical Teaching Track Faculty

The Clinical Teaching Track (C/T) is intended for non-tenure track faculty who participate in a broad range of teaching, service and scholarly activities. C/T appointees will have comparable ranks to tenured faculty (i.e., Assistant, Associate and Full Professor), except that in referring to them in official documents, the designation C/T will be placed after the academic rank (e.g., Assistant Professor C/T).

A C/T appointment is an "at will" appointment for a three-year term which is not a tenure track appointment. All holders of a C/T appointment must have obtained a Ph.D. in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. The typical appointment has a time/effort distribution of 80% Teaching, 10% Research/Scholarship, and 10% Service. Deviations from this apportionment must be approved by the Dean of CLAS.

In so far as it is possible, the normal departmental procedures and structures shall be used for C/T Faculty. Differences, due to the nature of this type of appointment, shall be explicitly stated in this personnel policy. C/T faculty may not participate in any activities related to evaluation, promotion, or dismissal of tenured/tenure track faculty. The procedures outlined below are in

addition to any policies for C/T faculty specified by the College, Campus, and University. Initial Appointment

IV.C.i Procedures for Initial Appointment to the C/T

The Executive Committee of the department shall determine whether or not to request from the Dean an appointment to the C/T track. Candidates for a C/T track appointment can be internal (instructors or senior instructors in the department) or external (new hires). Internal candidates must, as a first step, request such a consideration by the Executive Committee.

A candidate should submit an application packet consisting of, at a minimum, the following items: curriculum vitae, statement of teaching philosophy, student evaluations, evidence of continued scholarship, and letters of recommendation. For the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor C/T, there must be three letters, including at least one from outside of the department. For the rank of Professor C/T, five letters are required, two from outside the department. These letters will be solicited by the Department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate.

The application packet will be reviewed by the voting members of the department who will then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair, which includes a proposal as to the level of the appointment (Assistant Professor C/T, Associate Professor C/T, or Professor C/T). After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the DAC-C/T, and appropriate college and university level policies for initial appointment will be followed thereafter.

IV.C.i.a Criteria for Initial Appointment to the C/T

As the clinical teaching track is oriented toward teaching, applicants to the C/T should demonstrate, at a minimum, meritorious teaching with the potential for excellence in line with the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Applicants should also demonstrate the ability to carry out consistent and effective service, in line with the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2, and demonstrate potential for professional development through scholarly activity as discussed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3 For appointments at the rank of Associate Professor C/T or Full Professor C/T, the applicant should satisfy the criteria specified for promotion to the appropriate rank specified in Section IV.C.iii

IV.C.ii Re-appointment within the C/T

IV.C.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment within the C/T

Contracts for C/T faculty are limited to three years and are not automatically renewed. Unless otherwise stipulated by the College, the reappointment review will be conducted in the spring semester prior to the last year of the contract. At the beginning of this semester, a C/T faculty member seeking reappointment will submit a dossier to the Chair. This dossier shall include, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment with the exception of letters of recommendation. The dossier shall also include a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of teaching activities, including teaching evaluations, and summaries of scholarly and service activities.

Upon receipt of a candidate's dossier, the Chair will appoint a review committee consisting of at least three voting members of the department. The candidate's dossier will be reviewed by the committee, and a written recommendation will be made to the department faculty, who will

then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair. After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make their own written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the DAC-C/T, and appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

IV.C.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment within the C/T

In order to be reappointed at any rank within the C/T, an applicant must display a continued commitment to excellence in teaching, resulting in at least meritorious teaching on a consistent basis. An applicant should also demonstrate continued evidence of potential for overall excellence in teaching determined in relation to the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Additionally, an applicant should demonstrate a record of consistent and effective service and scholarship that meets the expectations outlined in both Sections IV.C.iv.b.2 and IV.C.iv.b.3, and which, taken as a whole, is meritorious overall.

IV.C.iii Promotion within the C/T

IV.C.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion within the C/T

1. The promotion procedure for C/T faculty differs from the analogous procedure for TT faculty only to the extent that there are two, instead of three, subcommittees of three faculty members apiece. One subcommittee evaluates teaching and the other evaluates service and research/creative or scholarly activities.
2. To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor C/T, a candidate should have spent at least three years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Assistant Professor C/T. Additionally, the candidate should have undergone at least one successful reappointment review prior to applying for promotion. A candidate seeking promotion must inform the Chair of this intent by the deadline specified by CLAS policies and no later than two weeks following the start of an academic year to be promoted for the following academic year. The candidate shall submit a dossier that includes, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment (including three letters of recommendation) and also a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of teaching activities, teaching evaluations, a summary of scholarly activities and a summary of service activities.
3. To be eligible for promotion to Full Professor C/T, a candidate should have spent at least five years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Associate Professor C/T. A candidate seeking promotion to Full Professor C/T must inform the Chair of this intent by the deadline specified by CLAS policies and no later than the start of the summer semester prior to the academic year in which the promotion will be considered. The candidate shall submit a dossier that includes, at minimum, all materials required for promotion to Associate Professor C/T. Two additional letters will be solicited by the department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate.

