

CU DENVER BUSINESS SCHOOL PRIMARY UNIT CRITERIA

I. Preamble

- A. The Business School's Primary Unit is defined at the school level. It includes all the appropriately credentialed faculty members having the authority to make recommendations concerning comprehensive, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. This document sets forth the Business School's policy of the Primary Unit and the standards and operating procedures for the Primary Unit. These include requirements for evidence of achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service within each Discipline that shall be employed in all promotion, tenure, and reappointment evaluations.
- B. The Primary Unit and reviewing bodies or persons making recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion and post-tenure review¹ shall strictly follow and apply these procedures and standards described herein. The Primary Unit elects its chair for a three-year term.
- C. These standards are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and other relevant system and campus APS policies and procedures, and as such, may be subsequently revised. These standards and procedures are meant to be applied in a manner consistent with current Regent and University rules. In the event of a conflict, Regent rules shall govern. Additionally, this document is responsive to APS 1022 and relevant Campus Administrative Policy requiring that each Primary Unit develop criteria that define the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service expectations of its faculty, which must be approved by the Dean and Provost. These Primary Unit criteria and procedures shall be made available to each faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment.

II. General Appointment Criteria to the Tenure-Track:

- *Assistant Professor:* Assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field. They should be well-qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research or scholarship in their Disciplines or related fields.
- *Associate Professor:* Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field, considerable successful teaching experience, and

¹ Each tenure-bearing unit must have a Post-Tenure Review Committee, comprised of members of the tenured faculty. During the year in which a faculty member is undergoing PTR, they should not serve on the PTR evaluation committee. The procedures for PTR are available separately from this document.

increasing accomplishment in research/scholarship, as articulated in the Primary Unit criteria.

- *Professor:* Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their fields, and (1) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (2) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless the individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (3) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/scholarship, and leadership and service.

III. Comprehensive Review

Campus Administrative Policy 1004 requires that Assistant Professors undergo comprehensive reappointment review before they may be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

- A. Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the tenure probationary period apart from the review for the award of tenure. The Comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service.
- B. The Comprehensive 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 the evaluation for tenure.
- C. The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the Comprehensive review, which is one of two outcomes: (a) the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or (b) the faculty member is informed that they will be given a one-year terminal appointment and the tenure-track appointment will not be continued.

IV. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Expectations in the Business School

- A. **Tenure:** Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (to the University, profession and/or public); and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work. The process leading to the award of tenure is an evaluation of a faculty member's cumulative performance. It is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation. Leadership and service is weighed into any decision regarding tenure. Still, such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarly/creative work are not an adequate basis for tenure.
 - For assistant professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one recommendation. Review for promotion to associate professor

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

occurs at the same time as the tenure review. There is no consideration for promotion to associate professor separate from consideration for tenure.

- B. **Promotion and Tenure Choice of Evaluative Criteria:** If new or revised Primary Unit criteria have been adopted during a faculty member's tenure probationary period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure based on the new criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. This election must be submitted to the Dean in writing, and the Dean must acknowledge the choice in writing. Both documents must be included in the faculty member's dossier. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current Primary Unit criteria shall apply.
- C. **Standards for Excellence in Scholarly/Creative Work:** A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work must include evidence of impact beyond the institution.
- D. **Standards for Excellence in Teaching:** A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall consist of multiple measures of teaching evaluation and 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.
- E. **Effort or promise of performance** shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure
- F. **The Tenure and Promotion Review Process** usually begins mid-year in the Primary Unit. Final dossiers (reviewed by the Primary Unit) and related materials for candidates are due in the Office of the Provost in January each year.
- G. **Tenure Probationary Period:** The tenure probationary period shall begin when the faculty member is first appointed to the rank of assistant professor or higher rank. A recommendation on tenure shall be made after a probationary period of continuous full-time service as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor, which shall include prior service credit as approved by the Dean and Provost. The probationary period shall not exceed seven years unless an extension has been approved by the Dean and chancellor or the chancellor's designee and is made following University and/or Campus policies. The Candidate may self-nominate for tenure consideration at any time during the probationary period, but only after a comprehensive review has occurred.
- H. **Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure:**
Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure requires that the Candidate demonstrate and document a record of high-quality research that indicates the potential for sustained accomplishment throughout their career.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated meritorious performance, in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service to the University and the faculty member's profession, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.

I. Promotion to Professor:

There is no standard or typical time at which this promotion consideration occurs. There are multiple potential pathways in a faculty member's career post-tenure. In the Business School, we encourage contributions from senior faculty that build on the requirements and standards required for tenure to advance the School's Mission, promote academic excellence, and positively impact both the academic and business communities.

As stated in the Laws of the Regents, faculty seeking to be promoted to Full Professor should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field(s) or its equivalent. They shall also have:

- A record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent;
- A record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless the individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and
- A record since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in research/scholarship, teaching, and service.

Activities that demonstrate excellence in research, teaching, and/or service include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Research:** Candidates may demonstrate excellence through many types of scholarly activities, such as publications in premier journals; other published scholarly work; journal or special issue editorship; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, fellowships, and other acknowledgments; citations or other measures of impact. It is important to note that "substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment" means an increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not an increase in the rate of publications.
- **Teaching:** Candidates may demonstrate excellence through many types of pedagogical activities, such as a sustained record of effective teaching according to student and peer evaluations, course rigor and difficulty, and program objectives; teaching awards; course, curriculum, and program design and

materials; student advising and mentoring; publications related to teaching (including textbooks); or other significant accomplishments in teaching that demonstrate an impact either within or beyond the University. It is important to note that all pedagogical work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.), as well as overall quantity and variety.

