

CU Nursing Appointment and Promotion Criteria for Instructional, Research, or Clinical (IRC) Faculty

I. PREAMBLE

- A. These IRC criteria approved by the Primary Unit and the General Faculty are written standards for initial appointment, optional anticipatory guidance, and promotion on the Instructional, Research, or Clinical (IRC) tracks at the CU Nursing. IRC faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure, as specified in Regent Policy 5.C.3.¹
- B. These criteria describe the nature and measures of achievement in teaching, research, or practice; scholarship;^{2,3} and leadership and service that shall be employed in all evaluations of faculty on the IRC tracks at CU Nursing. Faculty are appointed to one of the IRC tracks when they have primary responsibility for only one of CU Nursing's specific missions,⁴ which are teaching (Clinical Teaching), research (Research), and practice (Clinical Practice).⁵ Teaching must be the principal activity of every faculty member who is appointed to the Clinical Teaching track,⁶ but faculty on the Research or Clinical Practice Tracks may also teach some courses. Research track faculty are expected to work primarily on externally funded projects and to produce tier 2 scholarship as part of their work, but Clinical Teaching or Clinical Practice faculty may also be the lead on funded projects and scholarly works. Clinical Practice faculty primarily are funded to provide patient care, but Clinical Teaching or Research faculty might be partially funded to work in clinics (e.g., 1 day per week). Leadership and service is expected of all CU Nursing faculty members.⁷ Scholarship is expected of all faculty, and is further described in the CU Nursing

¹ Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. Section 5.C.3: Instructional, Research, and Clinical Faculty Appointments. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

² University of Colorado. (2020). (in development as of January 2020). APS 1043: Independent Teaching and Scholarly/Creative Work. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1043>³ American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2018). Defining scholarship for academic nursing. <https://www.aacnnursing.org/News-Information/Position-Statements-White-Papers/Defining-Scholarship-Nursing>

³ American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2018). Defining scholarship for academic nursing.

<https://www.aacnnursing.org/News-Information/Position-Statements-White-Papers/Defining-Scholarship-Nursing>

⁴ University of Colorado. (2020). APS 5060: Faculty Appointments (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5060>) defines each of the IRC tracks as follows:

- (a) **Instructional**: The primary responsibility of instructional faculty is teaching, however, some faculty members in this category may engage in limited service and/or leadership activities as assigned by the unit. In the College of Nursing, faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching are appointed to the Clinical Teaching Track.
- (b) **Research**: The primary responsibility of research faculty is to conduct research, although some individuals may be involved in instructional programs.
- (c) **Clinical**: Clinical practice faculty members are focused primarily on direct patient care. Some individuals may participate in scholarship.

⁵ CU Nursing. (2020). *Definition of Four Missions for CU Nursing*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

⁶ University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus. (2015). Campus Administrative Policy 1019: Instructional, Research, and Clinical Track Faculty Appointments. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

⁷ CU Nursing. (2020). *Definition of Four Missions for CU Nursing*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

CU Nursing APT Criteria for IRC Faculty

Approved by CON Primary Unit Faculty: 05/11/2020

Approved by CU Nursing General Faculty: 05/18/2020

Reviewed by the Office of the Provost: 12/21/2020

Adopted/Effective Date: 07/01/2020

Statement on Scholarship.⁸ The type and amount of scholarship required for a meritorious or excellent performance review vary by faculty rank and track, as described below.

- C. Campus policy requires that academic units have a process to evaluate the qualifications of instructional (Clinical Teaching track) faculty, a requirement that is satisfied by APT Committee review of IRC faculty at the time of their initial appointment.⁹ This document also includes standards used by CU Nursing including guidelines for “meritorious” or “excellent” ratings of IRC faculty. Although the Regents’ laws do not specify the criteria needed for promotion on the IRC tracks, this document sets a promotion policy for use within CU Nursing. Recommendations about appointment and promotion on the IRC tracks are made by the elected CU Nursing Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee.¹⁰
- D. The APT Committee and all reviewers making recommendations concerning initial appointment, anticipatory guidance, and promotion on the IRC tracks shall strictly follow and apply these procedures and standards described herein. Although the annual merit review process and the peer review of faculty by the APT Committee are separate, these criteria for “meritorious” and “excellent” work are also intended to support supervisors conducting annual reviews.¹¹
- E. Consistent with Regent Law and Policy,^{12,13,14} these IRC Criteria have been crafted in order to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation and for measuring the performance of IRC faculty who support the work of the Primary Unit. This document has been drafted by the faculty governance bodies of CU Nursing and reviewed and approved by the Dean and reviewed by the Office of the Provost as noted in the footer.
- F. These criteria are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other relevant university policies and procedures and described on the Board of Regents, University System and Campus Policies and Procedures webpages, and as may be subsequently revised. These criteria are meant to be applied in a manner consistent with current Regent and University rules. In the event of conflict, Regent rules for IRC faculty shall govern. CU Nursing’s policies for IRC track faculty are modeled after those for Tenure Track faculty^{15, 16} to promote consistency and equity between tracks, but are specific to one primary mission of the college in accordance with the Regents’ definitions of the IRC faculty tracks.

