

Departmental Policies for Reappointment and Promotion for non-tenure-track faculty

*Department of Classics
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Boulder*

The Department of Classics explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating non-tenure-track faculty (viz. instructors/teaching professors) for reappointment and promotion. All policies and procedures held by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Offices of the Provost and Chancellor, and the Regents shall apply.

1. *University and campus policies.* Regent Law Article 5 assigns to each campus the responsibility to determine policies for the reappointment and promotion. Campus guidelines (<https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-instructor-rank-faculty>) specify that instructor-rank faculty are typically reviewed in the last year of their (re-)appointment period in accordance with the percentage distribution of teaching, research and/or service specified in their letter of appointment or contract. Faculty on a multi-year contract are required to be evaluated by a primary unit evaluation committee (PUEC).
2. *Evaluation of Teaching.* Faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain all written records pertaining to teaching. The portfolio will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching. The Department may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

Materials to be used in the evaluation of achievement in teaching include:

1. examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations, and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
2. descriptions of the development or improvement of course work;
3. faculty course questionnaire (FCQ) scores from all classes;
4. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
5. range of subjects covered in courses; variety of course offerings; levels of courses; class size;
6. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
7. written statements concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following will also be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate and/or graduate students, supervision of independent studies or independent research projects involving undergraduate and/or graduate students, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seems appropriate for a particular individual.

Additionally, the Department will consider:

- i. awards for teaching excellence;
- ii. publications related to teaching, such as an article in a scholarly journal or in published conference proceedings;
- iii. contributions of pedagogical material used by the department or made available to extra-departmental audiences through presentation, collaboration, or materials distributed in print or online;

iv. performance of leadership role in an organization focused on pedagogy.

Faculty members can request that the Chair arrange a peer evaluation that will assist them in making improvements in teaching prior to evaluation. Other mechanisms for consultation on teaching include the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program and the Presidential Teaching Scholars consultation program. Faculty members are not required to use these mechanisms of self-improvement, but are encouraged to do so.

The rating assigned to the faculty member by the Department for the purposes of reappointment and/or promotion will be aligned with the categories and guidelines set out in the Department's Quality Teaching Initiative (QTI) document. A holistic and balanced analysis of the faculty member's teaching will determine the rating, but in general excellence in teaching will be reflected by ratings of above expectations (4) and significantly above expectations (5), meritorious performance by ratings of meets expectations (3), and performance deemed less than meritorious by ratings of below expectations (2) and fails to meet expectations (1). The rating process is not a simple arithmetic process of summation, however, but consists in an evaluation that takes into account multiple non-commensurate factors related to the faculty member's teaching assignments and their performance thereof.

3. *Evaluation of Service.* A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is the principal basis of the evaluation of their contribution in terms of service. This can include service on graduate and honors examination committees. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college or divisional committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial and reviewing for professional journals or professional societies, or professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it.

Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion or reappointment. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

Achievement in service may be considered as contributory to achievement in teaching and research where appropriate.

4. *Evaluation of Research.* The guidelines below are to be used for non-tenure-track faculty for whom research is a component of the terms of their employment, but even where it is not, achievement in research may be considered in the review for reappointment or promotion.

Publication is the most important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. All publications (books and articles) should be judged on the basis of originality, significance and utility to the relevant field. The Department will form its own judgment as to the quality, value, and contributions of the candidate's publications, but will also take into account such considerations as range, amount, variety, and venue of publication. Textbooks and published teaching materials will receive full consideration in the evaluation of the publication record. Other types of publications, including translations, anthologies, and items in popular media, may also be considered.

In addition, the Department will consider other evidence of achievement in research and scholarly activity that seems appropriate to a particular individual's case for promotion or reappointment. Such evidence may include public lectures, book reviews, edited volumes, conference organization

and participation, work as referee of publications or research proposals, grants, awards, and prizes, and proposals for future projects.

5. *Criteria for reappointment and promotion.* In accordance with campus guidelines, all non-tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and meritorious performance in the other performance areas designated by the terms of their contract (service and/or research), in order to be recommended for reappointment.

For promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor (or Instructor) to Teaching Associate Professor (or Senior Instructor), faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching, and at least meritorious performance in the other performance areas designated by the terms of their contract (service and/or research), typically over the course of six academic years.

For promotion to Teaching Professor (or Principal Instructor), faculty must demonstrate excellence across all categories of evaluation as defined by the terms of their contract. Thus, the successful candidate should demonstrate excellence in teaching as well as in service (and research, if applicable) for a minimum of three full academic years since their promotion to Teaching Associate Professor (or Senior Instructor).

Approved October 21, 2022