IV.C.iii.b Criteria for Promotion within the C/T

IV.C.iii.b.1 Promotion to Associate Professor C/T To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor C/T, an individual must demonstrate overall excellence in teaching determined in relation

to the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Additionally, the candidate should demonstrate a record of significant contributions in both service and scholarship, which meets the expectations outlined in both Sections IV.C.iv.b.2 and IV.C.iv.b.3, and which, taken as a whole, is meritorious overall.

IV.C.iii.b.2 Promotion to Full Professor C/T To be promoted to Full Professor C/T a candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching, including a record of outstanding contributions. The candidate should also demonstrate a record of meritorious contributions in service and scholarship, determined in relation to the expectations laid out in Section IV.C.iv.b The candidate's record, taken as a whole, should be excellent.

IV.C.iv Evaluation of Clinical Track Faculty

IV.C.iv.a General Procedure

1. C/T Faculty members will be evaluated annually by the Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee (NTT-MEC) based on the expectations outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.
2. The committee will evaluate each C/T faculty member according to the guidelines in Section IV.C.iv.c to determine a numerical rating in each of the three areas: teaching; research and scholarship; and leadership and service. A weighted average of these three numerical ratings determines an overall numerical rating, with the weights determined by the faculty member's workload distribution.
3. The committee will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members.
4. The NTT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.
5. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-4.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.
6. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee's comments should fairly reflect the evidence.
7. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years.
8. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g

IV.C.iv.b Expectations for Clinical Track Faculty

IV.C.iv.b.1 Teaching C/T faculty are expected to effectively teach their assigned classes (as defined in Section IV.E.i).

IV.C.iv.b.2 Leadership and Service Faculty appointed to the C/T are expected to carry out consistent and effective departmental service. Evidence of excellent or meritorious service could include active membership on a department committee, service on an internal or external search committee, outreach, and completion of other special assignments. Furthermore, attendance at department meetings is expected as it demonstrates a commitment to the department. In general, excellence in service is indicated by evidence that the service is of high quality, durability, effectiveness, and value.

IV.C.iv.b.3 Research/Scholarship For C/T faculty, scholarship is defined broadly and understood to be intellectual work that is visible, communicated externally and validated by peers. The level and type of scholarly expectation differs significantly from that expected of tenure-track faculty. There is no expectation for a major, focused program of original research (i.e., the scholarship of discovery) in the clinical ranks. Scholarship conducted by C/T faculty should support the teaching, service and/or research goals of the department. The appropriateness and importance of the type of scholarship C/T faculty may engage in will vary with the expectations of the position as outlined in the negotiated contract.

C/T faculty are expected to keep themselves professionally alive by consistently engaging in scholarly activity at a level commensurate with their workload. To be considered meritorious, this activity should result in meaningful scholarly output. Meritorious research or scholarship could be demonstrated by meaningful activity in any of the following: contributions to policy-making bodies such as the Colorado Council of Teachers of Mathematics or the Rocky Mountain Section of the Mathematical Association of America, or any Colorado based teaching councils; participating in the production of materials that are related to teaching or mathematics teacher education; offering high-quality professional development for school and university faculty; and presenting invited or contributed talks at professional conferences, including teacher conferences. Additionally, given the focus of the C/T, activities such as the development and dissemination of new and innovative courses, programs, or assessment tools may also be considered scholarly C/T faculty may also participate in more traditional research activities, including: obtaining external funding to support research and professional activities, including outreach; publishing research or expository articles in a variety of appropriate journals (pedagogical, outreach, etc.) and in conference proceedings; engaging in other scholarly and creative activities that are subject to peer review. The primary indicator of excellence regardless of the quantity of scholarly activity is evidence of the quality and impact of an applicant's scholarly output. In particular excellence in research or scholarship requires scholarly output that is communicated externally and validated by peers.