⁸ CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

⁹ University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus. (2018). Campus Administrative Policy 1026: Evaluating Qualifications of Instructional Faculty. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

¹⁰ CU Nursing Bylaws. (2020). *Section 1.0 – Name, Purpose, Members, and Officers of the General Faculty*. This document defines the role of the Primary Unit and the delegation of some reviews to the elected faculty APT Committee.

¹¹ University of Colorado. (2012). APS 5008: Performance Ratings for Faculty. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>

¹² Regents of the University of Colorado. (2010). Article 1: University of Colorado Legal Origin, Mission, Policy Framework and Ethical Conduct. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/1>

¹³ Regents of the University of Colorado. (2010). Article 4: Academic Organization and Program Planning. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/4>

¹⁴ Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty, Law and Policies. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

¹⁵ University of Colorado. (2020). APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

¹⁶ University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. (2021). Campus Administrative Policy 1049: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

- G. In contrast to Primary Unit faculty (tenured and tenure track) whose work addresses multiple missions of CU Nursing, IRC faculty have primary responsibility for only one mission – Instructional, Research, or Clinical.^{17,18} However, IRC faculty who make contributions to one or more other missions may use this as evidence of “excellent” performance in their role, because that work is above and beyond basic expectations. All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship; a consistent record of tier 2 scholarship is another way that IRC faculty can differentiate “excellent” from “meritorious” performance. The meaning of the term “tier 2 scholarship” is addressed in a separate CU Nursing Statement on Scholarship.¹⁹ To ensure that faculty members have appropriate expectations about the track to which they are appointed, these IRC criteria and procedures shall be made available by one of the APT Committee Co-Chairs to each new IRC faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment.
- H. The criteria below are leveled based on an expected progression of faculty after initial appointment (for policies about initial appointments, see the separate CU Nursing Faculty Hiring Policy). On the IRC tracks, faculty generally receive an at-will appointment, although IRC faculty may also receive limited appointments of 2-3 years’ duration based on demonstrated performance. IRC faculty who do not hold a terminal degree are generally appointed at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor, depending on experience and accomplishments. IRC faculty who hold a terminal degree may qualify for the rank of Assistant Professor (or higher, depending on experience and demonstrated accomplishments). APT Committee will offer IRC faculty an opportunity to submit materials for anticipatory guidance in their 3rd year as an Assistant Professor (this is also sometimes called the “midpoint review” because it parallels the review completed by tenure-track faculty in the 3rd year of a 7-year tenure clock). Regardless of whether APT Committee offers an invitation, however, any IRC faculty member may request anticipatory guidance in any year if they are considering promotion within the next few years and wish to receive suggestions to strengthen their portfolio for promotion review. IRC faculty may submit materials for promotion to Associate Professor at any time they believe they meet criteria for this rank (although there is no requirement to seek promotion on the IRC tracks), and as they continue to progress in their careers they may submit materials to be considered for full Professor.
- I. At all levels of progression, professional plans are developed by faculty members and their supervisors during the annual review process, and annual merit scores reflect progress toward the faculty member’s individual plan. CU Nursing annual professional plans clarify expectations and identify goals for each faculty member, and take into account any differentiated workload agreements that may exist. Annual professional plans are intended to assist faculty as they move through the varying levels of review associated with anticipatory guidance and promotion.

¹⁷ University of Colorado. (2020). APS 5060: Faculty Appointments. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5060>.