- **Leadership and Service:** Candidates may demonstrate excellence through many activities, such as full participation in the collegial activities of the School; relevant committees at the Discipline, School, or campus levels; professional service (e.g., reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals); or taking a demonstrable leadership role at the level of the Discipline, School, campus, CU system, community, and profession. It is important to note that it is not sufficient to be involved in numerous service and leadership activities. The quality of the service and leadership activities must be evaluated as effective and productive and as making contributions to the School, University, and Profession.

V. Tenure and Promotion Levels of Review in the Business School

- A. As indicated in section III, and further described in APS#1022: *the First-Level Review* is at the school level; it includes review by the Primary Unit, the Dean's Advisory Committee, and the Dean. *The Second-Level Review* is at the campus level; it includes commentary by the vice chancellor for academic affairs' advisory Committee, the vice chancellor for academic affairs, hereafter referred to as the "provost," and the chancellor. *The Third-Level Review* is at the presidential level; it refers either to the review by the president of a positive recommendation for tenure or to an appeal of a negative decision for tenure by a candidate. Promotion decisions are completed at the second level of review and are not eligible for third-level review.
- B. For tenure and promotion cases, faculty review committees at each level of review vote on the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service of the Candidate as "not meritorious," "meritorious," or "excellent." All members of a Primary Unit, even if not serving on a review committee, then vote on whether to recommend tenure and/or promotion.
- C. A faculty member may vote once on a case undergoing review and may not be present during or contribute to or influence in any way the discussion and vote on the matter at any other level of the process.

VI. The Primary Unit and the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

The Primary Unit will be comprised of all the appropriately credentialed Business School faculty members. For example, for tenure cases, the primary Unit is comprised of all tenured faculty except as noted herein. Dean's Advisory Committee members are excluded from participating in Primary Unit activities and actions.

Each Discipline in the Business School will prepare and adopt discipline-specific Primary Unit criteria and identify premier journals in its Discipline (as differentiated from high-quality peer-reviewed journals). The Primary Unit will utilize the relevant discipline-specific Primary Unit criteria appropriate for each case and will base its recommendations on such standards. The Primary Unit will adopt procedures to prepare and transmit a minority report for any case where more than 25% of the Primary Unit disagrees with the majority of votes cast.

- A. The Primary Unit establishes a Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) to evaluate a given case. The PUEC should consist of members elected from among the faculty of the Primary Unit with the appropriate credentials. The PUEC would be formed as at present, with two members from the Discipline and one outside member from Business School faculty. Proper credentials imply possessing a higher level of accomplishment than the case at hand. For example, full professors may serve on the PUEC for candidates for promotion to full; tenured faculty may serve on the PUEC for candidates for tenure and those for a Comprehensive review. PUECs are assembled in accordance with these principles.
 - a. The PUEC chair is chosen from the set of appropriately credentialed members of the Discipline by the mutual consent of the Candidate and the area's Discipline director.
 - b. The other members of the PUEC are determined by the mutual consent of the Candidate and the PUEC chair. These members will serve as the members of the PUEC for the case.
 - c. If appropriately qualified faculty members within the Discipline are not available for the case at hand, the chair of the PUEC will work in coordination with the Primary Unit chair to complete the committee membership by choosing appropriate faculty from other disciplines within the Business School.
- B. The PUEC works with the Candidates to develop their dossiers and writes the draft of the Primary Unit's report, and serves as part of the Primary Unit in making recommendations to the Dean regarding appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The dossier should include:
 - a. Information concerning the teaching ability of the Candidate, including the opinions of the Candidate's students, colleagues, and other qualified individuals who may have observed the Candidate's classroom presentation.
 - b. Each PUEC will use discipline-specific criteria in making recommendations on promotion and tenure cases.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

- c. The Candidate's scholarly and/or research efforts, including the opinions of colleagues and written publications that the Committee examines thoroughly.
 - d. The Candidate's University leadership and service, including the opinion of colleagues and relevant others.
 - e. Any other information submitted by the Candidate that the Candidate believes will assure an adequate consideration and evaluation of his/her appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.
 - f. The opinions in writing of scholars from outside the University, and from various locations, who are qualified to judge the Candidate. Such outside opinions are mandatory. See Section IX for information about the selection of external reviewers.
- C. In making recommendations on reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the Primary Unit evaluates the Candidate's performance on each of:
- a. The teaching record of the Candidate
 - b. The research record of the Candidate
 - c. The leadership/service record of the Candidate

Detailed standards for each Discipline are found in the appendices to this document.

- D. Following the PUEC recommendation, the faculty of the Primary Unit must conduct a vote. Voting procedures must be consistent with unit bylaws. Each participating faculty member must issue four votes, one each for teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, and a final "overall" vote. The ballots must be recorded and presented in a table, and for each action, the table should note the number voting in favor, the number voting against, and the number abstaining. The total size of the faculty in the Primary Unit eligible to vote on the case should be noted in the table as well. The results of the faculty vote must be reported to the Dean, the Dean Advisory Committee, and the Candidate.
- E. Discussion and voting on a given case are restricted to Primary Unit faculty physically or virtually present at the time of the meeting, and the votes were taken. All conversations and votes are strictly confidential.
- F. Following a secret ballot vote by the Primary Unit, the PUEC recommendations may be revised by the Primary Unit, and the results of the ballot are included in the Candidate's dossier. The Primary Unit chair forwards its final recommendation and the results of the faculty vote to the Dean and the Candidate.
- G. In the event of a significant split vote, an explanation of negative votes, in excess of 25% of the votes cast, is required, and a minority report shall be prepared by the primary unit chair and included as part of the Primary Unit report sent to the Dean.
- H. Form UCD-7 must be signed by the Primary Unit Chair and placed in the Candidate's dossier. The dossier is then forwarded to the Dean.

