

Primary Unit Policy, Process, and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion of Instructional Series Faculty and Reappointment of Scholars in Residence

Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department
College of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Colorado Boulder

Date of approval: March 6, 2024 by department voting-eligible faculty
Effective Academic Year: 2024-2025

1. Scope

This document describes the procedures, policies, and criteria for specific use by the Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department (ASEN) in evaluating instructional series (Teaching Professor track)¹ faculty for reappointment and promotion and for the reappointment of scholars in residence. This statement fulfills the unit's obligations stated in the university policies on faculty appointments ([Article 5.C.3: Instructional, Research, and Clinical Faculty](#) of the Laws of the Regents, [APS 5060 Faculty Appointments](#), and the [CU Boulder Provost Policy](#) on Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Teaching and Librarian Positions).

2. Boulder Campus Policy on Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Instructional Faculty

Per APS 5060 as revised July 1, 2024, teaching is the primary activity of Instructional Series faculty members (currently Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Principal Instructors whose titles will change to Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors on a rolling basis after 1/1/2024). Instructional series faculty members are generally expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and at least meritorious performance in the other components of their annual merit formula. In addition, instructional series faculty are expected to demonstrate continued professional growth in their fields. Scholars in Residence may hold a broader range of expected duties but are also expected to demonstrate excellence in their primary roles and meritorious performance in their secondary roles. Unit criteria are used for evaluation of reappointment and promotion to specific ranks.

In case of conflict, the rules of the College of Engineering and Applied Science and/or the University of Colorado Boulder Campus (Provost) and the University of Colorado System supersede this policy.

3. Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Policies and Procedures

This section describes the policies and procedures followed by ASEN during its portion of review for reappointment and, if relevant, promotion. After the ASEN review, a candidate's file is reviewed by the College for conformity with unit and college policy and requires dean's review and approval. Promotion to Principal Instructor involves an additional college-level review by the college's Principal Instructor Review Committee prior to the dean's review. The College of Engineering and Applied Science policies and procedures for reappointment and promotional guidelines for instructional faculty are available on the college's website (<https://www.colorado.edu/engineering-facultystaff/faculty/regular-faculty-non-tenure-track/reappointment-promotion-guidelines>).

¹ Instructional Series and Supplemental Faculty titles are specified in [Administrative Policy Statement 5060](#) as revised effective July 1, 2023.

A. Guiding Principles

Reappointment and promotion evaluations are holistic assessments of performance in past scholarly and pedagogical achievements, and of productive service to our communities. In teaching, we value effective teaching that imparts the desired learning outcomes onto the students, as well as motivates the students to engage in lifelong learning. In leadership and service, we value professional engagement to support department and college educational activities and committees, lead new educational initiatives, and assist with curriculum developments and/or revisions. In scholarly/creative work, we value research into scalable and modern educational methodologies suitable for an engineering curriculum. We also value research and applying best practices to develop an inclusive academic environment that supports a broad range of demographics.

B. Guidance to Candidate for Preparation of Materials

A description of the materials required for both standard and expedited reappointment and promotion reviews, and the format for each document, is available [online](#).

Candidates undergoing a standard review should prepare the following materials:

1. The candidate's **curriculum vitae** (CV). The CV represents a cumulative record of teaching, leadership and service, and for some (as included in offer letter or any subsequent modifications to job weightings), creative/scholarly work achievements. The version submitted should be formatted for ease of review during the personnel action being undertaken and contain [this recommended content](#). For example, classroom teaching should identify courses taught, semester, and enrollment, and Leadership and Service appointments should clearly state the timeline and effort level required.
2. The candidate's **Teaching Statement**. This statement should be 1,500 words or less and provide the detail that the CV cannot provide, including the candidate's teaching goals, motivations, and insights, as well as any other relevant information. It can include teaching practices, reflections on their successes and challenges, modifications over time, etc., as well as additional related activities that might otherwise be overlooked. For example, mentoring is a teaching activity; it can include one-on-one advising as well as leading workshops on networking, professionalism, resume-writing, etc. The candidate should include information about how they maintain currency in their teaching, for example, by engaging with the Center for Teaching and Learning, participating in teaching circles, seeking regular peer evaluation, and incorporating the feedback, or participating in pedagogical workshops or conferences. The candidate should discuss how they have worked to make their classroom teaching and mentoring activities inclusive and equitable.
3. The **ASEN Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Evaluation Summary** form should be included in the material submitted by the candidate and should specify the sources of evidence to be used as part of the teaching evaluation. **Candidates can submit the evidence they have access to, such as the teaching reflection, and then leave the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) to gather additional sources and evaluate the rating level.**
4. Candidates whose responsibilities include leadership and service should include a **Leadership and Service Statement** of 1,500 words or less that highlights their major contributions to activities in the unit and, as applicable for Senior and Principal Instructors, in the extended community (including the college, the university, the profession, and/or the public). It may also include their goals, insights, and reflections relevant to these contributions. Include information on any leadership training workshops the candidate has participated in. The candidate's statement should also discuss if/how leadership and service activities have made their profession more inclusive and equitable.
5. Candidates whose responsibilities include scholarly/creative work (a.k.a., research) should include a short (maximum 1,500 words) **Scholarly/Creative Work Statement** explaining the topics of their research and the quality of its contributions. This statement should give insight into the candidate's major contributions, describing their originality, independence, and impact, or any unique aspects of

