

BYLAWS AND ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE FOR COLLEGE OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION

Preamble

A. Establishment

The College of Media, Communication and Information (hereafter “the College” or “CMCI”) is a teaching and research unit of the University of Colorado at Boulder duly constituted in accordance with the Laws of the Regents of the University of Colorado.

B. Mission

The College of Media, Communication and Information (CMCI) prepares students for careers as engaged and effective citizens endowed with deep understanding of the historical and contemporary context of human communication and expression. Challenging the conventional picture of communication as passive transmission, CMCI trains graduates to study and practice constructive interaction among people, communities, industries and publics. The college equips its graduates with the skills needed to produce, gather, archive, curate, analyze and evaluate the flood of information, messages, images, sounds and ideas that populate our complex and rapidly evolving global media landscape.

To these ends, CMCI resourcefully combines disciplines newly extended and empowered by digital media and the social and cultural transformations those media engender. These include established scholarly, creative and professional fields such as media studies, communication, the history and interpretation of film and television, journalism, advertising and video production in its cinematic, documentary and broadcast forms. The college also houses both the fast-growing field of information studies, a discipline that through inquiry and innovation tackles the problems and opportunities facing a networked society, and the emergent disciplines of intermedia art, design, music, writing and performance.

In giving these activities a collaborative home, CMCI facilitates innovative interactions among them. Its academic structure stimulates cross-disciplinary cooperation at all levels of curriculum, research and creative work. Further, CMCI promotes the transformational exchanges it nurtures within its own walls for campus-wide benefit. Its organization fosters outreach and student and faculty participation from other schools, colleges, centers and facilities throughout CU Boulder and the wider Colorado community.

C. Values

The college is founded on the following values and commitments:

- encouraging students and faculty members to pursue their intellectual interests and creative passions with a minimum of restraint from traditional disciplinary and institutional structures and policies;
- a commitment to foster diversity in all its forms;
- shared communication, governance and accountability between and among the faculty and administrators of the college, in recognition that the best ideas emerge from consultation and discussion;
- adherence to the standards of collegiality, respect and professionalism outlined in the Academic Affairs policy, Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members;
- given the special nature of the college's intellectual and creative pursuits, a commitment to facilitate and appropriately reward innovative interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching, research, creative work and service;
- the importance of contributing expertise and experience to the wider university community as well as the local, regional, national and international public;
- attracting and retaining faculty members who bring excellence and diversity to the university.

Article I. Administrative Structure of the College

A. Dean of the College

The dean is the principal administrative officer for the college and the presiding officer for faculty meetings of the college. The dean is a tenured member of the CMCI faculty and serves, in his or her administrative role, at the pleasure of the provost. He or she is responsible for all matters at the college level, including, but not limited to, enforcement of admission requirements; the efficiency of departments and other academic and administrative units within the college or school; budgetary planning and allocation of funds; faculty assignments and workloads; recommendations on personnel actions; curriculum planning; academic advising, accountability and reporting.

Giving effect to the college's commitment to the principles of shared governance, the dean collaborates with the faculty of the college in all matters that concern only the college.

Pursuant to the Laws of the Regents, the performance of the dean shall be evaluated by the university every five years. In addition to any evaluation procedures employed by the university, the college, through its Executive Committee (described below), shall on the same schedule survey the faculty of the college on the dean's performance and submit the results to the provost.

B. Other Administrative Positions

The dean may appoint one or more associate or assistant deans to assist in carrying out his or her administrative responsibilities. Appointments shall be made in consultation with the Council of Chairs and Directors and the CMCI Faculty Council (see Article I.D and Article III, below).

C. Departments and Other Academic Units

The faculty of the college shall be organized in disciplinary departments and other academic units as appropriate. Each department and other academic unit shall establish and maintain bylaws specifying the organization, policies and procedures of the unit. Bylaws must be approved by the dean.

Each unit shall have a principal administrative officer (chair or director, as appropriate) to oversee the operation of the unit. Each chair or director shall be elected by the faculty members in his or her unit, subject to the approval of the dean. Chairs and directors serve a term specified by the unit's bylaws. Chairs and directors are subject to review in accordance with the Laws of the Regents.

D. Council of Chairs and Directors

The chairs and directors of their respective units serve on the Council of Chairs and Directors. The council acts jointly with the dean on all aspects of planning and resource allocation for the college, including its constituent programs, departments and other organizations.

Article II. The Faculty of the College

The primary governing unit of the college is the Faculty of Media, Communication and Information (FMCI). The FMCI will normally exercise its authority through its representative body, the CMCI Faculty Council.

A. Membership

Voting members of the FMCI are the voting members of the primary units in the College. The primary unit is the department, program or other academic unit with a minimum of two full-time-equivalent rostered faculty members. Included in the voting membership are the Dean, Associate Deans, and any other individuals with administrative contracts who also hold qualified teaching ranks in the college.

B. Conduct of Meetings

The FMCI shall meet at least once per regular semester in each academic year.

The meeting of the FMCI can be held only while classes are in session. It can be called by the CMCI Faculty Council Chair with ten (10) calendar days' notice.

The CMCI Faculty Council Chair shall call a special meeting of the FMCI, to be held within ten (10) business days, upon receipt of a petition signed by ten percent (10%) of the voting members. The petition shall state the specific item(s) to be considered at the meeting. The CMCI Faculty Council Chair shall also call a meeting of the FMCI at the request of the Dean.