VII. Dean's Advisory Committee

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective Date: 07/01/2020

The Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC) serves as part of the first level of review for RTP cases. DAC is comprised of seven tenured faculty members, with one member elected by each Discipline as available; they will be 'held-out' of Primary Unit activities and actions to serve on the DAC. DAC members would serve three-year terms, with staggered terms to maintain continuity. The DAC aids in the evaluation of recommendations forwarded by the Primary Unit.

Where it is not possible for the DAC to consist of appropriately qualified Business School faculty, the Dean and Primary Unit Chair will, as necessary, augment the DAC with faculty from other schools or colleges. No member could serve more than three years out of any six years to deal with recusals, staggering, etc. If a DAC member chooses to serve on a PUEC for a Candidate, then that member can only participate and vote at the Primary Unit and must be recused from the DAC reviews and voting for this Candidate. The member, however, may participate in the discussions of other candidates at the DAC level, as long as the DAC member did not also participate and vote at the Primary Unit in any other case (s) in the same year. Insofar as possible, members who rotate off the DAC shall be replaced in a manner to maintain the above makeup and achieve a staggered rotation. DAC elects its chair, and an appropriately credentialed faculty member from the Dean's office shall serve as an ex-officio representative.

Detailed criteria for the applicable Primary Unit shall be applied in evaluating each case. In making recommendations on reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the DAC evaluates the Candidate's performance on each of the following:

- a. The teaching record of the Candidate
- b. The research record of the Candidate
- c. The leadership/service record of the Candidate

When a member of the DAC has a conflict of interest, the member may not be present during any discussions of the case and must not contribute to or influence the debate. DAC members would not review cases for which they serve on the PUEC or where the members participated in the Primary Unit deliberations of any candidate. The member must be recused from voting and must not be present during the vote. (See Campus Administrative Policy 1004 for the definition of conflict of interest.)

The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend tenure" is not sufficient. A unanimous vote is not required.

When discussing and voting on a given case, four votes, one each for teaching, research and service, and a final "overall" vote, need to be recorded and presented in a table included in the report sent forward to the Dean. For each action, the table should note the number voting in favor, the number voting against, and the number abstaining. The total

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

size of the Committee should be pointed out in the table as well. Following the vote, the DAC makes its recommendation on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in writing to the Dean and the Candidate.

The recommendation letter to the Dean summarizes the case and each area of evaluation. In the discussion of the Candidate's scholarly/creative work, direct quotes, if used, from external reviewers, numbered in a sequence that matches the order in the "External Reviewer Report" from the Primary Unit, are to be included. Names and affiliations of the external reviewers are never to be included.

Two voting tables are included at the end of the recommendation; the first records the votes for each area of effort, and the second, if a positive recommendation, states, "Record Taken as a Whole is Excellent." The recommendation is placed in the dossier, and then the dossier and supporting material are submitted to the Dean. Should either the DAC or the Dean disagree with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the Dean shall communicate the nature of this disagreement with the head of the Primary Unit and the Candidate. The Primary Unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its revised judgment to the Dean for her/his consideration and that of the DAC.

VIII. Dean's Recommendation

The Dean prepares an evaluation and recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews and points out areas of concern or disagreement. The DAC and the Dean will base their assessments and reports on the discipline-specific Primary Unit criteria.

The recommendation of the Dean, the results of the votes of the Primary Unit and the DAC, and the comprehensive dossier on the Candidate shall be forwarded together to the Provost. If the reconsideration process leads to a delay in the submission of the dossier, the Dean should notify the Associate Vice Chancellor's Office in writing and provide a possible time for submission.

Where differences of opinion between the Primary Unit, the DAC, and/or the Dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context.

The Dean must promptly inform the chair of the Primary Unit of the Dean's recommendation. The chair of the Primary Unit must quickly notify the Candidate of the Dean's recommendation. The Dean provides the Candidate with a copy of the Dean's letter to the Provost at the time the letter is inserted in the Candidate's dossier. The Dean reviews the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included, completes and signs Form UCD 7, and forwards the complete dossier to the Provost's Office by January 9.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

IX. External Evaluators

The PUEC requests evaluations in writing by scholars from outside the University, and from various locations, who are qualified to judge the Candidate, using a solicitation letter following the Business School or school-approved format. Such outside evaluations are mandatory in cases of recommendations for tenure and promotion.

A. The Process for Selecting External Evaluators

1. The selection of external evaluators shall be undertaken by the Primary Unit; the Candidate shall be given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or indicate specific scholars whom the Candidate feels should be excluded from consideration.
2. For tenure reviews, a minimum of six (6) external letters must be provided. For Comprehensive reviews, a minimum of three (3) external letters must be provided. External Reviewers must have tenure and be at the rank of Associate Professor or higher.
3. For promotion to Full Professor reviews, a minimum of six (6) external letters must be provided. Reviewers must have tenure and the rank of Full Professor. Exceptions should be made when external reviewers hold high positions in education, business, government, or the arts.
4. Per Campus Administrative Policy 1004, at most, two external reviews can be selected from the Candidate's list, and at least four must be selected from outside the Candidate's list. For a comprehensive review, at least three external reviewers are required, with at most one selected from the Candidate's list, and at least two selected outside the Candidate's list.
5. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations may constitute a conflict of interest, such as external reviewers with close association with the Candidate, former dissertation directors, prior supervisors, and/or co-authors.

B. Criteria for Selection of External Reviewers

The PUEC will formally solicit external letters using a solicitation letter following the Business School approved format. The PUEC recommend external reviewers to the Primary Unit according to these criteria:

1. The reviewer's area of expertise should align with the professional plan of the faculty member under review.
2. External reviewers are selected from academic programs that share a professional or academic resemblance to the Primary Unit of the Business School.
3. External reviewers must be available to participate in the review process.