¹⁸ University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus. (2020). Campus Administrative Policy 1019: Instructional, Research, and Clinical Faculty Appointments. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

¹⁹ CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

II. PROMOTION ON RECEIPT OF TERMINAL DEGREE

Faculty in the Clinical Teaching, Research, Clinical Practice tracks at the Instructor or Senior Instructor level who receive a terminal degree (e.g., PhD, DNP, EdD) during their contract of employment will be eligible for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. To be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor rank in their current track, the faculty member must notify APT Committee by March 15th that they received a terminal degree in December or are expecting to receive a terminal degree in May, including the date of receipt and the college or university that granted or is expected to grant the degree. The faculty member also must provide a dossier that includes a letter (no more than 5 pages) requesting promotion and describing how the candidate meets criteria for Assistant Professor, plus a current CV, an evaluation letter from the faculty member's supervisor, the names of at least 3 expert reviewers able to evaluate the candidate's work who can be either inside or outside of CU Nursing or the CU system, copies of all teaching evaluations and annual merit review scores in the past 5 years, evidence of scholarly work, and any other supporting materials.

III. ANTICIPATORY GUIDANCE FOR IRC FACULTY (a.k.a. "Midpoint Review" for IRC faculty)

University APS #1022²⁰ and Campus Policy #1049²¹ require that Assistant Professors on the tenure track undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. No parallel requirement exists for IRC faculty. However, CU Nursing has a commitment to mentoring junior faculty in the IRC tracks and therefore anticipatory guidance is available to any IRC faculty member considering promotion within the next 3-5 years. Requesting anticipatory guidance this far in advance helps to give the IRC faculty member enough time to implement any recommended changes before going up for promotion. There is no strict timeline for anticipatory guidance, because IRC faculty may request promotion at any time and are never required to do so. However, the comprehensive review is sometimes called the "midpoint review" for tenure-track faculty (because it usually happens at about the midpoint of the 7-year tenure clock), and the term "midpoint review" is also sometimes used to refer to IRC faculty anticipatory guidance.

- A. Each Assistant Professor on one of the IRC tracks shall be offered the opportunity for Anticipatory Guidance at least once during their first 6 years of employment at the Assistant Professor level. The Anticipatory Guidance review typically occurs upon completion of the 2nd year of full time service as an Assistant Professor, and the APT Committee will invite all IRC Assistant Professors to request anticipatory guidance during their 3rd year. However, this review is not mandatory, and any IRC faculty member may request anticipatory guidance in any year, provided that they have not received such review within the previous 3 years.
- B. Similarly, new Associate Professors or Professors are offered the opportunity for Anticipatory Guidance, in a process parallel to that outlined below for new Assistant Professors.
- C. Other IRC faculty members including Instructors and Senior Instructors may request an Anticipatory Guidance review when they are considering promotion. Associate Professors (who were promoted rather than hired into that rank) may also request another Anticipatory Guidance review when they are considering promotion to full Professor.

²⁰ University of Colorado. (2020). APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

²¹ University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. (2021). Campus Administrative Policy 1049: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

- D. The Anticipatory Guidance review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate's strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before seeking promotion.
- E. At CU Nursing, the Anticipatory Guidance review requires evaluation by expert reviewers (a minimum of 3 letters plus one from the faculty member's supervisor), who can be from inside or outside of CU Nursing or the CU system. The IRC packet submission policy²² specifies how faculty should suggest and invite reviewers; all letters of evaluation are submitted directly from the reviewer to the Faculty Affairs office and are not shared with the candidate.
- F. The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the Anticipatory Guidance review, including areas of strength and suggestions for areas that could be improved before the faculty member applies for promotion. The APT Committee will also forward a copy of the evaluation letter to the candidate's Department Head or supervisor, and to the Dean.
- F. The CU Nursing Anticipatory Guidance Review for Assistant Professors is based on both the contributions the candidate has made to date to their primary area of responsibility (Instruction, Research, or Clinical practice), as well as the prospect for continued growth and contribution to the field. Evaluation of the dossier takes into consideration a number of different criteria, listed below. Consult the IRC matrices attached to this document for specific criteria.

Overall criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track): A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive teaching effectiveness, leadership in education, and collegiality contributing to the teaching mission of CU Nursing.

Overall criterion for Research (Research Track): A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive research expertise, leadership in advancing research, and research collaborative activities that contribute to the discovery of disciplinary and professional knowledge.

Overall criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track): A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive practice expertise, leadership in practice, and collaborative activities to advance the practice mission within CU Nursing and with professional or community organizations.

Overall criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks): A record of progressive participation and accomplishments in institutional, professional, and community service.