IV.C.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for C/T Faculty

The classroom teaching performance of all faculty will be evaluated according to the procedure described in Section IV.E.

Teaching

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Exceptional classroom teaching, or highly effective classroom teaching AND strong contributions to the teaching program of the department.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding Expectations; Highly effective classroom teaching, or effective classroom teaching AND significant contributions to the teaching program of the department.

2.5-3.25 Meeting Expectations; Effective classroom teaching.

1.5-2.25 Below Expectations; Deficient classroom teaching.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations; Problematic classroom teaching.

Research/Scholarship Given that a typical C/T appointment will have a 10% research/scholarship apportionment, it is suggested that the merit evaluation committee look more closely at a C/T faculty member's research and scholarly activity over a longer time period, not to exceed the three years.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Highly productive research activity reflecting overall excellence as detailed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3. There should be an indication that the faculty member's work has been communicated externally and validated by peers within the three year review window.

It should be noted that, in line with Section IV.C.v.c., a high publication rate should not be considered necessary for an Outstanding rating in this category.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding Expectations; Significant research and scholarship activity, in line with a meritorious record as detailed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3.

2.5-3.25 Meeting Expectations; Research and scholarly activity that, at a minimum, results in the faculty member remaining "professionally alive", as described in Section IV.C.iv.b.3.

1.5-2.25 Below Expectations; Little or no research or scholarly activity.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations; Evidence of deficiencies in professional integrity.

Service

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Strong and effective contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting overall excellence as outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2. There should be an indication of leadership and/or evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding Expectations; Meaningful contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting an overall meritorious performance as outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2. There should be evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

2.5-3.25 Meeting Expectations; Solid, reliable service to the department.

1.5-2.25 Below Expectations; Limited service and contributions.

0.0-1.25 Failure to Meet Expectations; A record of disruptive or unprofessional behavior.

IV.D Instructors

An appointment as Instructor or Senior Instructor is an “at will” appointment for a one year term, which is not a tenure track appointment. Instructors and Senior Instructors must have obtained a Masters degree in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. Instructors typically have a time/effort apportionment of 80-100% teaching and 0-20% service. Instructors are not evaluated on Scholarly activity.

IV.D.i Initial Appointment

IV.D.i.a Procedures for Appointment

Instructors are initially appointed by the Department chair, but do not become voting members of the department until they have been reappointed as per procedures in Section IV.D.ii

Initial appointment at the rank of senior instructor must be approved by a vote of the full faculty. In this case, full voting rights are conferred at initial appointment as outlined in Section I.C.iv

IV.D.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment

At a minimum, instructors must have a Master’s degree in the mathematical sciences, or have a Master’s degree in some other discipline AND 18 credit hours of graduate-level course work in the mathematical sciences.

IV.D.ii Re-appointment

IV.D.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment

Contracts for instructors are limited to one year and are not automatically renewed. Depending on the outcome of the annual merit evaluation, the department chair may recommend the instructor for reappointment. For initial reappointment, this recommendation must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty. For subsequent reappointments, no faculty vote is required. The recommendation for reappointment is forwarded to the Dean of CLAS. Reappointed instructors become voting members of the department as outlined in Section I.C.iv

IV.D.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment

Reappointment requires a satisfactory annual merit evaluation.

IV.D.iii Promotion to Senior Instructor

IV.D.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Instructor

Instructors who have exceeded expectations in annual merit evaluations for two of the previous three years are eligible to apply for promotion to senior instructor. The instructor will submit a portfolio to the Chair consisting of the following materials: A summary of teaching activities, copies of FCQs from all courses taught at UC Denver, peer teaching evaluations, annual performance evaluation reports, and a summary of service activities. The chair will appoint a committee to evaluate the record of the instructor. This committee will prepare a written report of the evaluation that will be presented to the faculty. The faculty will vote on the recommendation, and a copy

of the report will be forwarded to the chair. The chair will forward this report to the Dean along with his/her own recommendation. Appropriate College and University procedures will be followed thereafter.

IV.D.iii.b Criteria for Promotion

Candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor must have a demonstrated record of excellent teaching and must also have a meritorious record of service.

IV.D.iv Annual Evaluations

IV.D.iv.a Basic Procedure

1. Instructors and Senior Instructors will be evaluated annually by the Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee (NTT-MEC) based on the expectations outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b.
2. The committee will evaluate each faculty member according to the guidelines in Section IV.D.iv.c to determine a numerical rating in each of the two areas: teaching; and leadership and service. A weighted average of these numerical ratings determines an overall numerical rating, with the weights determined by the faculty member's workload distribution.
3. The committee will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members.
4. The NTT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.
5. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-4.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.
6. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee's comments should fairly reflect the evidence.
7. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years.
8. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g.