The CMCI Faculty Council Chair shall preside over meetings of the FMCI, assisted by the administrative assistant, who will prepare the minutes and send them to the Faculty Council Chair, who will distribute them to Faculty Council Members.

For action to be taken at a meeting of the FMCI, a quorum must be established. A quorum consists of twenty percent (20%) of the voting members of the College, with representation from more than fifty percent (50%) of the primary units in the College.

An affirmative vote of a simple majority of members present and voting shall be sufficient for adoption of all measures, except as noted in these bylaws or required by university policy or Laws of the Regents.

At the request of one-third or more of the members present and voting at a physical meeting of the FMCI, a mail ballot or e-mail ballot will be submitted to all voting members of the FMCI. For a mail or e-mail ballot to be deemed valid, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the voting members must submit their ballots. To be adopted, a measure must receive a majority of affirmative votes cast.

Article III. CMCI Faculty Council

A. Membership

The CMCI Faculty Council is comprised of at least one member elected from each primary unit. Academic units with 10 or more tenured or tenure-track faculty members have the option to elect two members to the Faculty Council. Members who are elected by their units serve staggered 3-year terms. The Dean of the College is an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Faculty Council.

B. Responsibilities of Members

Members of the CMCI Faculty Council are expected to

- Attend meetings of the Faculty Council
- Participate in the work of the Faculty Council's standing committees
- Represent to the Faculty Council views of their units and report back to their units activities of the Faculty Council

C. Purpose

The CMCI Faculty Council represents the views and interests of the faculty of the College. The Faculty Council meets monthly during the academic year to discuss matters of policy affecting the College, make proposals for consideration by the faculty of the College and/or the Dean, and advise the Dean on other matters to carry out the mission of the College. The Faculty Council reports on its activities to the faculty of the College on a regular basis and at least once each semester.

D. Operation

The CMCI Faculty Council participates in the governance of the College through its actions and actions of its standing committees. The Dean will submit administrative and policy matters for review, amendment, and approval or disapproval by the Council. The Dean shall regularly report and explain his or her policies and decisions, both general and specific, to the CMCI Faculty Council or its appropriate committees, ensuring that significant decisions affecting the College will have been reached in a collaborative manner.

E. Election and Vacancies

Each primary unit elects one member of the voting faculty to serve on the CMCI Faculty Council. Any academic unit with 10 or more tenured or tenure-track faculty members may elect a second representative to the Faculty Council.

Elections are carried out according to procedures established by the unit. Members serve 3-year staggered terms. If a member goes on leave during his or her term, the unit may elect a temporary replacement, allowing the member to resume membership upon his or her return. Alternatively, the unit may elect another voting member who will begin a new 3-year term.

Representatives may serve no more than two consecutive terms on the Council. After a 2-year hiatus from service, former representatives may stand for election again. Any representative may be removed from the Council by majority vote of the Council for reason of nonattendance or other good cause.

Each academic unit is responsible for replacing its representative if, for any reason, the position falls vacant.

F. Officers

1. Chair

The Chair acts as the presiding officer of the CMCI Faculty Council and its Executive Committee, and is an ex officio member of the Council's standing committees. The Chair is an ex officio member of CMCI's Chairs and Directors meetings. The Chair serves as a nonvoting member of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) and of the BFA Executive Committee.

a) Election

Each year, a Council member will be elected by the Council to preside over the election of the following year's Chair. The presiding officer may not be a candidate. At the next-to-the-last meeting of the Council in the spring semester, the presiding officer solicits nominations for the election of the Chair and conducts the election. Prior to the vote, candidates will present themselves and describe their qualifications. The vote will be held by secret ballot. The successful candidate will receive a majority of the votes cast. In the event that no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, a run-off election will be held between the candidate receiving the most votes and the candidate or candidates receiving the second-most votes.

b) Term

The Chair serves a 1-year term, commencing at the end of the current academic year. The Chair may not serve more than two consecutive terms. In the absence of the Chair, the Council will designate one of its members to act as presiding officer.

c) Responsibilities

The Chair is responsible, among other things, for setting the agenda for FC meetings, appointing members to FC committees, and maintaining ongoing communication with the Dean and with chairs of FC committees.

d) Assistance

The Chair will be assisted by a full-time program assistant (Administrative Assistant III or above). The position shall be provided by the Dean and supervised by the Chair of the CMCI Faculty Council. The program assistant will take notes during meetings of the Council and assist in other matters relevant to the Council and to the business of the committees of the Council. The administrative assistant will prepare the minutes of the CMCI Faculty Council meetings and send them to the

Faculty Council Chair, who will distribute no later than one week before the next meeting.

2. Parliamentarian

The Council will appoint one of its members or someone else to serve as a parliamentarian for CMCI Faculty Council meetings and for meetings of the CMCI faculty.

Article IV. Committees of the CMCI Council

A. Purpose and Process

The committees of the CMCI Faculty Council are working committees participating in the governance of the College. Each committee establishes and publishes its rules of procedure, subject to the approval of the Faculty Council and the Dean. Proposals from the faculty and administration of the College shall be submitted to the appropriate standing committee in a timely manner to allow for review and discussion before they take effect. The administration of the College will provide adequate staff support to ensure the timely disposition of matters submitted to the committees for review.