IV. PROMOTION EXPECTATIONS

- A. *External Evaluations:* The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential external evaluators. At CU Nursing, promotion review for IRC faculty requires evaluation by 3 external reviewers, who may be recommended by the candidate or selected by the APT Committee, unless a different minimum number is required by campus policy. Reviews will not be shared with the candidate. Reviewers generally should be at a higher level than the candidate – e.g., Associate or full Professors, or at a minimum Assistant Professors who have already completed a midpoint review, or should have specific content expertise that is necessary for completing an effective review. Emeriti faculty may act in role of external reviewer, as long as they meet the other criteria of rank and have not had direct collaborations or supervisory relationships with the candidate.

²² CU Nursing. (2020). *APT Packet Submission Policy for IRC Faculty*. Attachment to the APT Committee bylaws.

- B. *Supervisor Letter*: The APT Committee will also request a letter of evaluation from the candidate's supervisor; like the external letters, this letter of evaluation will not be shared with the candidate.
- C. *Choice of Evaluative Criteria for Promotion*: If new or revised APT criteria for IRC faculty have been adopted during a faculty member's current appointment, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for promotion based on either the new criteria or the criteria that were in place at the time of appointment.²³ Once the current appointment letter expires (e.g., after 1 year or 2 years), the new criteria will apply.
- D. *Demonstrating Teaching Impact beyond the Institution*: A recommendation of promotion to the Associate Professor level or higher that is based on excellence in teaching must include evidence of impact beyond the immediate instructional setting.²⁴ External reviewers will be asked to speak to a candidate's teaching impact. An external evaluator's judgment is one type of possible evidence of impact beyond the institution. Faculty can also demonstrate how they meet this requirement in other ways, such as use of teaching strategies or curricula developed by the faculty member by other universities or organizations, mentorship of faculty at other institutions, or dissemination of teaching innovations in public, peer-reviewed formats.
- E. *Effort or promise of performance* shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Instead, demonstrated past performance and outcomes are required to qualify as excellent or to be promoted to a higher rank.²⁵
- F. *The IRC Promotion Review Process* normally begins July 1. Candidates' dossiers are due in the Faculty Affairs Office by October 15, each year. APT Committee submits recommendations to the Dean's office in the spring, and formal written notification is given to candidates by the following June. Promotions are effective at the start of the next fiscal year.
- G. *No Award of Tenure*: IRC faculty are not eligible for tenure, regardless of rank, duration of service, or quality of work.²⁶ Tenure is a separate track within the faculty structure, as established by Regents Article V and university policies.²⁷ To be considered for tenure, a tenure-track position would need to be available and the IRC faculty member would need to be hired into that position. See the CU Nursing Hiring Policy²⁸ for details on changing tracks.

V. WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE FOR PROMOTION

²³ Based on the principles for tenure-track faculty, articulated in campus policy: University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. (2021). Campus Administrative Policy 1049: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review.

<https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

²⁴ Based on the principles for tenure-track faculty, articulated by: Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. Policy 5D, Section 5.D.2.(B). <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

²⁵ Based on the principles for tenure-track faculty, articulated by: Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. Policy 5D, Section 5.D.2.(C). <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

²⁶ Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. Policy 5D, Section 5.D.2.(B).

<https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

²⁷ University of Colorado. (2020). APS [1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review](https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022). <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

²⁸ CU Nursing. (2020). *Hiring Policies & Procedures for Faculty*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

