



Department of Bioengineering

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
DENVER | ANSCHUTZ MEDICAL CAMPUS

Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review

Revised May 19, 2020 to reflect new Regent Policy 5.D.2(B) requirement for excellence in teaching.

The Primary Unit

The Department of Bioengineering serves as the primary unit for faculty. Voting members of the primary unit are tenured faculty in Bioengineering. Until the Department has three voting members, the Chair shall add tenured faculty (within the CU system) from related disciplines who have the expertise to evaluate the candidate's record (such as faculty with joint or affiliate appointments in Bioengineering) to create a primary unit of at least 3 members. In these situations, the primary unit may have a different composition for each tenure-track faculty member because of the different specializations of the tenure-track faculty.

In considering promotions to full professor, the voting members of the primary unit shall be full professors. If the primary unit lacks three full professors in Bioengineering, the Chair shall add tenured full professors (within the CU system) from closely related disciplines who have the expertise to evaluate the candidate's record (such as faculty with joint or affiliate appointments in Bioengineering) to create a primary unit of at least 3 members.

Even after the Department achieves the threshold of three tenured (for tenure decisions) or three full professors (for promotion to full), the Chair may augment a primary unit by adding faculty from other units (within the CU system) with particular expertise in the candidate's field. Faculty added to a candidate's primary unit normally remain on the primary unit for its deliberations on tenure and promotion.

The primary unit is charged with evaluating the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the criteria provided in this document (see Criteria section).

The primary unit has the authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure. Recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are made by the department by a majority vote. The primary unit shall vote separately on the teaching, research and service record of the candidate, using the terms "not meritorious, meritorious, or excellent."

Criteria for Reappointment (Comprehensive Review)

All candidates for tenure must undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review. This is normally undertaken in the fourth year of appointment. The faculty member undergoing review (i.e., the candidate), assisted by

the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair, will develop a dossier with materials reflecting his/her record in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The reappointment evaluation measures whether the candidate is on a reasonable trajectory to receive tenure. The section entitled Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor provides detailed explanations of expectations.

As part of the reappointment evaluation, the chair or his/her designee will solicit at least 3 letters from external evaluators concerning the candidate's research/scholarship. The primary unit may solicit names of external evaluators from the candidate consistent with university policy.

To be reappointed, the candidate must receive a meritorious evaluation in all three areas and must be on track to develop a record of excellence in either teaching or research. The evaluation should indicate what the candidate's areas of strength are and also what areas of weakness exist. Special attention should be given to advising the candidate on remedies. For example, a faculty mentor might be provided for a faculty member with problems teaching large classes. Or a senior faculty member might advise the candidate on the best way to focus and accelerate research and publication. Candidates with weaknesses in certain areas should be counseled by the chair and colleagues on how to get on track for tenure. A candidate who demonstrates major weaknesses and who exhibits little or no promise of improvement or accomplishment and who is quite evidently not on a trajectory to achieve tenure should be recommended for termination (non-renewal).

Candidates should be advised to focus their efforts on achieving a record of excellence in either teaching or research. (Being highly meritorious in both will not result in a positive recommendation for tenure; there must be a record of excellence in one.)

Candidates are responsible for their own careers and records, but the department has an obligation to provide advice and mentoring where needed.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in research, teaching and service. Tenure-track faculty will undergo review for tenure and promotion no later than their seventh year of appointment. Per Regent's policies, a faculty member may request a deferral in his/ her tenure evaluation for certain conditions (maternity leave, etc.) Per Regent's policies, a faculty member may also request early evaluation of tenure.

A pre-tenure faculty member (the candidate) seeking tenure must present his/ her record in the form of a dossier. It is the responsibility of the department chair or a faculty member chosen by the department chair to help the candidate develop the dossier. The candidate should refer to the University's "Standards Processes and Procedures" document for a guide to the steps involved in the evaluation process.

Regent policy states that the program requirements of the department shall be considered at the time of appointment and reappointment; the merit of the candidate shall be the primary consideration in recommendations for the award of tenure.

Primary unit evaluators, assisted by external reviewers, provide an evaluation of the candidate in all three Regent-mandated categories-teaching, research/scholarship and service. External evaluators normally focus primarily on the research/scholarship record of the candidate though they may also comment on the teaching and service record, if they have knowledge of these activities. Six letters from external evaluators are required; these evaluators are selected by the primary unit. The candidate may recommend a list of external evaluators from which one or two possible evaluators are chosen. The candidate may also recommend certain fields or sub-fields from which evaluators should be chosen in order to provide a comprehensive evaluation in the multi-disciplinary world of bioengineering. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility to determine the external evaluators.

The possible ratings are excellent, meritorious and not meritorious. To achieve tenure, a candidate must be evaluated by the primary unit committee (by majority vote) and by subsequent levels of evaluation (college and campus) to be at least **meritorious in all areas and excellent in either teaching or research**. A record is kept of the primary unit's votes in each of the three areas and reported to the Dean and the Dean's Advisory Committee.