the record. It can also express the candidate's inspiration, goals, and progress in creative or scholarly work. Candidates who use scholarly/creative work to maintain currency in their field(s) can discuss this here. The candidate's statement should also discuss if/how their scholarly/creative activities have been focused on making their profession more inclusive and equitable.

6. **Other material the candidate wishes to provide.** The candidate has the option to provide additional material that they believe is relevant to their performance during the review period. For example, the candidate may wish to provide a statement describing how the COVID pandemic impacted their teaching.

When allowed per CU Boulder and CEAS guidelines, ASEN will use the expedited review process for reappointment. Note that expedited review is only available for faculty on an appointment of no longer than three years who already hold Senior or Principal Instructor (Assistant Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor) or Scholar in Residence rank and who have earned annual department performance merit scores of "5 - Outstanding" or "4- Exceeding Expectations" on their last two completed annual performance evaluations (since their last reappointment). The expedited review process requires submission only of the candidate's CV and the chair's or director's support letter. More information is available [online](#).

C. Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Process

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) and Voting Eligibility

The department office manager will assemble the candidate's dossier, which must contain at least the mandatory items described in the campus and [college](#) guidelines.

When used as a measure of teaching performance, letters solicited from students and mentees should be anonymized upon receipt by the unit and the letters, along with a copy of the solicitation template for each group, should be included as a supplementary document alongside the final dossier as described by the latest materials checklist on the CEAS website.

The chair shall constitute the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) based on unit bylaws.

The final dossier shall be made available to the faculty who are eligible to vote (see department [bylaws](#) on voting eligibility) on the case for a minimum period of time prior to any vote on the case as stated in the department bylaws.

The chair is not eligible to participate in the department vote. The faculty vote will be reported in the chair's letter.

Report of the Chair/Director/Primary Unit Evaluation and Recommendation

After the unit discussion and vote are complete, the chair will provide a summary of the faculty's discussion of the candidate's case, report the primary unit vote, and explicitly provide their own evaluation and recommendation, which may agree or disagree with the primary unit faculty vote. Regardless of the assessment, the chair shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The chair letter is meant to offer constructive feedback to a candidate, regardless of the type of assessment being made, and shall be shared with the candidate via email when the case is forwarded to the Dean's Office.

The final chair letter, along with all required material, will be submitted to CEAS HR for dean's review and processing by submitting a [ticket](#) to the CEAS HR Team.

4. Criteria

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Instructional series faculty will be reappointed and promoted based on their teaching performance. Per [CU Boulder Provost policy](#), reappointment and promotion of instructional series faculty requires that their teaching be rated as excellent, where a rating of excellent is discussed below. The expectation in Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences is that an instructional series faculty member with a full-time position (1.0 FTE) and 80% annual merit allocation to teaching should teach 5 teaching credits per academic year. This will be pro-rated for lesser appointments and effort allocations.

At time of reappointment review of Instructor (Assistant Teaching Professor) rank faculty

The criteria for **meritorious** performance in teaching are:

- Teaching a full load of courses, as appropriate for the faculty member's merit formula (allocation percentage), that supports the needs of the unit including, as appropriate, both upper and lower division undergraduate courses and/or graduate courses per unit expectations
- Participation in curricular discussions at the unit level
- In the context of the TQF (as defined by the unit), a proficiency level of at least PL2 in dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

The criteria for **excellent** performance in teaching are:

- Meeting the criteria for meritorious performance
- Teaching performance as demonstrated by proficiency levels in the TQF rubric of Excellent in the dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

At time of reappointment of Senior Instructor (Associate Teaching Professor) rank faculty

The criteria for **meritorious** performance in teaching are:

- Teaching a full load of courses, as appropriate for the faculty member's merit formula (allocation percentage), that supports the needs of the unit including, as appropriate, both upper and lower division undergraduate courses and/or graduate courses per unit expectations
- Contributed to curricular discussions at the unit level.
- In the context of the TQF (as defined by the unit), a proficiency level of at least PL2 in dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

The criteria for **excellent** performance in teaching are:

- Meeting the criteria for meritorious performance
- Teaching performance as demonstrated by proficiency levels in the TQF rubric of Excellent in the dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

At time of reappointment of Scholars in Residence with teaching duties

The criteria for **meritorious** performance in teaching are:

- Teaching a full load of courses, as appropriate for the faculty member's merit formula (allocation percentage), that supports the needs of the unit including, as appropriate, both upper and lower division undergraduate courses and/or graduate courses per unit expectations
In the context of the TQF (as defined by the unit), a proficiency level of at least PL2 in dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

The criteria for **excellent** performance in teaching are:

- Meeting the criteria for meritorious performance

- Teaching performance as demonstrated by proficiency levels in the TQF rubric of Excellent in the dimensions appropriate to the specific faculty appointment.