4. The PUEC for a given candidate under review recommends potential reviewers by scanning the field, consulting with peers, reviewing the academic programs that a reviewer is connected to, and assessing the credentials/vita of potential reviewers.
5. The PUEC for a given candidate also applies the above criteria to their recommendation of final reviewers from the Candidate's list of potential reviewers.
6. If a candidate for tenure is a new hire, and at the time the letter of offer was issued, the individual held a tenured position at another institution, the letter(s) of recommendation for hire may be used in the tenure evaluation process in place of the external evaluation letters typically required. If necessary, additional letters may be requested in the tenure evaluation process. Campus Policy 1021 Hire with Tenure should be consulted in all such cases.

X. Early Tenure

The standards of performance that apply to faculty members on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, scholarly/ creative work, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member coming up in the seventh year. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. The Primary Unit for a given candidate has a responsibility to counsel tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early promotion or tenure.

XI. Annual Review/Merit Evaluations and Annual Performance Ratings

The Annual Performance Review and merit procedures for the Business School can be found in the faculty handbook section on "Business School Annual Performance Review and Merit Procedures."

XII. Post Tenure Review (PTR) & Professional Plans

The Business School requires that faculty members prepare and maintain a professional plan after their award of tenure. At the time of annual merit evaluation and during the post-tenure review (or extensive review), the PTR committee shall review the professional plan (and any revisions or updates to the plan) and compare the faculty member's goals to the actual achievements of the faculty member during the five-year review period. The PTR committee shall utilize the annual merit evaluation scores to produce a five year average for each category of research, teaching, and service. This plan intends to support faculty achievements through thoughtfully articulated goals, adequate preparation, effective execution, compelling presentations, documentation and contextualization of activities, and reflective self-assessment. Business School Faculty Professional Plans clarify expectations and identify goals that are individualized for each faculty member. Faculty Professional

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

Plans assist faculty as they move through the varying levels of evaluation associated with a Comprehensive review, tenure and promotion review, and post-tenure review.

See the Business School faculty handbook section on "Post Tenure Review Evaluation Subcommittee," which describes Post-Tenure Review (PTR) requirements of the University of Colorado Denver Business School.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective Date: 07/01/2020

Appendix A-1 CU Denver Business School

Evidence for Evaluating Meritorious and Excellent Accomplishment in Scholarly/Creative Work for Tenure and Promotion

- A. The goal of research in the Business School is to generate new knowledge that advances a field of inquiry or practice. In evaluating the record, the Primary Unit will consider both the Candidate's cumulative performance (including all work published before the probationary period) and the extent to which the Candidate has demonstrated increasing accomplishment in scholarly/creative work since joining the Business School and/or receiving tenure. Following Regent Policy 5.D.2(B), a recommendation of tenure and promotion based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution, as determined in herein.
- B. *Cumulative performance:* The Primary Unit will consider all publications, whether published at CU or prior institutions. The research record should reflect the number of years in the Candidate's academic career.
- C. *Increasing accomplishment:* The Primary Unit expects the Candidate to have published work consistently since joining the Business School. Candidates may demonstrate increasing achievement through many types of scholarly activities in addition to journal publications (e.g., other published scholarly work; journal or special issue editorship; late-stage revise and resubmits at elite journals; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, fellowships, and other acknowledgments; citations of the Candidate's work; evidence of impact on policy and practice, etc.). The Primary Unit views "increasing accomplishment" as an increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not an increase in the rate of publications.
- D. The Primary Unit will also consider the quality of the published work, the interaction between articles in defined areas of research, and the impact of the Candidate's publications (as evidenced by citation counts, impact measures, and external letters).
- E. The faculty has expertise in the business Disciplines, and collectively the faculty members in the respective Disciplines shall establish discipline-based meritorious and excellent criteria for tenure and promotion based on generally recognized norms in the Discipline.
- F. Primary Unit recognizes the scholarly standards that define Excellence in Research vary according to the Discipline area within the business (i.e., Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing, Information Systems, Business Analytics, and International Business). The primary Unit, therefore, considers Discipline-appropriate evidence of the significance of the research.

Business School Primary Unit Criteria
Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: XX/XX/XXXX
Adopted/Effective Date: 07.1.2020

- G. Primary Unit also recognizes the importance of interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and across-college research (mainly associated with the Business School's Centers). It evaluates research outside of the disciplinary areas based on citation indexes, impact factors, journal lists, and other quality and impact considerations.
- H. The Business School puts substantial weight on refereed publications in the best Discipline journals. In compiling a record of achievement, a candidate may be evaluated on different pathways. For example:
1. Premier publications – a focus on publications in premier journals;
 2. Balanced publications – a mix of publications in premier journals, high-quality journals, and other peer-reviewed journals;
 3. Sub-Discipline publications – a focus in publishing in high-quality journals in the Candidate's area of expertise.
- For example, an evaluation of Meritorious in Scholarly/Creative Work could be demonstrated by:
- A publication in a premier journal and at least one other peer-reviewed publication; or
 - At least one publication in a high-quality, refereed journal and two to four publications in peer-reviewed journals.
- For example, an evaluation of Excellence in Scholarly/Creative Work could be demonstrated by:
- Two premier journal articles and one to three other peer-reviewed journal articles; or
 - A single premier journal article and four to six other peer-reviewed journal articles; or
 - Three high-quality journal articles and three to six other peer-reviewed journal articles;
- I. All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier. The Candidate is responsible for providing evidence of papers accepted for publication online or in the press, including any conditions on acceptance.
- J. The Primary Unit reserves the right to consider cases with substantial, externally-funded grants or other significant scholarly activities that may substitute for some (but not all) peer-reviewed publications.
- K. Although single- or first-authored refereed journal articles are recognized as superior achievements because it is the norm in some Disciplines to list authors alphabetically, first-authorship or sole authorship is not required. Still, there should be evidence of independent intellectual contributions for a faculty member to receive an evaluation of either excellent or meritorious.
- L. Quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as meritorious or excellent. All scholarly activities will be evaluated based upon the Candidate's contribution to the publications, their quality (which may include prestige, significance, impact factors, citation counts programmatic nature, creativity, growth, Discipline norms, etc.), as well as the total quantity. The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate standards within the area of research, balancing the significance and quality of the contribution with the number of publications and other scholarly products.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Definitions:

- Premier Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as to the best in a field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria.
- High-Quality Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as those that rank higher than most and just below premier status in that field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria.
- Peer-reviewed journals are journals that require a blind peer review process and publish research that has a measurable impact on the field.