- A. Promotion is based on a pattern of performance and achievement in teaching, research, or practice, as well as scholarship and leadership and service, that yields a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop. Evidence must clearly indicate that the faculty member has made significant accomplishments to date, and rank is not determined based on future potential.²⁹
- B. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor on the IRC tracks must demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research/scholarship, or practice (depending on track), as well as leadership and service, as evidenced by attainment of criteria within each of these missions. Candidates for promotion furthermore must be judged to have further achieved excellence in their primary mission area (teaching, research, or practice, depending on their track), as demonstrated based on the criteria. All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship as part of meritorious performance; strong evidence of tier 2 scholarship is one of several ways that IRC faculty can demonstrate excellence. Although IRC faculty are primarily aligned with just one of CU Nursing's missions, making substantial contributions to another mission is another way for IRC faculty to demonstrate excellence. The evidence must show clearly that the candidate is one of the very best in his or her field for a specific mission of CU Nursing, and that the candidate's special competence, leadership, collaboration, and scholarship will bring added distinction and visibility or otherwise be of special value to CU Nursing and to the University.³⁰
- C. For Clinical Teaching Track faculty, the impact of the candidate's teaching contributions must extend beyond the faculty member's immediate instructional setting.³¹ There should be evidence that the candidate has contributed creatively to teaching in the field, for instance through scholarship, leadership, or teaching activities that also support the other missions of CU Nursing. Unusually positive student evaluations of teaching are important, but are insufficient by themselves to support a case for promotion based on excellence in teaching. Clinical Teaching track faculty must demonstrate scholarship as described in the CU Nursing policy on scholarship, in order to achieve a rating of at least "meritorious" in teaching. The specific content of the scholarship (e.g., scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of application, scholarship of discovery) is less important than its quality. Clinical Teaching track faculty whose scholarship is at the "tier 2" level (e.g., national/international presentations, peer-reviewed publications in well-regarded professional journals) may present this work as evidence of "excellence."³²
- D. For Research Track faculty, candidates for promotion must document significant quality (i.e., as judged by peers) and quantity of systematic inquiry that advances scientific, disciplinary, and/or professional knowledge. The candidate must demonstrate sustained contributions through tier 2 peer-reviewed publications (e.g., on average two peer-reviewed publications per year during the typical probationary period) and presentations at regional and national/international professional conferences (e.g., on average 1-2 per year). Ordinarily, the candidate should present evidence of

²⁹ Based on principles for tenure-track faculty, articulated in: Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

³⁰ Based on principles for tenure-track faculty, articulated in: Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

³¹ Based on principles for tenure based on excellence in teaching, articulated in: Regents of the University of Colorado. (2018). Article V: Faculty. Policy 5C and Policy 5D. <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

³² CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

considerable contributions (e.g., first or second author) to a significant number publications and presentations, and should show a track record of continued external funding for research activities.³³ Team science contributions are also considered, and will be weighted based on the faculty member's specific role on the team. The candidate should be able to identify their own unique or meaningful contributions as a member of the team, and ideally be able to present one or more first-authored papers that emphasize their own aspect of the overall team-based work product. Research faculty whose knowledge-generating work also supports CU Nursing's teaching or practice missions may present this as additional evidence of "excellence."

- E. For Clinical Practice Track faculty, the impact of the candidate's contributions must extend beyond the care of individual patients. There should be evidence that the candidate has contributed creatively to the professional practice of nursing, for instance through scholarship, leadership, or practice activities that also contribute to the other missions of the university. Unusually positive evaluations of practice by one's supervisor or patients are important, but are insufficient by themselves to support a case for excellence in practice. Clinical track faculty must demonstrate scholarship as described in the CU Nursing policy on scholarship, in order to achieve a rating of at least "meritorious" in practice. The specific content of the scholarship (e.g., scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, scholarship of discovery) is less important than its quality. Clinical faculty with tier 2 scholarship (e.g., national/international presentations, peer-reviewed publications in well-regarded professional journals) may present this work as evidence of "excellence."³⁴
- F. Although numerical benchmarks have been provided to provide direction to candidates' preparation for promotion, the quality and impact of one's work shall be considered of greater importance than numbers per se in judging the candidate's overall record. Tier 2 scholarly work (as further described in the CU Nursing Statement on Scholarship), significant leadership within a specific mission, or significant contributions to other missions of the university (e.g., support of the practice mission by Clinical Teaching track faculty) may strengthen a case for promotion on the IRC tracks.

VI. LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION ON THE IRC TRACKS

- A. For IRC faculty, (1) the First-Level Review is at level of the college, beginning with the elected faculty APT Committee as specified by the CU Nursing bylaws. The APT Committee makes an initial recommendation, which is forwarded to the Dean, who is also part of the first-level review. If the Dean is in agreement, then the Second-Level (2) Review is at the campus level by the Provost, who if in agreement with the Dean's recommendation sends the promotion request to the Chancellor for final approval.³⁵ Appointment and promotion decisions for IRC faculty are completed at the second level of review do not require Regents review.