IV.D.iv.b Expectations

IV.D.iv.b.1 Teaching Instructors and Senior Instructors are expected to effectively teach their assigned classes (as defined in Section IV.E.i).

IV.D.iv.b.2 Service Instructors whose contracted workload distribution includes service are expected to carry out consistent and effective departmental service. Evidence of excellent or meritorious service could include active membership on a department committee; service on an internal or external search committee; outreach; and completion of other special assignments. Furthermore, attendance at department meetings is expected as it demonstrates a commitment to the department. In general, excellence in service is indicated by evidence that the service is of high quality, durability, effectiveness, and value.

IV.D.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for Instructors and Senior Instructors

IV.D.iv.c.1 Teaching

The classroom teaching performance of all faculty will be evaluated according to the procedure described in Section IV.E.

4.5-5.0 Outstanding; Exceptional classroom teaching, or highly effective classroom teaching AND strong contributions to the teaching program of the department.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding Expectations; Highly effective classroom teaching, or effective classroom teaching AND significant contributions to the teaching program of the department.

2.5-3.25 Meeting Expectations; Effective classroom teaching.

1.5-2.25 Below Expectations; Deficient classroom teaching.

0.0-1.25 Failure to meet expectations; Problematic classroom teaching.

IV.D.iv.c.2 Service

4.5-5.0 Outstanding: Strong and effective contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting overall excellence as outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b. There should be an indication of leadership and/or evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

3.5-4.25 Exceeding Expectations: Meaningful contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting an overall meritorious performance as outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b.2. There should be evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

2.5-3.25 Meeting Expectations: Solid, reliable service to the department.

1.5-2.25 Below Expectations: Limited service and/or ineffective or insubstantial contributions.

0.0-1.25 Failure to Meet Expectations: A record of disruptive or unprofessional behavior.

IV.E Evaluation of Classroom Teaching Effectiveness

Classroom teaching effectiveness refers to how well an instructor teaches his/her assigned courses (excluding readings courses, independent studies, thesis supervision, seminars, workshops, etc.). This section describes a uniform policy for evaluating the classroom teaching effectiveness of all rostered faculty of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences. The evaluation of classroom teaching is one component of the overall teaching evaluation of each faculty member.

IV.E.i Expectations

While no specific teaching style is mandated, all faculty must comply with the following expectations for classroom teaching:

1. Be knowledgeable and proficient in the subject matter they are teaching.
2. Use class time effectively to facilitate student learning.
3. Give assignments that appropriately challenge students to enhance their learning.
4. Provide timely feedback to students.
5. Be available to answer student questions outside of class.
6. Be responsive to student questions and concerns.
7. Grade fairly and consistently with other courses of the same level.
8. Treat students with respect and understanding.
9. Comply with Department, College, and University teaching policies.

IV.E.ii Evaluation Criteria

The following factors will be considered in evaluating classroom teaching effectiveness:

1. Student learning/achievement.
2. Planning and organization.
3. Classroom performance.
4. Efforts to improve teaching and/or efforts to maintain a previously demonstrated track record of effective teaching.
5. Student satisfaction.

IV.E.iii General Procedure

1. The evaluation will be based upon materials submitted by the faculty member as well as the following information and data maintained by the department:
 - (a) FCQs.
 - (b) Grade distributions and DFW rates.
 - (c) Student feedback (from all sources, including written comments on FCQs, exit interviews, and communications with the chair or associate chair).
 - (d) All peer evaluations (if any) of classroom performance performed by observers designated by the chair.
 - (e) Other data specified by the merit committee if applied uniformly to all faculty members. (For example, analysis of results on uniform finals, statistical analysis of student performance in subsequent courses, etc.).
2. The evaluation committee will rate the classroom teaching effectiveness of each faculty member according to the guidelines described in Section IV.E.v.

IV.E.iv Faculty Files

The faculty member should submit the following materials for evaluation:

- Syllabus for each course taught.
- Written account of how each course was conducted, including what material was actually covered (compared to what is listed in the syllabus), what help was provided to students (extra credit, curving of grades, etc.), what went well in each class, and what problems arose, and were they dealt with.