Standing committees may invite members of the administration to serve as nonvoting members to consult on specific issues. The standing committees may nominate College faculty members who are not on the CMCI Faculty Council to serve as voting members of their committees. Nominations will be reviewed and, if appropriate, approved by Faculty Council. Faculty Council will also determine the terms of service of faculty members who join a standing committee.

B. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee consists of the Faculty Council Chair and elected Chairs of the four standing committees (Academic Community and Diversity, Grievance, Personnel, and Undergraduate Curriculum). The chair of the CMCI Faculty Council chairs the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is authorized to meet and make decisions during times of immediate crisis during the academic year and when Faculty Council is not in session (i.e., the summer).

C. Appointed Standing Committees

Each standing committee shall have at least one member drawn from the CMCI Faculty Council and at least three additional members drawn from CMCI faculty members who represent different CMCI academic units. The Chairs of the Academic Community and Diversity Committee and of the Grievance Committee must be members of the CMCI Faculty Council and are

elected annually by voting members of their respective committees. The Chair of the Personnel Committee need not be a member of the CMCI Faculty Council, so long as the Committee includes at least one member of the Faculty Council as a member. On that condition, the Chair may be either a full professor, or associate professor with at least three years in rank, selected from the faculty of CMCI.

i. Academic Community and Diversity Committee

The Academic Community and Diversity Committee considers issues of academic community and retention, and promotes diversity at all levels of the College.

ii. Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the Dean of the College on grievances and appeals of individual faculty members, students, groups or primary units, provided that at least one of the parties in the dispute is a member of the College faculty. The Grievance Committee establishes procedures for addressing appeals (i.e., requests to overturn a decision made by a unit-level administrator or committee) and grievances (i.e., allegations that a decision made by a unit-level administrator or committee violated a policy or established practice or was arbitrary or capricious).

iii. Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee advises the Dean of the College on matters of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of the faculty of the College.

iv. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee oversees the College's undergraduate curriculum. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has the authority to review and approve proposals for new undergraduate courses and to propose changes to the College's undergraduate core curriculum. The CMCI

Faculty Council has the authority to review and approve proposed changes to the College's undergraduate core curriculum.

Article V. Student Organization

The college shall establish a student organization to give voice to students enrolled in the college's programs. The organization shall be self-governing in accordance with bylaws established by the organization's members. Bylaws must be approved by the dean of the college. Members of the organization shall elect two students, at least one of whom must be a graduate student, to serve as nonvoting representatives to the CMCI Faculty Council.

Article VI. Parliamentary Procedures

Deliberations of the CMCI faculty and the CMCI Faculty Council shall be governed by the document Rules for Decision Making in the College of Media, Communication and Information.

Article VII. Amendments to the Bylaws

Any member of the Faculty of the College may propose an amendment to these bylaws by submitting the proposal in writing to the Chair of the CMCI Faculty Council. The Chair of the Faculty Council shall notify the faculty of the College of the proposed amendment no later than one week before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty of the College. Amendments requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of the faculty of the College, a quorum having been established.

Revised April 24, 2018

CMCI Personnel Policies and Procedures

Approved November 16, 2016

What follows is a description of the policies and procedures in the College of Media, Communication and Information (CMCI) for personnel cases. Such cases include comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor and/or granting of continuous tenure and promotion to full professor, as well as the appointment, evaluation and promotion of lecturer and instructor rank faculty.

In all aspects, these policies and procedures conform to, and are an expression of, the policies of the University of Colorado and the Board of Regents. Faculty are urged to familiarize themselves with these specific policies. For an overview, as well as the specifics, please see the following:

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Rank Faculty from the University of Colorado Boulder Office of Faculty Affairs:

<https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-of-tenure-rank-faculty>

Policy 5M: Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion, from the University of Colorado Board of Regents:

<https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-5m-reappointment-tenure-track-position-tenure-and-promotion>

Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty

https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/lecturer_instructor_appointment_evaluation_promotion_guidelines_2017_revisions_remediated_091917.pdf



CMCI encompasses a diverse ecosystem of disciplines with faculty carrying out a broad range of research and creative work. Given this diversity, CMCI's personnel policies and procedures do not attempt to prescribe highly specific sets of expectations for faculty. As specified by Policy 5M of the University of Colorado Board of Regents, that is the job of

each primary academic unit within CMCI. Each one, by necessity, implements its own policies and procedures:

“Primary units develop criteria that explicate the teaching, research and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for articles, books, and/or research grants, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field. These primary unit criteria, once reviewed for rigor, fairness and consistency with regent requirements and approved by the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs, are included in the candidate’s dossier and shall guide evaluation at every level of review.”

But the following college-wide document does serve as an overarching guide. It expresses the values of the college as a whole, focusing on research, creative work, teaching and service. It establishes broad expectations of meritorious and excellent performance for faculty in the conduct of their work at the university. And it lays down the parameters within which each unit may create and evolve its own particular policies and procedures, reflective of the specific nature of each discipline.

As individual units within CMCI develop and evolve their own personnel policies and procedures, they should be guided by the values expressed in the college’s mission statement and six strategic themes:

CMCI MISSION:

Our college cultivates reflective agents of change, creates new knowledge and fosters forward thinking practices for emergent media, communication and information landscapes.

Our graduates go forth as proactive leaders with the confidence, knowledge and skill to address the humanitarian, social and technological challenges of the 21st century.