³³ CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

³⁴ CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

³⁵ University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus. (2018). Campus Administrative Policy 1019: Instructional, Research, and Clinical Faculty Appointments. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/policies>

- B. For IRC promotion cases at CU Nursing, reviewers must consider the mission-specific activities of the candidate (teaching for Clinical Teaching faculty; research for Research faculty, or practice for Clinical Practice faculty),³⁶ in order to determine whether the faculty member’s work is “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” Definitions for these terms are given in section VI below, with examples in a grid provided as an attachment. Reviewers should also consider leadership and service³⁷ and scholarship³⁸ for all faculty.
- C. The APT Committee is a standing committee of CU Nursing faculty, as described in the CU Nursing Bylaws.³⁹ Additionally, the CU Nursing Bylaws describe the role of the Primary Unit in evaluating faculty members, and the delegation of appointment and promotion reviews for IRC faculty to the elected faculty APT Committee.⁴⁰ The Primary Unit may hear appeals of APT Committee decisions, as described below. Any faculty who serve on committees at other levels of the process may not participate in any aspect of discussions at this first level of review.
- D. Only members of the APT Committee who are full Professors (including those on the IRC tracks and those on the tenure track) may vote on promotion to full Professor.
- E. A faculty member may speak to and vote at only one level on a case undergoing review and may not be present during or contribute to or influence in any way discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of the process.⁴¹

VII. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

For initial appointment as an Instructor, criteria are described below and in more detail in Attachments A-C. For initial appointment or promotion to Senior Instructor, see Attachments D-F. For appointment or promotion to Assistant Professor, faculty will be evaluated for their competence and performance as outlined in Attachments G-I. For faculty being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, please see Attachments J-L. Decisions about faculty promotion to full Professor are based on Attachments M-O. The appropriate appendix should be selected based on the faculty member’s appointment type (e.g., Instructional (Clinical Teaching Track) faculty are reviewed based on attachments A, D, G, or J). In addition, the following overall criteria should be reviewed:

A. *Initial Appointment as Instructor*

³⁶ University of Colorado. (2020). APS 5060: Faculty Appointments. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5060>

³⁷ CU Nursing. (2020). *Definition of Four Missions for CU Nursing*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

³⁸ CU Nursing. (2020). *Statement on Scholarship*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

³⁹ CU Nursing Bylaws. (2020). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee*.

⁴⁰ CU Nursing Bylaws. (2020). *Section 1.0 – Name, Purpose, Members, and Officers of the General Faculty*.

⁴¹ This “one bite at the apple” rule is based on principles articulated for review of tenure-track faculty in: University of Colorado. (2020). APS 1022: Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

- *Overall criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track):* Potential to develop teaching effectiveness, informal leadership, and collegiality contributing to the teaching mission of CU Nursing.
- *Overall criterion for Research (Research Track):* Documented evidence of interest and abilities in research and scholarly activities.
- *Overall criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track):* Potential to develop practice expertise, informal leadership, and collaborative activities within CU Nursing and with professional or community organizations.
- *Overall criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks):* A record of participation in institutional, professional, and community service

B. Appointment or Promotion to Senior Instructor

- *Overall criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track):* A record of progressive teaching effectiveness, leadership, and collegiality contributing to the teaching mission of CU Nursing.
- *Overall criterion for Research (Research Track):* Documented evidence of participation and beginning leadership in research and scholarly activities.
- *Overall criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track):* A record of progressive practice expertise, leadership, and collaborative activities to advance the practice mission within CU Nursing and with professional or community organizations.
- *Overall criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks):* A record of progressive participation in institutional, professional, and community service activities.

C. Appointment or Promotion to Assistant Professor

- *Overall criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track):* A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive teaching effectiveness, leadership, and collegiality contributing to the teaching mission of CU Nursing.
- *Overall criterion for Research (Research Track):* A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive research expertise, leadership, and research collaborative activities that contribute to the discovery of disciplinary and professional knowledge.
- *Overall criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track):* A record of scholarly/creative work, progressive practice expertise, leadership, and collaborative activities to advance the practice mission within CU Nursing and with professional or community organizations.
- *Overall criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks):* A record of progressive participation and accomplishments in institutional, professional, and community service.

D. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor:

- *Overall Criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track):* A sustained and consistent record of scholarly/creative work, teaching effectiveness, leadership, and collegiality including substantial contribution to the teaching mission of CU Nursing.

- *Overall Criterion for Research (Research Track):* A sustained and consistent record demonstrating scholarly/creative work, research expertise, leadership in advancing knowledge and research collaboration that contributes to the development of disciplinary and professional knowledge.
- *Overall Criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track):* A sustained and consistent record demonstrating scholarly/creative work, practice expertise, leadership and collaborative activities that have an impact on the profession at the regional or national level.
- *Overall Criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks):* A sustained and consistent record of accomplishments in service that includes providing effective contributions, demonstrating leadership, and facilitating others through collaborative service at the University, community, and regional/national professional levels.