Examples of Meritorious and Excellent Indicators in Scholarly/Creative Work

	Meritorious in Research/Creative Work	Excellent in Research/Creative Work
Accounting, Business Analytics, Finance, Information Systems, International Business, Management, or Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A publication in a premier journal and at least one other peer-reviewed publication, or at least one publication in a high-quality, refereed journal, and two to four publications in peer-reviewed journals. All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier. • Some citations of publications • Receipt of a university research award/fellowship for publication • Internal funding for research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two premier journal articles and one to three other peer-reviewed journal articles; or a single premier journal article and four to six other peer-reviewed journal articles; or three high-quality journal articles and three to six other peer-reviewed journal articles. All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier. • Frequent and/or extensive citation of publications. • Recipient of significant fellowship, research, or publication award (s). • Recipient of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research to the extent it is applicable to the Discipline. • Awards and honors: for example, "best paper" prizes awarded by journals or conferences; an appointment as an Associate Editor or Section Editorship of the major journal; and articles reprinted in edited volumes. • Recognition by other scholars of research and publication • Publication by a research sponsor or technical reports or monographs • Professional reputation (both inside and outside the University)

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

Accounting Approved list

Premier Journals	
1	Accounting, Organization, and Society
2	Accounting Review
3	Contemporary Accounting Research
4	Journal of Accounting and Economics
5	Journal of Accounting Research
6	Review of Accounting Studies
plus	Premier journals from other disciplines
High-Quality Journals	
1	Accounting Horizons
2	Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory
3	Behavioral Research in Accounting
4	British Accounting Review
5	European Accounting Review
6	Issues in Accounting Education
7	Journal of Accounting, Auditing, and Finance
8	Journal of Accounting Literature
9	Journal of Accounting and Public Policy
10	Journal of American Taxation Association
11	Journal of Business, Finance, and Accounting
12	Journal of Information Systems
13	Journal of Management Accounting Research
14	Management Accounting Research
plus	High-Quality journals from other disciplines

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

BANA Approved list

Definitions:

Premier and High-Quality journals publishing Business Analytics research are often outside of typical business journal lists. Accordingly, the BANA faculty defines premier and high-quality journals in the following manner:

Premier Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as the best in a field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria. (Like Web of Science rankings). Specific examples and other declarations of Premier journals for BANA are given below:

1. Specific examples of Premium Journals for BANA faculty

- INFORMS Journal on Computing
- Operations Research
- SIAM J. on Optimization
- European J. of Operational Research
- of the American Statistical Association (JASA)
- of the Royal Statistical Society (JRSS)
- Annals of Statistics
- Journal of Bus and Economic Statistics

2. Additional Premier BANA journals include Premier Journals from other disciplines including sub-fields such as Stat & Probability, AI, MS/OR and Applied Math.

High-Quality Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as those that rank higher than most and just below premier status in that field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria. (Like Web of Science rankings)

1. Specific examples of High Quality journals for BANA are:

- Journal of Econometrics
- International Statistical Review
- Technometrics
- Journal of Multivariate Analysis
- Journal of the Operational Research Society
- Operations Research Letters
- Computers and Operations Research
- Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

2. Additional High Quality BANA journals include High Quality Journals from other disciplines including sub-fields such as Stat & Probability, AI, MS/OR and Applied Math.

Peer-reviewed journals are journals that require a masked peer-review process and published research that has a measurable impact on the field.

All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier.

Examples of Meritorious and Excellent Indicators in Scholarly/Creative Work

	Meritorious	Excellence in Research
Business Analytics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A publication in a premier journal and at least one other peer-reviewed publication; OR • At least one publication in a high-quality journal, and two to four publications in peer-reviewed journals. • Some citation counts. • Receipt of a university research award/fellowship for publication • Internal funding for research • Demonstrable increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not solely an increase in the rate of publications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two publications in premier journals and one to three other peer-reviewed articles; OR • A single premier journal article and four to six other peer-reviewed journal articles; OR • Three high-quality journal articles and three to six other peer-reviewed journal articles. • Frequent and/or extensive citations counts of publication; • Recipient of significant fellowship, research, or publication award (s); • Recipient of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research to the extent it is applicable to the Discipline; • Awards and honors: for example, "best paper" prizes awarded by journals or conferences; • An appointment as an Associate Editor or Section Editorship of the major journal; and articles reprinted in edited volumes; • Publication by a research sponsor or technical reports or monographs; • Professional reputation (both inside and outside the University. • Demonstrable increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not solely an increase in the rate of publications.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

Finance Revised Approved List

The Finance discipline values research in finance, risk management, economics, and interdisciplinary research.