Strategic Themes:

- **Inclusive Excellence:** *To develop the College of Media, Communication and Information as a community that is not content to welcome people into its existing values and practices but, rather, seeks to cultivate a genuinely inclusive environment that fully integrates our diversity – race/ethnicity, nation, socioeconomic status, gender, sexuality, ability, age, veteran status, geography and religion, as well as individual perspectives and learning styles.*
- **Academic Excellence:** *To advance the College of Media, Communication and Information as a distinctive and unique academic unit, recognized for innovative*

teaching, cutting edge scholarship, innovative partnerships and the achievements of its faculty and students.

- **Creativity and Innovation:** *To advance the College of Media, Communication and Information as an incubator for creating new ideas with a culture that brings them to fruition as innovation – as processes, models, partnerships and products – without fear of risk or failure.*
- **Resource Responsibility and Sustainability:** *The College of Media, Communication and Information is committed to the stewardship of our many resources, the practices of transparency, efficiency and sustainability.*
- **Public Service and Global Citizenship:** *To distinguish the College of Media, Communication and Information as a community of deeply committed leaders whose engagement with the world is an essential component of a holistic education.*
- **A Culture of Integrity, Generosity and Respect:** *To encourage a college culture of integrity, generosity and mutual respect, where diverse views are welcome and trust ensures that all voices are heard and respected. We will build a community that supports and recognizes the range of creative, scholarly, administrative and service work of our members and embraces difference.*

A central tenet of CMCI's personnel policies and procedures is this: The diversity of our disciplinary ecosystem is a strength that can help us achieve our mission and actualize these strategic themes. Just as in a biological ecosystem, it is the web of *connections* that defines who we are and provides resilience. With this in mind, CMCI as a whole values both disciplinary scholarship *and* interdisciplinary creative work and collaborative research that forge new connections between different fields.

CMCI faculty members adhere to a common set of principles in evaluating excellence and meritorious accomplishment in their scholarly lives. Tenured and tenure-track CMCI faculty have a responsibility to engage in research and creative work within their disciplines, and — where considered appropriate and productive — work collaboratively with scholars and artists in other disciplines.

The college values intellectual diversity and tries to support it organizationally. When a faculty member has a joint appointment, CMCI is committed to recognizing and supporting the special circumstances of that appointment. Such support will be attentive to the needs of faculty at their different ranks.

In order to achieve a standard of excellence, faculty members are expected to have research and/or creative work profiles at the national and international level. They are also expected to have developed programs of sustained intellectual and creative activity.

The responsibility to teach is equally important to the role and mission of CMCI and its various departments and programs. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, teaching should be informed by their scholarly and/or creative work. Their intellectual talents should be reflected in all levels and forms of instruction, both graduate and undergraduate.

Finally, CMCI faculty members also serve their primary units, the college, the campus, the larger communities in which the University of Colorado is located and the professional fields their work circulates in. This service comes in the form of activities that enable these communities to benefit from the research and creative activity of the faculty and the students of CMCI.

By necessity, we typically evaluate these activities — research/creative work, teaching and service — separately. But they are, in fact, intimately related. The new knowledge created by a faculty member through research and/or creative work should infuse that person's teaching, as well as service and outreach to broader constituencies. And when the time for promotion to full professor arrives, a faculty member is evaluated on the totality of this work, taken as a whole.

Reappointment/Comprehensive Review

Under Regent Law, reappointment review, also known as comprehensive review, entails an evaluation to determine if the candidate is successfully proceeding toward achieving the requirements of tenure and promotion. It typically takes place at the end of the fourth year. Each primary unit determines the specifics of what constitutes successful progress toward tenure and spells that out in its own policies and procedures.

Tenure and Promotion

After reappointment, a tenure-track faculty member undergoes a mandatory tenure and promotion review, typically in the seventh year.

The most common route to tenure has been excellent scholarly work, and meritorious teaching and service. In CMCI this is also true. At the same time, we value excellence in teaching and seek to keep teaching excellence with meritorious research and service as a real option for a profile at tenure time.

Awarding of tenure within the College of Media, Communication and Information recognizes that a faculty member has attained, and promises to continue to attain, high levels of performance in the intimately connected activities of scholarship and/or creative work, teaching and service.

Research/Creative Work Standards:

The basic standards used by the CMCI disciplines to judge scholarly and creative work do not vary considerably. Even so, the actual materials upon which those judgments of scholarly and creative work are based may differ considerably from unit to unit.

For instance, the quality of work in some fields is typically demonstrated in publications or peer-reviewed conference proceedings. In other fields, a blend of research and creative work may be highly valued.

Some faculty may, in fact, be “hybrids,” producing research in the form of papers, books and the like, as well as professional creative work, such as documentary films or artistic works. Some faculty may produce creative work alone, such as contemporary art installations, journalistic books, digital narratives, multimedia performances, curated exhibitions and/or prominent blogs published in nationally and internationally recognized venues. Still other faculty may be national or international leaders in advancing their fields through the creation of cutting-edge media labs or research labs or experimental learning environments that facilitate cross-disciplinary research and development.

Within some disciplines, publication of scholarly books may be regarded as central to a record of excellence. Others may place equal or even greater emphasis on publication in refereed journals or peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Similarly, some disciplines may quantify productivity in relation to the number and size of grants received for team projects that result in jointly-authored papers that can also be considered evidence of excellence in research. In other disciplines, it may be customary for faculty members to work on their own. In this case, greater value may thus be placed on single-authored books and papers. With this in mind, the frequency of publication may be less in the latter disciplines, although the impact may be as great as in other disciplines where numerous papers are to be expected in any given year.