E. Appointment or Promotion to Professor:

- *Overall Criterion for Teaching (Clinical Teaching Track):* A sustained and consistent record of scholarly/creative work, teaching effectiveness, leadership, and collegiality including substantial contribution to the teaching mission of CU Nursing with demonstrated impact beyond the University.
- *Overall Criterion for Research (Research Track):* A sustained and consistent record demonstrating scholarly/creative work, research expertise, leadership in advancing knowledge and research collaboration that is recognized nationally/internationally as contributing to the development of disciplinary and professional knowledge.
- *Overall Criterion for Practice (Clinical Practice Track):* sustained and consistent record demonstrating scholarly/creative work, practice expertise, leadership and collaborative activities that have an impact on the profession at the national level.
- *Overall Criterion for Leadership and Service (All Tracks):* A sustained and consistent record of significant, sustained accomplishments in service that includes providing effective contributions, demonstrating leadership and facilitating others through collaborative service at the University, broader community, and national/international levels.

VIII. STANDARDS FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

The APT Committee requests evaluations in writing by scholars from inside or outside the University and from various locations who are qualified to judge the candidate in an unbiased manner, using a solicitation letter following the college-approved format. External letters are required for promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor on the IRC tracks, as described in the IRC Packet Submission Policy document; for promotion to Assistant Professor or Anticipatory Guidance review on the IRC tracks, evaluation letters may be either internal or external.

A. Number and Type of Letters Required

1. For the anticipatory guidance review of Assistant Professors or Associate Professors on the IRC tracks, the candidate will request 2-3 letters from colleagues at the rank of Associate Professor or higher as peer evaluators, who may be from within CU Nursing or outside of the college, as well as a letter from their supervisor. These letters will be sent directly to the APT Committee by the reviewers and will be considered as additional evidence in the APT Committee's review.
2. In the case of faculty being considered for promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor on the IRC tracks, the candidate must identify at least 3 external colleagues who are sufficiently knowledgeable about the candidate's work to assess his/her performance within the criteria for rank. In addition to these external review letters, the candidate must request an evaluation letter from her or his supervisor. Reviewers for IRC faculty promotion cases must be *external* to both the college and to the university. As described in the IRC packet submission policy,⁴² the APT Committee will then solicit letters from some but likely not all of these potential reviewers, and will identify additional reviewers who are not known to the candidate but who have the appropriate rank and type of expertise. At least half of the reviewers must be from the discipline of Nursing, and the reviewers must either be at the desired academic rank or higher, or else have special content expertise that is relevant to the individual case. External reviewers will be sent the candidate's materials and a copy of the APT criteria for CU Nursing. APT Committee will strive to receive a minimum of 3 letters identified by either the candidate or the committee, which will be considered as additional evidence in developing the committee's recommendation about promotion.

B. The Process for Selecting External Evaluators

Selection of external evaluators is undertaken by the APT Committee on behalf of the Primary Unit; as described above, the candidate is given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or to indicate specific scholars whom the candidate feels should be excluded from consideration.

Candidates must suggest appropriate internal or external candidates as described in the "packet submission policy for IRC faculty" document.⁴³ In the case of reviews where external letters are required (promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to full Professor), the APT Committee may identify additional potential letter-writers with appropriate qualifications and expertise, and will make final determinations about which and how many letter-writers to invite. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations may constitute a conflict of interest, such as a dissertation director, co-author, or co-investigator on a funded project.⁴⁴ Consistent with Regents' rules for tenure-track faculty, APT Committee will strive to receive a minimum of 3 letters for each IRC candidate, which will be considered as additional evidence in developing the committee's recommendation.

C. External Reviewer Packets

The APT Committee will formally request external references and will send the following documents to the selected reviewers: a current curriculum vitae, a letter of self-evaluation,

⁴² CU Nursing. (2020). *APT Packet Submission Policy for IRC Faculty*. Attachment to the APT Committee bylaws.

⁴³ CU Nursing. (2020). *APT Packet Submission Policy for IRC Faculty*. Attachment to the APT Committee bylaws.