Premier Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as the best in a field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria. These premier journals are:

1. The Journal of Finance
2. Journal of Financial Economics
3. Review of Financial Studies
4. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
5. Journal of Banking and Finance
6. Journal of Corporate Finance
7. Journal of Empirical Finance
8. Journal of Financial Markets
9. Financial Management
10. Journal of Risk and Insurance

The Economics profession has much larger numbers of faculty than finance, and a much larger number of premier journal outlets as well. As such, any publication in a premier economics journal, though very rare, will also be considered as "premier." An illustrative list of such premier economics journals are:

1. The American Economic Review
2. Quarterly Journal of Economics
3. Journal of Political Economy
4. Journal of Monetary Economics
5. Econometrica
6. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking
7. Journal of Financial Intermediation
8. Review of Economics and Statistics
9. RAND Journal of Economics

Other journals listed as premier for other areas and interdisciplinary journals that meet premier status can be considered on their individual merits with candidates providing information on these showing they are premier.

High-Quality Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as those that rank higher than most and just below premier status in that field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria. These high-quality finance journals are:

European Financial Management
Financial Analysts Journal

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Financial Review
Journal of Applied Corporate Finance
Journal of International Money and Finance
Journal of Financial Research
Journal of Financial Services Research
Journal of Futures Markets
Journal of Portfolio Management
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty
Insurance: Mathematics and Economics
Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment
Journal of Commodity Markets
Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics
Journal of Derivatives

Other journals listed as high quality for economics and other areas and interdisciplinary journals that meet high-quality status can be considered on their individual merits with candidates providing information on these showing they are high quality.

Peer-reviewed journals are other journals on the ABDC list that require a blind peer-review process and published research that has a measurable impact on the field.

The Finance discipline believes that this list may still be limited. Thus, **the Discipline will maintain the flexibility in evaluating other journals that are not on the aforesaid lists as candidates for premier and high-quality journals** for the purposes of tenure and promotion and for annual reviews. **All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier.**

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Information Systems Approved list

Category 1: Premier*	Category 2: High Quality**
European Journal of Information Systems	ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction
Information Systems Journal	AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction
Information Systems Research	Computers and Security
Journal of AIS	Computers in Human Behavior
Journal of Information Technology	Communications of the Association for Information Systems
Journal of MIS	Decision Support Systems
Journal of Strategic Information Systems	Government Information Quarterly
MIS Quarterly	Information & Management
	Information and Organization
<p>The College of Senior [Information Systems] Scholars encourages colleagues, as well as deans and department chairs, to treat the above "basket" of eight journals as top journals in the IS field. The list recognizes topical, methodological, and geographical diversity. Also, the review processes are stringent, editorial board members are widely-respected and accepted, and there are international readership and contribution. This list is considered most appropriate for PhD-granting, research-oriented universities.</p> <p>*In addition to those listed as premier above, the Information Systems area</p>	Information Systems Frontiers
	Information Technology & People
	International Journal of Electronic Commerce
	International Journal of Information Management
	Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology
	**In addition to those listed as high quality above, the Information Systems area recognizes high-quality journals in allied disciplines, including other business disciplines and computer science.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

<p>recognizes premier journals in allied disciplines, including other business disciplines and computer science.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Category 3: Measurable Impact</p> <p>Journals categorized as A on the ABDC Journal Quality Guide, those classified as a three or above on the Academic Journal Guide by Chartered ABS and any journal on an AIS Special Interest Group (SIGs) top 5 journal list is considered to have a measurable impact. The Information Systems area recognizes journals of similar quality in allied disciplines, including other business disciplines and computer science.</p>
--	---

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

International Business Approved list

Journal List for International Business Primary Unit Criteria					
No.	Journal	ABDC	Impact Factor	SJR	H index
Premier					
1	Journal of International Business Studies	A*	7.724	5.55	168
2	Journal of Business Venturing	A*	6.333	4.84	154
3	Entrepreneurship Theories and Practice	A*	6.193	5.07	121
4	Journal of World Business	A*	5.789	2.672	95
5	International Business Review	A	3.639	1.373	79
6	Journal of International Marketing	A	3.375	2.84	79
7	International Marketing Review	A	3.447	1.4	77
Note: Plus Premier journals from CU Denver other disciplines, other A* in ABDC, FT 50					
High-Quality					
8	Journal of Business Research	A	4.028	1.68	158
9	Journal of International Management	A	2.83	1.673	60
10	Management International Review	A	2.689	1.56	46
11	Asia Pacific Journal of Management	A	2.737	1.15	65
12	Global Strategy Journal	A	2.73	2.18	12
13	International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research	B	2.391	0.79	57
Note: Plus High-Quality journals from CU Denver other disciplines, other A in ABDC					
Quality					
14	Multinational Business Review	B	1.97	1	24

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

15	Thunderbird International Business Review	B	1.89	0.63	29
16	Journal of International Entrepreneurship	-	-	0.57	37
17	International Journal of Emerging Markets	B	2.067	0.37	22
18	International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management	B	1.34	0.37	41
19	Asia Pacific Business Review	B	0.897	0.31	29
20	International Negotiation: a journal of theory and practice	A	0.61	0.31	17
21	Journal of International Business Policy	new			

Note: Plus Quality journals from CU Denver other disciplines, other B in ABDC

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Marketing Discipline Appendix

The Marketing Discipline at CU Denver has programs, impactful research, and research scholars that primarily focus on the intersection of research that is international, applied (not ivory tower), grounded in marketing theory, empirically substantiated with quantitative techniques, has practical managerial relevance, and often focused on specific domains (e.g., services, consumer values, brand equity, diffusion of innovation). Relative to our journal quality guideline, established via statistical analysis of bibliometric measures (e.g., 4-year impact factor¹), we selected 14 premier journals as exemplars of the Discipline's research focus.