The faculty member may submit other materials developed in the normal course of teaching, which may assist the committee in evaluating teaching performance. These materials may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Description of strategies used to achieve learning objectives.
- Explanation of how student learning was assessed, and summary of the results of the assessments. Copies of final exams and summary of the raw scores (before any curve).
- Summaries of classroom observations.

IV.E.v Guidelines for Rating Classroom Teaching Effectiveness

Below, we list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member's classroom teaching effectiveness. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member's performance.

Exceptional:

- Evidence of very high levels of student learning.
 - Evidence of outstanding quality of course organization, content, tools used for student assessment, and teaching practices.
 - Evidence of outstanding commitment to improving student performance such as providing significant written feedback (e.g., on assignments, exams, or presentations).
 - Evidence of significant positive impact beyond the candidate's specific classes. (For example, adoption of course materials by other faculty).
 - High levels of student satisfaction relative to similar courses
- Highly Effective:
- Evidence of above average levels of student learning.
 - Evidence of high quality in lectures, course organization, content, tools used for student assessment, and teaching practices.
 - Above average levels of student satisfaction relative to similar courses.

Effective:

- Compliance with all departmental expectations for classroom performance, as described in Section IV.E.i.
- Reasonable levels of student learning and student satisfaction relative to similar courses.

Deficient:

- Deficiencies in meeting some of the expectations for classroom performance. For example,
 - Evidence of deficiencies in student learning.
 - Documented problems in conducting the course; for example, failure to provide timely feedback to students, insufficient office hours, inconsistent grading, etc.
 - Evidence of significant student dissatisfaction.
- AND evidence of efforts to improve on deficiencies.

Problematic:

- Deficiencies in classroom teaching coupled with unwillingness or inability to address these deficiencies.
- Or, major deficiencies in meeting expectations for classroom performance. For example
 - Documented problems with respect to treatment of students.
 - Large numbers of student complaints that provide evidence of specific problems.
 - Evidence of significant problems with respect to student learning.
 - Severe student dropout rates in relation to other courses of the same level.

Article V

Amendments

These bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 written vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members followed by approval by the Dean of CLAS and by the Provost/Chancellor. Faculty members on sabbatical or on leave will not be counted unless they opt to cast a vote. The vote cannot be taken until one week after debate has ended on the proposed amendments.

Disclaimers

These Bylaws are not intended to and do not create any contractual obligations.

To the extent that these Bylaws are inconsistent with CLAS Bylaws, Regent law, policy, or administrative policy statements, or University of Colorado Denver policies, the CLAS Bylaws, Regent law, policy, and administrative policy statements and University of Colorado Denver policies prevail.

Nothing in these Bylaws abrogates the right of any constituency or other duly organized body within the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences to organize and meet.

Appendix A

Policies and Procedures

The following policies and procedures provide details on the operations of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences. Articles A, B, and C were approved by a majority vote of the faculty on October 9, 2013, and are intended to be consistent with the department's bylaws. In the case of any conflict between these policies and the bylaws, the bylaws will take precedence.

A Department Administration

A.i Division of responsibilities between Chair and Associate Chair

The responsibilities of the Chair are stated in the bylaws with the understanding that many of the specific responsibilities are delegated to the Associate Chair. The following is the current division of labor between the Chair and Associate Chair.

A.i.a Specific responsibilities of the Chair

1. Assignment of teaching loads and other duties within the Department consistent with appropriate FTE levels, and consistent with the concept that the appropriate mix of teaching, research or creative work, scholarship, and service may differ from person to person, and from time to time in the career of an individual;
2. Arrangement and assignment of duty for counseling of students, and for training and supervision of teaching assistants and other student teachers and teacher aides;
3. Recommendation of sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence to the Dean, and for ensuring that their scheduling is consistent with Departmental needs;
4. Formation of standing and ad hoc committees;
5. Scheduling and chairing faculty meetings;
6. Making regular verbal or written reports to the faculty regarding administrative communications and decisions. Producing a public written annual report on Departmental activities, including raw data, about publications, funding, teaching, student enrollments, faculty service, etc.;
7. Making emergency temporary appointments of duration no longer than an academic year with the advice of the Faculty.

A.i.b Specific responsibilities of the Associate Chair

1. Serving as acting Chair when the Chair is absent;
2. Assisting the Chair with the day-to-day operations of the Department;
3. Planning and implementing a schedule of classes for each semester. This includes negotiating with the Dean's office; assigning faculty and graduate teaching assistants to courses; and hiring lecturers;
4. Responding to student requests, appeals and complaints.