For Promotion to Senior Instructor (Associate Teaching Professor),

The criteria for **excellent** performance in teaching are:

- All criteria described above for excellent teaching performance at the Instructor (Assistant Teaching Professor) rank.
- Faculty must be at least six years in rank as Instructors (Assistant Teaching Professor) before advancing to Senior Instructors (Associate Teaching Professor), but promotion is not simply a function of time in rank.
- Evidence of impactful **leadership within the Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department's teaching mission**. For example, candidate has led modifications to curriculum, supports ABET accreditation, significant design or redesign of course/sequence of courses, etc.

For promotion to Principal Instructor (Teaching Professor), a faculty member must demonstrate a consistent record of excellent teaching and pedagogical development since being appointed as Senior Instructor (Associate Teaching Professor; per [APS 5060](#) Appendix A-2), must meet the unit criteria for excellence in teaching, and must demonstrate a "record of distinction." As defined by the college, a "record of distinction" refers to a record of accomplishments of an instructional series faculty member beyond the regular responsibilities of a Senior Instructor within the teaching and leadership and service categories. Promotion to Principal Instructor primarily focuses on efforts made since promotion to Senior Instructor but may also include activities throughout their academic career.

The record of distinction in teaching for the Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department requires satisfying:

- All criteria described above for excellent teaching performance for re-appointment as a Senior Instructor (Associate Teaching Professor).
- Consistently strong teaching metrics as demonstrated by FCQs.
- Consistently sustained a full teaching load suitable for a teaching faculty appointment which can include maintaining laboratories that support teaching and/or student projects. The teaching load should match the appointment percentage.
- Strongly positive peer evaluations of teaching in multiple contexts.
- Strongly positive letters of support from students, including from recent alumni, and/or feedback on Senior Exit Surveys.
- Contributions to course and curriculum development.

B. Evaluation of Leadership and Service

Most instructional track faculty in the Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department have contracts which specify that 20% of their effort is allocated to leadership and service. For other cases, the criteria below will scale accordingly.

Reappointment

For reappointment, an instructor's leadership and service must be deemed at least meritorious.

Meritorious service requires:

- contributions to the educational administration of the unit,
- participation in unit meetings,
- participating in program processes to improve courses and teaching (e.g., curriculum meetings, undergraduate retreats, etc.)
- possible participation beyond the unit (including service on college or university committees, professional service),

- fostering student engagement through mentoring of individual students within the unit, etc.

Promotion to Senior Instructor (Associate Teaching Professor)

For promotion to this rank, the individual’s leadership and service must be deemed at least meritorious. This includes the same expectations for meritorious contributions for reappointment, in addition to demonstrated evidence of impact of leadership within the unit/college.

Promotion to Principal Instructor (Teaching Professor)

For promotion to this rank, the individual’s leadership and service must support a “record of distinction”. Within Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department, Leadership and Service activities must have an impact on either the unit, school/college, campus and/or national communities. Further, a record of distinction should include at least 3 of the following criteria:

- Contributions made toward fostering student engagements as evidenced, for example, through mentoring of students, service on honors thesis committees, etc.
- Evidence of professional student society support and mentoring
- Contributions to local or national workshops on teaching
- Relevant publications such as textbooks, articles on pedagogy, etc.
- Body of work that improves teaching across multiple curriculum groups or multiple departments.
- Papers, posters, or presentations on pedagogical topics delivered at conferences.
- Outreach to communities and partners beyond the university, including nonprofits, or disadvantaged groups, that draws upon the candidate’s expertise.

C. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Work

Most instructional series faculty and scholars in residence do not include a scholarly/creative work expectation. For those faculty who do have expectations in this area,

Meritorious performance would include at least 2 of the following criteria:

- Publication/presentations at conferences or workshops
- Conducting technical or educational research
- Engaging students in research (UROP, DLA, etc.)

Excellent performance would include at least 2 of the following criteria:

- Publication of journal papers
- Participating on State or National panels directing research
- Serving on thesis or dissertation committees

Approvals

DocuSigned by:



5F5D65D0D2F640D...
Hanspeter Schaub, Chair

3/12/2024

Date

Smead Aerospace Engineering Sciences Department



84E9CCE726C24E6...
Keith R. Molenaar, Dean,

3/12/2024

Date

College of Engineering and Applied Science