Each candidate will have a somewhat different profile of achievements and strengths. Any candidate recommended by the primary unit for tenure should add overall strength to the Department and help it maintain excellence in teaching, research/scholarship and service.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Any tenured associate professor may apply for promotion to full professor. Normally, the interval between achieving tenured associate professor status and applying for full professor status is about seven years, but a candidate with a record he/she feels meets the standards for full professor may apply at any time after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. The candidate puts together a dossier, advised by the chair or a faculty member appointed by the chair. The primary unit solicits 6 letters from external evaluators on the candidate's qualifications to be promoted to full professor. The candidate may nominate a list from which one or two external evaluators are chosen. Nevertheless, the primary unit has sole responsibility in selecting the external evaluators.

The University's policy "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion" sets the standard for full professor as having: "(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."

Full professors are expected to continue to be highly productive members of the department and to take leadership roles as appropriate.

Full professors have an overall record of excellence that shows evidence of substantial and continued growth in accomplishments. To achieve a record of overall excellence, the candidate's record in at least two of the three categories should be evaluated as Excellent. Continued service to the department, particularly as mentors to junior colleagues, college, university, community or profession is also an important component of the evaluation for full professor.

Criteria for Successful Post-Tenure Review

University policy requires that every tenured faculty member undergo post-tenure review every five years. A post-tenure review committee will be constituted by the chair, consisting of tenured faculty within the department. The chair may select tenured faculty from outside the department (within the University of Colorado system) to serve on this committee as well. The post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member's professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member's record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance report, including FCQs , peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member's five-year professional plan.

One feature of the University's post-tenure review process is the identification of problems that may arise in a tenured faculty member's record BEFORE the mandated post-tenure review. In any case in which the annual merit evaluation produces a "below expectation" rating (still in effect after any appeal of such a rating), the faculty member so rated must work with the chair to develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) that includes specific goals, timelines and benchmarks to measure progress. The PIA can be for one or two years. If the faculty member achieves a "meeting expectations" at the annual evaluation following the PIA, the process is complete and the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle.

If at the end of the PIA, the annual evaluation is still "below expectations," the faculty member must participate in an Extensive Review, assisted by an ad hoc committee in the Department that helps to identify areas of weakness and potential remedies. The resulting Development Plan sets benchmarks and timelines (similar to the PIA process). If the resulting annual review is "meeting expectations" or better, the faculty member returns to the usual post-tenure review cycle. If at the end of the Development Process, the faculty member's work is still "below expectations," the faculty member will normally have his/her tenure revoked and his/her employment terminated (for professional incompetence and/or dereliction of duty) by the Board of Regents. In certain circumstances, other sanctions may be imposed. If they believe

it to be warranted, the department chair and committee may provide recommendations for alternate sanctions to the dean. The Board makes the final determination.

Faculty Recruitment

Faculty members recruited into the department will be appointed at the level appropriate to their position. Faculty hires entering the department without tenure at their prior institution and who ask for a tenured-appointment within the department will have to undergo the normal tenure evaluation process prior to joining the department as a tenured member. For faculty without tenure who wish to be considered for tenure after joining the department, the letter of offer must clearly indicate the time by which the faculty member must apply for tenure.

The following matrix provides examples of activities that would be considered meritorious or excellent in the areas of evaluation. This list is intended to reflect some of the example of work or achievements by faculty and is not intended to be comprehensive.

Promotion Criteria Matrix

The following is intended to present examples of various levels of accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. It is not exclusionary, but is intended to assist faculty, department chairs and promotion committees in matching candidates' accomplishments to the promotion criteria. Moreover, areas frequently overlap in practice, although they are presented as distinct entities here.

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, it is expected that the candidate will satisfy some of the typical criteria for excellence. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, it is expected that the candidate will achieve excellence through more criteria.

Teaching

Meritorious

1. Active participation in teaching activities of the department, including two or more of the following: presenting a series of lectures covering one or more topics; coordinating a course, acting as primary instructor in a course, advising students, mentoring students and/or fellows, seminar or journal club organizer, small group or laboratory teacher, continuing education activities.
2. Meritorious peer reviews of class meetings and other teacher-student venues
3. Curriculum advising and participation in curriculum review or revision for the program
4. Meritorious teaching evaluations from students and peers.
5. Development or redevelopment of teaching materials for students, continuing education courses and/or other faculty training.
6. Meritorious standardized student evaluations (FCQs) from every course. This measure is required by the Board of Regents. Normally, there are no FCQ for independent study and thesis advisory roles. However, letters from students in independent study or whose thesis was advised by the candidate or interviews with such students by a member of the primary unit can assist in evaluations.

7. Solicited and unsolicited opinions of students and recent graduates, if available
8. Invitations to present Grand Rounds/seminars here and at other institutions; invitations to present courses outside of primary department.
9. Invitations to be a visiting professor at another institution.
10. Peer-reviewed conference presentations on teaching methods or curricular innovations.

Excellent

1. To achieve a rating of excellent in teaching, faculty must have demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level, which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting.