A.ii Director of Graduate Studies

As stated in the bylaws, *the Director of Graduate Studies serves on the executive committee and provides oversight for the graduate committee.* Specific responsibilities include reviewing applications for admission, making recommendations for TA appointments, coordinating preliminary exams, monitoring student progress, maintaining the graduate web site, nominating outstanding graduate students for each commencement, and adjudicating appeals and special requests. In addition, the director of graduate studies regularly reviews graduate policies, requirements and procedures and works to promote the program and attract quality applicants. Also, the director is responsible for the preparation of the annual graduate program assessment report and contributes to the Department's annual report.

The Director of Graduate Studies is normally given a one course teaching release.

A.iii Director of Undergraduate Studies

As stated in the bylaws, *the Director of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for providing leadership for the Undergraduate Studies Committee.* Specific responsibilities include; certifying undergraduate student graduation requirements, preparing the annual undergraduate program assessment report and contributing to the Department's annual report.

The Director of Undergraduate Studies is normally given a one course teaching release.

A.iv Director of the Math Clinic

As stated in the bylaws, *the Director of the Mathematics Clinic is responsible for the development and leadership of the Mathematics Clinic as an integral part of the educational and research mission of the Department.* Specific responsibilities include soliciting clinic sponsors, negotiating terms of the clinic contracts with the sponsors and the University, recruiting and training clinic instructors, archiving clinic reports, and assessing the overall clinic program. For the duration of each clinic, the Clinic Director coordinates and acts as the chair of the Math Clinic Advisory Committee which is typically composed of one or more clinic instructors and sponsor representatives. A standing Math Clinic Committee may be formed at the discretion of the Clinic Director to assist in carrying out the functions of the Math Clinic program.

The Director of Mathematics Clinic should be given a one course teaching release.

A.v Service Course Coordinator

As stated in the bylaws, *the service course coordinator is responsible for the content and instruction of 1000 and 2000 level courses that are primarily populated by non-math majors.* Specific responsibilities include leading discussions about topics to be covered, textbooks and technology used, means of evaluating students and course assessment. Other responsibilities include improving the quality of instruction, keeping students informed of course requirements, mediating student/instructor conflicts when the instructor is not tenure-track, and providing scheduling and staffing input.

The Service Course Coordinator is normally given a one course teaching release.

A.vi Director of Mathematics Education Resource Center

As stated in the bylaws, *the Director of the Mathematics Education Resource Center is responsible for the operation of the Mathematics Education Resource Center to service the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences.* Specific responsibilities include staffing, supervising, keeping equipment operational and updated, preparing the budget, monitoring expenditures, and administering any course-wide exams needed to evaluate students' mathematical proficiency.

The Director of the Mathematics Education Resource Center is normally given a one course teaching release.

B Committees

B.i The Undergraduate Studies Committee

As stated in the bylaws, *this committee is charged with introducing, reviewing, modifying and interpreting policies related to the undergraduate mathematics curriculum.* These responsibilities include, but are not restricted to, the periodic review of graduation requirements; the consideration of new undergraduate courses; the implementation of effective advising procedures for mathematics majors; the supervision of multi-sectioned undergraduate courses; the review and implementation of placement examinations; and the determination of honors candidates for Departmental approval.

This committee typically consists of the Director of Undergraduate Studies and four additional faculty members, a teaching assistant, the Service Course Coordinator and a Department staff member. Also, one undergraduate mathematics major and one graduate student may be asked to serve by the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

B.ii The Graduate Studies Committee

As stated in the bylaws, *this committee is charged with introducing, reviewing, modifying and interpreting policies related to the Master's and the Ph.D. programs.* These activities include, but are not restricted to, the admission of new students to the graduate programs; the periodic review of requirements for the graduate degrees; the consideration of new graduate courses; the recommendation of teaching assistant appointments and tuition support awards; oversight of the administration of preliminary and comprehensive examinations; and the determination of the various graduate student awards.

This committee typically consists of four faculty members, a Department staff member and two graduate students. The committee is charged with introducing, reviewing, modifying and interpreting policies related to the Master's and the Ph.D. programs.

B.iii The Tenured/Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee

The committee is responsible for reviewing the current Department policy for merit evaluation and for performing a complete and careful evaluation of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member, primarily for the purpose of salary adjustments for the next academic year. The makeup and functioning of this committee is detailed in the department Merit Policy.

B.iv The Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee

This committee is responsible for performing a complete and careful evaluation of each rostered non-tenure track faculty member, excluding research faculty. The makeup and functioning of this committee is detailed in the department Merit Policy.