Books and articles written by faculty of the College of Media, Communication and Information are generally considered to be completed when they are published in peer-reviewed print or online journals, in peer-reviewed conference proceedings or are in galley stage. That is, a publication can be considered finished when all corrections and modifications are complete and have been accepted for publication. Works that are still in the review and revision stage are considered to be works in progress.

Despite the variance in measures of evaluation of these research and/or creative activities, and the college's embrace of a wide range of research and creative work, excellence is generally demonstrated through evaluations made by the faculty member's national communities of peers and upon whom they depend for their reputations.

Meritorious standard for research/creative work: In order to be judged meritorious in research and/or creative work, faculty must have established a strong record of accomplishment as judged against the criteria of the primary unit and CMCI.

A meritorious record typically includes most or all of the following, which may be selected, weighted and added according to the standards of the primary unit:

- Regular research activity and/or artistic production
- Sustained development in a line or lines of research going beyond the dissertation
- Intellectual and/or creative originality
- High quality as indicated by publication in scholarly presses, leading trade presses, on-line publication and creative work, and in recognized refereed journals or conferences or similarly prestigious exhibitions, performance venues and curatorial work at the national or international level
- Impact on relevant fields of scholarship and/or artistic production

Additional indicators could include external funding, invitations to publish, perform, exhibit or present ones scholarly or creative work, commissions of new art work, and awards or any other indicators established by the primary unit.

Excellence standard for research/creative work: Demonstrated excellence in research and/or creative work must go above and beyond the primary unit's criteria for meritorious accomplishment. It requires accomplishment equivalent to that of the top group of tenured faculty in the discipline at a similar stage of career, here and in comparable departments or programs at other institutions. External review letters play an important role in this judgment.

Teaching Standards:

Within CMCI, teaching also comes in diverse forms. For example, faculty members teach in large lecture classes, small seminars, lab-like settings and studios. They work with students in independent study arrangements and supervise and collaborate with students on research and creative work, at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

Therefore, teaching within CMCI must be evaluated based on a wide variety of criteria that reflect the diversity of instruction.

Meritorious standard for teaching: The factors considered in determining whether a faculty member has demonstrated meritorious achievement typically include most of the following, which may be selected, weighted and added to according to the standards of the primary unit:

- The record of the candidate in both undergraduate and graduate classroom instruction
- The quality and quantity of individualized instruction and mentoring the candidate has performed
- Contributions to the curriculum of their primary unit and to CMCI overall
- Thoughtful preparation of course materials and syllabi
- Involvement of students in research and/or creative work activities
- Student evaluations contained in Faculty Course Questionnaires
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Work with the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program
- Participation in professional pedagogical activities or organizations.

Excellence standard for teaching: Excellence in teaching is based on many of the same factors. But a teaching record may be deemed excellent only if it goes both qualitatively and quantitatively beyond excellent classroom teaching, and beyond other standard activities that support classroom teaching. In other words, documenting excellence in teaching requires evidence of significant achievements above and beyond excellent classroom performance.

Relevant indicators of such achievements would usually include a subset of the following:

- Important visiting professorships or artist-in-residence appointments emphasizing teaching activities
- The publication of noteworthy pedagogical papers or books on the theory and/or practice of pedagogy
- Substantial contributions to curriculum development (such as creating new certification or interdisciplinary programs, or developing an unusual number of innovative new courses)
- Receipt of college-wide or campus-wide teaching awards
- Evidence of exceptionally strong performance in individualized instruction of graduate and/or undergraduate students; effective integration of service-learning and community-based activities into coursework; effective teaching in residential academic programs or honors program; significant participation in professional pedagogical organizations; contribution to core/required courses in departments

and/or CMCI with skillful delivery across a range of teaching contexts; or mentoring of graduate instructors

Lastly, primary units may develop other criteria deemed suitable for demonstrating excellence in teaching. Moreover, primary units are free in their own personnel policies and procedures to stipulate which criteria are absolutely required to demonstrate excellence in teaching.

Service Standards:

Service to the primary unit is expected of all faculty members within the College of Media, Communication and Information. Within CMCI, junior faculty members should contribute to service over the probationary period for tenure. At the same time, the overall commitment to service should be less than for more senior faculty.

Meritorious standard for service: Within CMCI, meritorious service may involve some or all of the following:

- Significant service on departmental or university committees recognized by faculty peers as active and significant
- Significant administrative work at an academic center
- Successful external service, such as serving on juries or selection committees, the editorial board of an academic journal, on an advisory board of a professional organization, or as an external evaluator in tenure or promotion cases
- Significant public service or outreach

In all cases, there should be evidence of both quality and quantity.

Excellence standard for service: Excellence in service typically means positive, transformative leadership (not just participation) going above and beyond the criteria for "meritorious" and encompassing, in more or less equal measures, the university, the community and the profession. One or more awards for service, especially if the service is external, could constitute strong evidence but is not required.

Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to the rank of full professor, the Regents require “a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be ‘excellent.’” The standards described above for excellence in scholarly work, teaching, and service can provide guidance for what constitutes an overall record of excellence. But as those words — “a record that, taken as a whole” —

suggest, the case for promotion to full professor is more integrative than that for tenure. Evaluations by external reviewers are particularly important here.

In addition, significant service of high quality performed for the university, the profession, and the community, is an expected component of the typical case for promotion to full professor in CMCI. Such service demonstrates that a faculty member has become a leader — within the primary unit, university, and academically relevant discipline.

Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty

With regard to all matters involving instructors, lecturers and professors of practice, CMCI will follow without modification the policies and procedures of the Office of Faculty Affairs (adopted by the FMCI at the April 24, 2018 all faculty meeting).

CMCI Review Process

Cases coming to the CMCI Personnel Committee from primary units with positive recommendations are assigned to a primary reader who is responsible for making a careful, thorough review of the candidate's dossier. The primary reader then reports a summary of this review to a meeting of all members of the committee. In addition, all members of the Personnel Committee receive copies of the letter from the departmental chair, the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee report as well as the candidate's vita. The complete dossier is also available to any Personnel Committee member who wishes to read it.

After the report to the Personnel Committee meeting, a discussion and a vote will follow. If this vote is a negative, simple majority vote, it is considered to be a motion for all members to read the complete dossier, and the case is rescheduled. Subsequent discussion and committee vote on a recommendation to the Dean are postponed to a future meeting.

If the vote is positive, again including a simple majority, then the primary reader prepares a report to be submitted by the Personnel Committee to the Dean.

All of the cases that come before the Personnel Committee with a negative vote from the primary unit shall be automatically read by the all members of the Personnel Committee.

When the Personnel Committee's vote disagrees with a primary unit's recommendation, whether it is positive or negative, the Personnel Committee will detail their reasoning in a letter sent to both the Dean and the primary unit. In addition to sending the letter from the Personnel Committee, the file is returned to the department for reconsideration. The department will then reconvene the primary unit committee, to respond to the Personnel Committee, take a new vote, and write a letter of response to the Personnel Committee. Upon its return to the Dean's office, the CMCI Personnel Committee meets again to consider the file and a final recommendation is made to the Dean. The Dean is responsible for making a separate recommendation, informed by the letter from the Personnel Committee.

The Personnel Committee and Dean recommendations are then added to the dossier, which is sent to the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC). Copies of the letters of recommendation by the Personnel Committee and the Dean are provided to the candidate and to the candidate's chair or director.

No member of the Personnel Committee may participate in his/her own reappointment, promotion, or tenure case; in a case from his/her own primary unit; or in a case regarding a family member, spouse, partner or former student. Members of the Personnel Committee must disclose any potential conflicts of interest that might compromise objective evaluation of the case (research collaboration, close friendship, business relationship, etc.) to the chair of the Personnel Committee prior to review of the file and discussion by the Personnel Committee.

Revised April 24, 2018



MEMORANDUM

To: Lori Bergen, Founding Dean, CMCI
Bill Aspray, Chair, CMCI Faculty Council
From: Kristi Gitkind, Sr. Executive Aide to the Dean
Date: September 29, 2017
Re: CMCI Instructor Rank Faculty Reappointment & Promotion

The Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) provides clear guidelines for appointment, reappointment and promotion for Instructor and Lecturer Rank faculty (**Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty, 2011, Update June 2017 (Addendum 1)**)

http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/lecturer_instructor_appointment_evaluation_promotion_guidelines_2017_revisions_remediated_091917.pdf

OFA also provides guidance for the appointment and reappointment of Professors of Practice (**Unusual Faculty Titles and Definitions (Addendum 2)**).

There are instances in which OFA leaves process decisions to the unit or college. The following recommendations are made to further consistent practices throughout the college.

Lecturer and Instructor Adjunct Appointments and Evaluation

OFA guideline: The establishment of a hiring committee for lecturers and instructor adjuncts is recommended but not required. Units should work with the Dean's Office to set honorarium salaries at market rates.

Dean's Office recommendation: Units will develop and follow a consistent process for the hiring of lecturers and instructor adjuncts. Units will offer consistent, market-based salary levels to all lecturers and instructor adjuncts.

OFA guideline: A written statement of evaluation policy should be provided from the beginning of employment.

Dean's Office recommendation: Units will include a written statement of evaluation policy on the offer letter of all lecturers and instructor adjuncts.

OFA guideline: Lecturers with three years consistent appointments at 50% or greater within a unit should be considered for a rostered Instructor position.

Dean's Office recommendation: Units will evaluate 50% or greater third-year lecturers for potential appointment as instructors.

Instructor Appointment, Reappointment

OFA guideline: The unit should establish the criteria for successful reappointment of instructors which should include an evaluation of teaching and other duties.

Dean's Office recommendation: Units will establish the criteria for the successful reappointment of instructors and include in their unit personnel document.

Promotion to Senior Instructor

OFA guideline: Units will establish the criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor.

Dean's Office recommendation: Units will establish the criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor and include in their unit personnel document. Review process will be a unit-level review forwarded directly to the dean for approval. This may or may not be the PUEC.

Senior Instructor Reappointment

OFA Guideline: The chair and/or dean will review the Senior Instructor's file as part of a formal but expedited review in the final year of initial appointment.

Dean's Office recommendation: The chair will review the Senior Instructor's file and inform the dean of endorsement.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

OFA prescribes a clear review process for promotion to teaching professor, including review by the personnel committee prior to forwarding to the dean. The Dean's Office has no additional recommendations.

Professor of Practice Appointment and Reappointment

OFA Guideline: Appointments and reappointments of Professors of Practice should be reviewed by the appropriate dean and by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Dean's Office recommendation: The candidate's CV and department chair's letter will be forwarded to the dean prior to extending the initial offer to the candidate. If approved, the dean's memo of support and letter of offer draft will be sent to OFA for signature routing approval.