Marketing Area Premier Journal List Exemplars
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science
Journal of Marketing
Journal of Marketing Management
Marketing Theory
Journal of Product & Brand Management
Marketing Letters
Business Horizons
Journal of Service Research
Journal of service management
Journal of Services Marketing
Journal of Consumer Research
Psychology & Marketing
Journal of Consumer Marketing
Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of Marketing Research

¹SCImago, (n.d.). SJR — SCImago Journal & Country Rank [Portal]. July 13, 2020, from <http://www.scimagojr.com>

2. Additional Premier MKTG journals include Premier Journals referenced by other disciplines. Premier journals also include interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and sub-fields relative to Section G, including but not limited to Transportation, Tourism & Travel, Sports, Sociology, Psychology, Marketing Modeling, Logistics, Sales (B2B), Industrial Marketing, International Marketing, Hospitality, Ethnography, Entrepreneurship, Entertainment, Ecommerce, Digital Media, Cultural Studies, Consumer Studies, Communications, Channels & Distribution, and Behavioral Research.
3. High-Quality Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as those that rank higher than most and just below premier status in that field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria (e.g., SciMago). Examples would include Marketing journals that are not on the Premier list but rank "A" on the ABCD list. It also includes other disciplines "high quality" journals.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Examples of Meritorious and Excellent Indicators in Scholarly/Creative Work

	Meritorious	Excellence in Research
Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A publication in a premier journal and at least one other peer-reviewed publication; OR • At least one publication in a high-quality journal, and two to four publications in peer-reviewed journals. • Some citation counts. • Receipt of a university research award/fellowship for publication • Internal funding for research • Demonstrable increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not solely an increase in the rate of publications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two publications in premier journals and one to three other peer-reviewed articles; OR • A single premier journal article and four to six other peer-reviewed journal articles; OR • Three high-quality journal articles and three to six other peer-reviewed journal articles. • Frequent and/or extensive citations counts of publication; • Recipient of significant fellowship, research, or publication award (s); • Recipient of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research to the extent it is applicable to the Discipline; • Awards and honors: for example, "best paper" prizes awarded by journals or conferences; • An appointment as an Associate Editor or Section Editorship of the major journal; and articles reprinted in edited volumes; • Recognition by other scholars of research and publication; • Publication by a research sponsor or technical reports or monographs; • Professional reputation (both inside and outside the University. • Demonstrable increase in the Candidate's cumulative research accomplishments, not solely an increase in the rate of publications.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

Management Approved List

Category 1: Premier*	Category 2: High Quality
Academy of Management Journal	Academy of Management Annals
Academy of Management Review	Academy of Management Discoveries
Administrative Science Quarterly	Annual Review of Sociology
Journal of Applied Psychology	Decision Sciences
Organization Science	Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice
Strategic Management Journal	Human Relations
	Human Resource Management
<p>*In addition to those listed as premier above, the Management area recognizes premier journals in discipline-specific areas of management (e.g., OB, OT) as well as allied social science basic disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, economics) and professional schools (e.g., public administration, engineering) that inform the understanding of management and organizations. The below list provides <i>examples</i> of such areas and <i>examples</i> of premier journals:</p> <p>OB & Psychology examples: <i>Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes</i>, <i>Personnel Psychology</i>, and the <i>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology</i></p>	Human Resource Management Review
	Journal of Behavioral Decision Making
	Journal of Business Ethics
	Journal of Business Venturing
	Journal of International Business Studies
	Journal of Management
	Journal of Management Inquiry
	Journal of Management Studies
	Journal of Organizational Behavior
	Leadership Quarterly
	Organizational Research Methods

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

OT/Strategy & Sociology examples: <i>American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, and Management Science</i>	Organization Studies
	Organization Theory
	Strategic Organization
	Strategy Science
	<p align="center">Category 3: Measurable Impact Journals categorized as A on the ABDC Journal Quality Guide that are not included elsewhere on this list, along with those from other fields of comparable quality.</p>

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Appendix A-2
CU Denver Business School
Evidence for Evaluating Meritorious and Excellent Accomplishment in Teaching

Candidates may demonstrate meritorious or excellent performance through many types of pedagogical activities, such as teaching awards, peer evaluation of teaching, preparation of course materials, course rigor and difficulty, course and curriculum design and program objectives, student advising and mentoring, innovations in teaching, publications related to teaching, or other significant accomplishments in teaching. It is important to note that all pedagogical work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.), as well as overall quantity and variety.

Following the Regent Policy 5. D. 2(B), to receive an excellent rating in teaching, a candidate 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. Evidence of meritorious or excellent performance in teaching requires multiple sources or measures.

For example, an evaluation of *Meritorious in Teaching* is demonstrated by:

- Evidence that clearly indicates the faculty member is an effective teacher whose teaching supports objectives, rigor, and difficulty that is consistent with program goals.
- A faculty member is receiving students' evaluation scores at or above the midpoint of the scales.
- Faculty members with scores below the scale midpoints may demonstrate meritorious teaching by engaging in activities that serve to improve teaching and/or support the quality of the program they teach in as a whole.

For example, an evaluation of *Excellence in Teaching* is demonstrated by all of the following:

- A candidate meeting all of the criteria required for an evaluation of meritorious
- Superior teaching evaluations (well above the midpoint of the scale), accounting for course difficulty
- Other evidence of teaching quality which might include:
 - Teaching awards
 - Substantial student mentoring (e.g., supervising active student groups, Ph.D. committee participation, etc.)
 - Innovation in teaching (e.g., demonstrates the use of high-impact practices including but not limited to leading international courses, project-based courses, etc.).
 - Other outstanding accomplishments in instruction.
 - Other intellectual and widely disseminated contributions related to teaching (e.g., creation of workshops or short courses,

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

development of new programs, development of a MOOC or online simulation, etc.)