B.v Preliminary Examination Committees

These committees are three-member faculty committees appointed by the Chair of the Department that write and grade the preliminary examinations in applied analysis, applied linear algebra and any other area that the Department requires according to the schedule set by the Graduate Studies Committee. The committees determine who passes the examination and reports the results to the Graduate Studies Committee.

B.vi The Library Liaison Committee

This committee consists of one or two faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Department and is responsible for representing the interests of the Department to the faculty and staff of the Library.

B.vii The Bylaws Committee

The Bylaws committee shall usually consist of a single faculty member, but during periods of intense activity (each 5-year bylaws review, required inclusion of new bylaws, etc.) the committee will be augmented with two additional faculty members. All members of the committee shall be appointed by the Chair.

Changes to the bylaws requested by faculty members shall be submitted to the Bylaws Committee. When the committee consists of only one faculty member, the request is reviewed for language and consistency with other bylaws, and College and University rules. The proposal, without recommendation, shall be presented to the Department at the next regular Department meeting or the one thereafter. When the committee is augmented, it may solicit and originate changes to the bylaws which will be presented to the Department as a whole or in parts.

B.viii Ad-hoc Committees

Ad-Hoc committees may be created to perform specific activities that fall outside of the responsibilities of standing committees. The members and chair of each ad-hoc committee are appointed by

the Department Chair in a consensual process consistent with any University policies governing the activity of the committee. The duration of the appointment is determined by the Department Chair. Depending on the function of the committee, the Department Chair may appoint him/herself to the committee either as a voting or ex-officio member, provided that such an appointment is consistent with any University policies relevant to the function of the committee.

B.viii.a Search Committee

A faculty search committee is formed as needed to fill faculty positions in the Department. The search committee is responsible for conducting the search in a manner consistent with all University policies. Specific activities of the search committee may include writing and posting the job description, advertising the position, reviewing applicant files, conducting telephone interviews with applicants and references, selecting finalists, arranging campus visits for the finalists, and making a hiring recommendation to the Department faculty and to the Dean of the College. Additionally, search committee members must comply with any training requirements specified by University policy.

The members and chair of the search committee are appointed by the Department Chair with consultation of the faculty. When possible, the committee should include members from several different research areas of the Department, but will typically include multiple members from the area of recruitment. Normally, the chair of the committee will be from the area of recruitment, but this is not a requirement. The Department Chair must ensure that all University Policies regarding committee membership (such as diversity policies, and external members) are followed. The Department Chair may appoint him/herself to the search committee as an ex-officio member, but may not be a voting member of the committee.

C Department Operation

C.i Procedure for Nominating Department Chair

The department bylaws specify that the Chair is nominated by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and is appointed by the Dean of CLAS. The following procedure should be followed for making this nomination.

1. Prior to initiating formal search and nomination procedures for a Department chair, the faculty of the Department (or a group delegated by them) should meet with the Dean of the college to discuss the needs and expectations of the Department as they relate to the appointment of a new chair, the role of the chair, the type of search (i.e., internal or external) that will most likely ensure that an appropriate candidate is recommended, and to discuss any budgetary considerations related to the search and appointment of a new chair.
2. The selection of the Department Chair should be based on the following criteria:
 - (a) Ability to provide intellectual leadership in the development of departmental faculty and programs;
 - (b) Ability to provide administrative leadership in the effective functioning of the Department;
 - (c) Personal skills to deal effectively with faculty, administrators, and support staff within the college and campus structure.

3. In order to reflect the University's commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action, efforts should be made to provide experience for females and minorities that will prepare them for these positions.

C.ii Teaching Schedules

The Associate Chair, with consultation of the faculty and the approval of the Chair, determines which classes are offered and who teaches each course. The choice of courses offered should allow students to progress in a timely manner through their respective courses, and should be made in consultation with the faculty. The choice of who teaches which courses should be based on a balance between the needs of the students (who need particular courses) and the talents and needs of faculty (research faculty need to be able to attract graduate students into their programs and there may be personal reasons for faculty to teach particular courses).

Faculty frequently have course releases for various reasons. Faculty shall request the justified release from the associate chair in writing and fill out the non-standard workload form for the semester. Such requests are subject to approval by the Chair.