Addendum I

Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty

Approved in Dean's Council, 29 March 2011

Approved by Provost Moore, 29 March 2011

Revised, 1 June 2017

General Remarks

The purpose of this document is to provide to members of the Boulder campus community a set of guidelines for the appointment, evaluation, and reappointment of non-tenure-track teaching faculty in the lecturer, instructor, senior instructor, and teaching professor faculty ranks. This document has a history running from a document adopted by the Boulder Faculty Assembly on April 2, 1998 titled "Instructors' Bill of Rights," to an Academic Affairs policy adopted by Deans Council on March 9, 1999, on to a BFA/Academic Affairs Task Force on Instructors Report issued during the 2007-2008 Academic Year, and then to a new BFA task force during the 2009-10 academic year. A major revision was approved on 29 March 2011.

Lecturers and instructors play an integral part in the ability of the Boulder campus to provide the breadth and quality of educational experience expected of an AAU public university. Lecturers and instructors supplement and complement the teaching activities of the tenure-track faculty, and in so doing they allow the tenure-track faculty to engage more students in individualized instructional opportunities in their studios, libraries, and laboratories. They also provide the institution the ability to adjust more rapidly its educational opportunities to meet student needs and preferences than can always be accommodated for by the tenure-track faculty alone. It is important that the campus community recognize the important role played by instructors in enabling the campus to address both its research and its teaching missions.

Instructors and lecturers play different roles on campus. Lecturers help meet changing student demands, as enrollments change, as faculty vacancies occur, and as educational needs shift. By definition, lecturers, whether part-time or full-time, are not continuing employees. They make an important contribution to teaching on campus, but their role is restricted to teaching, and their position is contingent upon changing needs.

Rostered full-time instructors are considered by the University of Colorado to be part of the regular faculty, which is also comprised of the tenure-track faculty. Instructors contribute over a number of years, and sometimes over an entire career, to the teaching and service missions of the university; they may pursue their own research or creative work alongside their university duties, work that may enrich their contributions. Rostered instructors should be considered as continuing members of their departmental, college, or school community; they should participate in the governance of the department, in particular in relation to curricular matters (although they may not be involved in personnel decisions concerning tenure-track faculty). As rostered faculty, they are reviewed as part of the annual merit process. (Please note that some other titles, such as scholar-in residence, are treated under the same policies and procedures as instructors.)

The nature of the instructional mission of the Boulder campus is such that each college and school has a different need and pattern of employment of lecturers and instructors. Accordingly, the different colleges and schools use these titles differently and attach different expectations and compensation to these titles. The guidelines below are meant to influence the application of these titles, not to inhibit their usefulness. Hiring units or individuals with questions concerning the rights and privileges of these titles should consult their dean's office or the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Schools and colleges should analyze where they need continuing, perhaps career-long contributions to their missions by non-tenure-track faculty. In those cases, and in those cases alone, positions should be created for rostered instructors on multi-year (usually three year), renewable contracts. The campus should do what it can to integrate these instructors into the university community and to provide them with working conditions conducive to the performance of their duties. In other cases, where part-time or temporary employees are needed to teach classes, units should hire lecturers.

Full-time Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Teaching Professor positions are offered under the CU System Instructor Employment Agreement (available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website). The CU System Instructor Employment Agreement offers non-at will contracts for up to three years to full-time instructors with at least 50% teaching in their annual merit formula.

With the exception of Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Teaching Professor positions that qualify for placement on a CU System Instructor Employment Agreement, all Lecturer, Instructor and Senior Instructor positions are considered to be at-will appointments by the University and by the State of Colorado. All appointment letters of at-will employees must carry a description of at-will status. Nothing described in this document is meant to nor may it be interpreted to conflict with the at-will status of these job titles. An excerpt of that at-will statement appears below. The full text of the appropriate offer letter template is available from the Office of Faculty Affairs.

"State law specifically requires that you be an employee-at-will in your non-tenure track position and that the following paragraph be included in this letter of offer:

Your employment contract is subject to termination by either party to such contract at any time during its term, and you shall be deemed to be an employee-at-will. No compensation, whether as a buy-out of the remaining term of the contract, as liquidated damages, or as any other form of remuneration, shall be owed or paid to you upon or after termination of such contract except for compensation that was earned prior to the date of termination."

Definition of Full-Time: Lecturers and instructor-rank faculty have responsibilities, privileges, and benefits defined in part by whether their appointments are to positions that are considered less than 50% full-time or 50-100% full-time. The percent time of the appointment (% full-time) is based on the college- or school-specific definition of 100% full-time effort, which typically includes three to four 3-credit courses per semester or equivalent. In larger colleges, full-time expectations may be defined on a discipline-specific basis.