⁴⁴ University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. (2021). Campus Administrative Policy 1049: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review. http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/employees/policies/Pages/default.aspx

supporting materials related to declared area of scholarship, the CU Nursing criteria for rank on the IRC tracks, and all other documents listed in CU Nursing's packet submission policy.⁴⁵

External reviewers will be asked to address:

- the quality and quantity of the candidate's work,
- the impact of this work on the field,
- the degree of creativity and originality of scholarship,
- how the candidate compares with others in this field with similar training and experience, and
- how the candidate's performance would be categorized (below average, average, above average, or outstanding) compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.

IX. GRIEVANCES FOR ADVERSE PROMOTION DECISIONS

To promote equity between TT and IRC faculty, CU Nursing provides an appeals process for IRC faculty who receive an adverse determination from the APT Committee when they request promotion to a higher rank. Because in this case the initial determination about rank came from APT Committee, the IRC faculty member may instead appeal their case to the full Primary Unit group of which the APT Committee is a delegated entity. Faculty members have 30 days after being notified of an adverse promotion decision to appeal the decision, and must notify the Faculty Affairs office in writing within the 30-day window to indicate that they wish to appeal. In the case of an appeal, the Tenured Chair of APT Committee will convene a special meeting of the Primary Unit faculty (including both Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty), and will provide (a) the IRC faculty applicant's original promotion packet as well as (b) the APT Committee's evaluation letter summarizing the committee's recommendation. The applicant may write an additional letter summarizing their case or may provide additional evidence for consideration by the Primary Unit if so desired. The Primary Unit faculty will then evaluate the materials, vote on whether to uphold or revise the initial recommendation, and instruct the APT Committee to revise their letter if so indicated. The revised letter of recommendation with Primary Unit input will be sent to the Dean, who makes the final decision about promotion.

X. APPEALS PROCESS FOR "UNSATISFACTORY" RATINGS ON ANNUAL MERIT REVIEWS

Schools must provide an appeals process for faculty who receive an unsatisfactory score on their annual review.⁴⁶ Therefore, although the annual merit review and the APT Committee peer review of faculty are distinct, the two processes overlap and must use similar criteria in evaluating faculty members' performance.

⁴⁵ CU Nursing. (2020). *APT Packet Submission Policy for IRC Faculty*. Attachment to the faculty bylaws of the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee.

⁴⁶ University of Colorado. (2012). APS 5008: Performance Ratings for Faculty. <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>

At the time of hire each faculty member will be assigned a supervisor, who may be a Division Chair, Associate Dean, grant PI, etc. depending on the organizational structure currently effective for CU Nursing. The supervisor completes annual merit reviews using the campus-approved HR process. Because the supervisor is not functioning in the role of a peer reviewer, normal APT regulations like faculty being evaluated only by peers of a similar or higher rank, or tenure-track faculty only being evaluated by tenured faculty, do not apply to the annual merit review. However, in cases of discrepancy between a faculty member and his/her supervisor about the rating or summary evaluation, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the APT Committee. In that case the peer review process can be used to ensure an evaluation by appropriately qualified peers.

Faculty on the IRC tracks should receive a score of “meeting expectations” (3 out of 5) as long as they demonstrate basic levels of success in their primary mission – e.g., teaching for Clinical Teaching track faculty, research for Research track faculty, or practice for Clinical track faculty. Conversely, faculty who do not demonstrate basic success in their primary mission should not receive a score of “meeting expectations” even if they also make meaningful contributions to other missions of CU Nursing. As described above in the IRC criteria, faculty members’ scholarship, leadership roles, or contributions to *other* missions beyond their primary mission may be used as evidence for strong or exceptional performance (scores of 4-5 out of 5) on the annual merit review. However, these contributions may not take the place of demonstrating at least basic success in the primary mission that is associated with the faculty member’s track appointment.

To appeal an annual merit rating of 1 or 2, the faculty member should write a letter to the APT Committee requesting a second-level review and explaining the reason for disagreement with the supervisor. Along with the letter, the faculty member should submit (a) his or her annual review documents as originally submitted to faculty affairs and the supervisor, and (b) the supervisor’s written review including the merit score assigned. Faculty members may submit additional supporting materials that are relevant to the appeal. Faculty members must submit appeals within 60 days after receiving their merit score, and the APT Committee must complete its review within 6 weeks. The APT Committee may contact the supervisor or may request additional information from the supervisor or the faculty member. The APT Committee will then make a written recommendation as to whether the annual merit score should be revised, and will forward that recommendation to the Dean. In cases of continued disagreement between the supervisor and APT Committee, the Dean will be provided with both perspectives for consideration. The Dean’s decision about merit scores is final.