In general, faculty who are not on sabbatical or leave are expected to teach at least one class each semester. However, exceptions to this policy may be granted provided there is compelling justification. Examples of such justification may include (but are not limited to):

- reduction of teaching load below 2 courses per year due to research buy-outs, /PhD supervision course reductions, and other activities involving course releases.
- allowing a faculty member to take advantage of a professional opportunity involving extensive travel.
- personal circumstances (such as maternity/paternity leave, extended illnesses of family members, etc.)
- having a planned course canceled just before or during the semester begins and it is deemed more appropriate by the department chair to have the faculty member teach an additional course during the next semester.

The procedure for requesting a zero-course load for a semester is to submit a written request to the executive committee. This request must include:

1. the justification for a zero teaching load,
2. how the faculty member will satisfy his/her other academic responsibilities (service, supervision of graduate students, etc.) during the semester.

If the request is due to personal circumstances, the faculty member may submit the request to the Department Chair instead of the executive committee.

The executive committee will make a recommendation to the chair who will follow the Regent's and the dean's office procedures for following through on the request.

Faculty may request a course to teach in the summer, and remuneration for such a course will be in accordance with the CLAS policy.

If a faculty member becomes unable to teach a course, the chair/associate chair will have the responsibility of moving instructors around in order to best cover the course with minimal disruption for the students.

C.iii Sabbaticals

C.iii.a Eligibility

Any tenured faculty member will normally be eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave after having been continuously employed in a tenured or tenure track position for six years since their last sabbatical. Such a sabbatical could include full pay for one semester or half pay for an academic year. Around the middle of February of each year the appropriate Associate Dean of CLAS will forward to each department the names of those eligible to apply for a sabbatical during the following academic year. As soon as possible each eligible associate or full professor will discuss with the Chair the appropriateness of applying for a sabbatical during the following year. In some cases an eligible faculty member may choose to post pone application for a year in consultation with the Chair and with the Associate Dean.

C.iii.b Application process, including timelines

By mid-February each person intending to apply for a sabbatical will complete the application forms and submit the required materials to the Department Chair who will then complete a form indicating the manner in which the Department will cover the teaching and service duties normally performed by the applicant. The various forms required are available online. An applicant should consult these forms for a complete description of the required materials, but the major necessary materials for which the applicant is responsible are as follows: A detailed sabbatical plan; a report of the most recent sabbatical taken (if appropriate); a current vita. After receiving the materials submitted by the applicant, the Chair will complete and forward the application materials to the office of the Dean of CLAS.

C.iii.c Approval process

When the applicants for sabbatical leave declare to their department Chair the intention of applying for a sabbatical to be taken the following academic year, the Chair will review their sabbatical plans and take into consideration the needs of the department and any obligations the faculty member currently has. If he agrees that a particular application should be submitted, it will be forwarded to the office of the Dean of CLAS, where the Dean's Advisory Committee will evaluate all the proposals from departments in CLAS. Those applications approved at the Dean's level will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Special Advisory Committee no later than March 15 of the year prior to the academic year in which the sabbatical is expected to be taken. If approved by the Chancellor, the application will be forwarded to the Regents for their approval.

C.iii.d Setting priorities when multiple faculty members apply

Normally it is expected that the department Chair, in consultation with the affected faculty members, will decide which applications to support. If there are objections to the Chair's decisions, the Executive Committee of the department will be asked to arbitrate the matter.

C.iii.e Deferring sabbaticals

When, for the good of the department or the convenience of the applicant, it is deemed necessary to post pone the taking of a sabbatical for a year, this shall be communicated to the appropriate Associate Dean. Such requests are normally granted.

C.iii.f Report of work and accomplishments during the sabbatical

During the first semester after returning to regular duties, the faculty member must file with the Dean a substantive report of his/her work and accomplishments during the sabbatical. Both the plan for the sabbatical and the post-sabbatical report shall be public documents. Therefore, no proprietary information reflecting intellectual property issues should be included in these documents. Copies of the plan and the report will be kept on file by the Dean. In accepting a sabbatical assignment, the faculty member shall agree to return to the University for at least one year thereafter. In case the faculty member is responsible for terminating his/her connection with the university within the period of one year after expiration of the sabbatical, the individual shall refund the sabbatical remuneration to the university on a prorated basis, except in exceptional circumstances, including permanent disability or death, wherein neither the individual nor the heirs shall be obligated to refund any part of the amount paid while on sabbatical.

C.iv Procedure for proposing amendments to the bylaws

Amendments to the bylaws may be proposed by any faculty member at any time. Such a proposal is submitted to the bylaws committee, which will provide a report to the faculty. If the bylaws committee has failed to act in a timely manner on such a proposal, the faculty member proposing the amendment may introduce it at a regularly scheduled department meeting.