Sample Criteria:

- Institutional, national, or international teaching awards that recognize contributions to the discipline (e.g., pedagogical innovation, curricular redesign):
 - Evidence of positive impact on teaching in the discipline, such as citations of publications or presentations related to teaching, or authorship of a critically reviewed textbook or other educational materials that have been widely adopted by others;
 - External letters documenting the faculty member's impact on efforts to improve the quality of teaching in the discipline;
 - Evidence of a leadership role in developing and implementing curricular redesign that has been adopted by other institutions;
 - Evidence of a leadership role in designing and implementing effective assessment practices for student learning within the discipline beyond the campus;
 - Evidence of inclusion of high-impact practices, inclusive pedagogy, or other teaching strategies followed by evaluation of these tools as effective methods for teaching in the discipline, such that teaching practices across the campus or beyond are positively impacted;
 - Published research and/or externally funded research designed to improve pedagogy.
2. Regularly assumes greater than average share of teaching duties - e.g., course director, fellowship director.
 3. Consistently receives outstanding teaching evaluations or teaching awards, recognition as an outstanding role model for students.
 4. Acquiring (PI) teaching or curriculum development grants (e.g. T32, etc.)
 5. Trains students/fellows who pursue outstanding academic careers.
 6. Develops innovative teaching methods such as educational software, videotapes, packaged courses or workshops, etc.
 7. Successfully runs regional continuing education courses.
 8. Consistent participation in national educational activities - e.g., programs sponsored by professional organizations, re-certification, workshops and symposia, etc.
 9. Provides educational leadership by writing syllabi, textbooks or assuming an administrative role (e.g., Assistant Dean Research, Academic Planning, Student Services)).
 10. Publications on teaching in peer-reviewed educational journals.

Less than meritorious evaluations are based on a record that does not rise to the level of merit describe above. Consistently poor teaching evaluations, little effort to improve teaching, a pattern of student complaints deemed legitimate, and uninspired or ineffective mentoring are indications of a less-than-meritorious record.

Research

Meritorious

1. Sustained research focus, building a coherent body of research findings/innovation.
2. Authorship of papers in high quality peer- reviewed journals.
3. Co-investigator on grants.
4. A sustained role in the management of a research program with external funding.
5. Entrepreneurial activities such as licenses, contracts with venture capitalists or other developers of research finding to achieve practical application.
6. Presentations at national meetings; invited research seminars.

Excellent

1. A consistent level of peer-reviewed and/or other funding for research over a sustained period of time.
2. Served as a primary mentor to graduate students who successfully completed or are on the path to successfully complete their Ph.D.
3. Provide consistent research support for at least 2 graduate students per year.
4. Demonstrated evidence of originality as an investigator.
5. Principal investigator status on peer- reviewed grants.
6. Development of patents.
7. An ongoing, peer-reviewed publication record with senior author publications.
8. A national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference, invitations to present at national/international meetings, visiting professor- ships, service on study sections , organizing national meetings, serving as a national consult ant, or on editorial boards of journals, etc.

Less than meritorious evaluations result from a record that is seriously lacking in some of the areas described above. Failure to obtain grant support (even as a collaborator), research without focus, and lack of publications are obvious signs of a less-than-meritorious work.

Service

Meritorious

1. Willingness to perform department services (serving on committees, being faculty advisor to student clubs/organizations, etc.).
2. Serving on departmental committees.
3. Involvement in professional societies, especially serving as an officer or committee chair.
4. Outreach to the community (lectures, guest presentation, coaching pre-college students, serving on boards and committees, etc.).
5. Engaging in college-wide or university-wide service, including faculty governance.
6. Participating in grant and paper reviews.

Excellent

1. Externally documented exceptional leadership in a professional society.
2. Assumption of a substantive leadership role at the regional or national level - i.e., chairing committees, or accepting positions as officer of local or statewide professional organizations.
3. Editorial role in a journal.
4. High impact outreach to the community as evidenced by external review, independent media sources, etc.
5. Chairing NIH study sections or grant review sections.

Less than meritorious evaluations of service derive from the candidate's unwillingness to undertake a reasonable level of service to the department, the college and campus, the profession, or the larger community. Refusing to serve or consistently failing to attend or participate in departmental, college or campus service is an indication of less-than-meritorious service. A pattern of disruptive and unprofessional behavior in service activities is also deemed less than meritorious.

Approvals

The Primary Unit

Department of Bioengineering

by unanimous vote

Robin Shandas, PhD
Chair and Professor

Date

Richard K.P. Benninger, PhD, Assistant Professor
Emily Gibson, PhD, Assistant Professor
Kendall Hunter, PhD, Assistant Professor
Daewon Park, PhD, Assistant Professor
Richard F. Weir, Research Associate Professor

The Dean's Office

College of Engineering and Applied Science

Martin L. Dunn, Dean
College of Engineering, Design and Computing

Date

The Provost's Office

Office of the Provost, Academic and Student Affairs

See Provost Memo Dated August 6, 2020

August 4, 2020

Roderick Nairn, Provost
University of Colorado Denver

Date