Examples of 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 evidence include:

- 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.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

In all instances, quantitative teaching data from faculty course questionnaires (FCQs) is required and should be presented in line with the example below:

Course	Times offered	Course Ratings	Instructor Ratings	GPA
Programming, Data, File, Object Structures (ISMG 3200)	7	3.12	2.23	2.27
Physical program design & implementation (ISMG 4800)	1	3.63	4.00	2.85
Undergraduate (on-campus)		3.37	3.53	2.99
Undergraduate (online)		2.82	2.79	1.78
Undergraduate Average (all)	8	3.18	3.34	2.47
Distributed Object System Development (ISMG 6140)	2	3.60	3.68	3.40
Interactive Multimedia Systems (ISMG-6040)	3	3.28	3.46	3.41
Object-oriented Programming(ISMG 6020)	1	3.27	3.33	3.40
Graduate Average	6	3.41	3.52	3.40
Overall Average	14	3.28	3.41	2.79

■

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

Examples of Meritorious/Excellent Indicators in Teaching

	Meritorious in Teaching	Excellent in Teaching
All Disciplines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students, graduate trainees or other learners, such as through FCQs (<i>normative minimal criteria</i>) • Teaching awards on-campus teaching and learning * • Syllabi that meet Business School expectations with articulated outcomes, assigned tasks specific to those outcomes, and demonstrate sequential learning across the areas of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. • A record of school and University funding for teaching initiatives and efforts. • Innovations in teaching * • Good Peer evaluations of teaching. • Mentoring of student projects. • Independent studies directed • Contributions to the assessment and updating of course and program outcomes. • Contributions to the development of program handbooks or guidelines for students • Contributions to the development of gateway, milestone, and capstone experiences in a program. • Contributions as guest lecturer of master classes in colleagues' classrooms and/or on campus. • Adopting University-offered teaching technology tools such as Canvas. • Attendance at professional education conferences. • Mentor other faculty in the School or the University in teaching and learning activities. • Organize or coordinate an event that features students' work on campus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students, graduate trainees or other learners, such as through FCQs (<i>minimal normative criteria</i>) • Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction that occur outside of campus * • Evidence of national/international impact on education, such as citations of educational publications or presentations, authorship of a critically reviewed textbook or other educational materials used elsewhere, national or international teaching awards, and external letters reviewing educational contributions* • Excellent external Peer evaluation of teaching • Research on curriculum and pedagogy that contributes to collaborations * • Outstanding mentoring and career counseling • Outstanding Alumni evaluation • Evidence of teaching at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence * • Quality of Doctoral dissertation and Master's thesis supervision • Student mid-term evaluations and retention scores • Evidence of risk-taking to enhance learning * • Curriculum development that enhances learning * • Performance of students, graduate trainees or other learners in higher-level courses or levels of training or placement • Performance of learners on Standard Professional Examinations* • Teaching scholarships * • Selection of student awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.

* May demonstrate 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.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020

Appendix A-3

CU Denver Business School

Evidence for Evaluating Meritorious and Excellent Accomplishment in Leadership and Service

Candidates may demonstrate excellence through many activities, such as full participation in the collegial activities of the School; relevant committees at the Discipline, School, or campus levels; professional service (e.g., reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals); or taking a demonstrable leadership role at the level of the Discipline, School, campus, CU system, community, or profession. It is important to note that it is not sufficient to be involved in numerous service and leadership activities. The quality of the service and leadership activities must be evaluated as effective and productive.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, candidates in the Business School must demonstrate a record of service and leadership. However, candidates are not expected to engage extensively in leadership activities prior to tenure. The following activities are considered relevant:

- University Committees and Administrative Service
- Service to Profession and Discipline (State, National, and International level)
- Consultation and Public Service

For example, an evaluation of Meritorious in Service and Leadership is demonstrated by:

- Participation in relevant committees at the Discipline or other levels.
- Regular attendance at formal Business School meetings (Discipline and faculty meetings).
- Participation in Business School and campus events and other relevant activities.
- Professional service, which may include but is not limited to reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals.

For example, an evaluation of Excellence in Service and Leadership is demonstrated by:

- A candidate meeting all of the criteria required for an evaluation of meritorious and
- Taking a leadership role in one or more service activities either in the Discipline, Business School, University, Community, or Profession. This may include but is not limited to being a faculty advisor on an active student club, chairing a standing college or campus committee, serving as an officer for an academic interest group, or serving on the Editorial Board at a journal, or editing a particular issue in a journal.

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
Effective 07/1/2020

Examples of Meritorious/Excellent Indicators in Leadership and Service

	Meritorious in Leadership & Service	Excellent in Leadership & Service
All Disciplines	<p>a. Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and informal peer-reviewing of journal articles, books, external grants, • Conference submissions, or working papers • Participation in professional association committees • Participation in department and school research workshops (attending and engaging in the intellectual discourse) • Participation in other department and school activities • Providing professional expertise to the media <p>b. Institutional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service on departmental committees • Advisor to student groups • Participation in departmental meetings and activities 	<p>a. Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and informal peer-reviewing of journal articles, books, external grants, conference submissions, or working papers • Mentoring junior colleagues • Editorial Board memberships and Editorial Assignments (such as editorship of a major journal(s), editorship of a highly regarded scholarly book, associate editorship, or section editorship of the major journal(s). • Participation in professional association committees • Participation in the department, School, and University research workshops (attending and engaging in the intellectual discourse) • Participation in other departments, School, and university activities • Public engagement such as serving community groups or speaking to them in a professional capacity • Providing professional expertise to the media • Legislative testimony of a professional nature • Writing evaluation letters for promotion cases at other schools • Invitation to present showcase or keynote paper or address at important international and national conferences. <p>b. Institutional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service on University, School or departmental committees • Administrative appointments (e.g., departmental Ph.D. director) • Advisor to student groups • Regular participation in departmental meetings and activities • Well-documented contribution (e.g., mentorship) to the research of others, especially junior colleagues. • Consistent service on graduate committees

Approved by Faculty: 09/07/2020
 Approved by Dean: 09/14/2020
 Approved by Provost: 11/10/2020
 Effective 07/1/2020