I. LECTURER, INSTRUCTOR ADJUNCT

1. **DEFINITION:** Lecturers and instructor adjuncts are hired on a semester-to-semester basis and do not have regular faculty appointments. An advanced degree in an appropriate discipline is normally required for appointment to these ranks. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time. The role of lecturers and instructor adjuncts is extremely important to the University's ability to offer special programs and classes according to the fluctuations of demand and funding from semester to semester.
2. **APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT:** Appointment as a Lecturer or as Instructor Adjunct is an at-will appointment and is subject to the limitations and restrictions defined by Colorado Statute and by the University's "at-will" policy. Campus administration urges that departments show due consideration for lecturers and instructor adjuncts by providing early notification of possible extensions of their appointment and that units keep the principle of continuity of employment in mind when making teaching assignments. The establishment of a hiring committee is recommended but not required for appointments to these faculty titles.
3. **SALARY:** A pay scale within the primary unit shall be established, defined on a per-course or per-credit-hour basis, taking into consideration experience and the nature of the assignment. Honorarium teaching should not be indexed by instructor salaries: instructors have duties and roles on campus that are different from those of lecturers. Departments working with their deans' offices should set honorarium salaries at market rates.
4. **BENEFITS:** **Lecturers:** University of Colorado Boulder provides to lecturers the same health care benefit options available to other faculty ranks once a person teaches for a semester at 50% or more time. Benefits are not provided to an individual whose appointment is or falls below 50% full-time. Lecturers are not eligible for retirement benefits (other than FICA) because they are not continuing faculty members and thus do not have appointments that extend up to the vesting date. Hiring authorities or candidates should direct questions regarding benefits to the [Benefits Office of Employee Services](#). Lecturers with simultaneous appointments in two or more units will be eligible for benefits if the sum of their appointments is equivalent to 50% time or above as defined by the unit of their earliest-dated, active appointment. In such cases, the obligation for notifying in writing all units of appointments that sum to 50% or greater rests with the employee. Costs of benefits will be borne by each unit on a proportional basis. **Instructor Adjuncts:** As is the case for all faculty adjunct positions, instructor adjuncts are not eligible for University health or retirement benefits regardless of the percent time of their appointment.

Lecturers and instructor adjuncts are eligible for parking, bookstore, recreation center, library, and University ID privileges as permitted by specific campus policies.

Sufficient instructional support, including access to supplies, staff support, and office space for meeting students shall be provided.

Lecturers and instructor adjuncts shall be eligible for most teaching awards.

Where someone has been a lecturer at 50% or more for three years, the unit should consider whether the position should be redefined as a rostered instructor: again, if a long-term relationship between the individual and the campus is desirable, a rostered instructorship should be created. Where the position is temporary and contingent, lecturers should be employed. Where a unit finds that it has continuing but fluctuating part-time work, it is best not to employ someone beyond three years because doing so may suggest a guarantee of continuing employment that does not exist. Having multiple lecturer appointments in different units constitutes a different situation: while the individual may have more than a 50% appointment, there is no need for a single, continuing position.

5. **EVALUATION:** Units may evaluate the performance of lecturers in a number of ways, including Faculty Course Questionnaires, class visits, and/or the Faculty Report of Professional Activities. A written statement of policy should be provided from the beginning of employment.

II. INSTRUCTOR

1. **DEFINITION:** The title of Instructor is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the discipline. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time. Instructors usually teach undergraduate courses and may have advising responsibilities and some limited administrative responsibilities in addition. Application to the Graduate School for graduate faculty status is required in order for instructors to teach at the graduate level, including service on graduate committees.
2. **APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT:**

Appointment as a full-time Instructor may be made through a CU System Instructor Employment Agreement (available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website). Full-time instructors with at least 50% teaching in their annual merit formulas qualify for placement on this Agreement. The appointment should be for three years. An appointment for less than three years is permitted if a probationary period is needed, or if the need for teaching is less than three years. This Agreement is accompanied by a Cu Boulder campus letter of offer that describes, among other things, annual merit weights and the 50% teaching requirement. Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. The unit should establish the criteria for successful reappointment, which should include an evaluation of teaching and other duties. In most cases, reappointments of instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance,

a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a multi-year reappointment or non-reappointment.

Appointments as a 1) part-time Instructor and 2) full-time instructor not qualifying for placement on a CU System Agreement are at-will appointments and are subject to the limitations and restrictions defined by Colorado Statute and by the University's "at-will" policy. A letter of offer for the initial appointment must be for more than one year and may be up to four years. Annual merit weights will be defined in the letter of appointment. Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. The unit should establish the criteria for successful reappointment, which should include an evaluation of teaching and other duties. In most cases, reappointments of instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to four years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a multi-year reappointment or non-reappointment.

3. **SALARY:** Academic Affairs shall establish a floor for full-time instructors (based on a 9-month appointment in all units except the libraries, where the appointment is for 12-months). Based on that floor, each college and school shall establish a salary range for 100% full-time instructors within their unit.

In larger colleges, starting salaries may be discipline-specific. Instructors on less than 100% time appointments shall be paid proportionately. Instructors shall be eligible for annual merit increases as part of the regular faculty merit assessment process.

4. **BENEFITS:** Instructors at 50% time or greater receive health and retirement benefits consistent with those offered to tenure-track faculty. Health benefits and retirement are not extended to those instructors whose appointments are initially or fall below 50% full-time.

Under University policy on parental leave, instructors are entitled to eighteen weeks of leave to provide care for the faculty member's child within twelve months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of the child, during which period the faculty member may use accrued sick leave. If the faculty member exhausts all accrued sick leave before the end of the eighteen-week period, then the faculty member may continue the leave for the remainder of the period at half pay with full benefits.

Instructors are eligible for most faculty teaching and service awards and may apply for most faculty development fund programs offered to the general tenure-track faculty, such as travel or research/creative work awards. Administrative units at all levels should consider applications from rostered instructors for any administrative position (excluding those that involve personnel actions concerning tenure-track faculty) where the terms of that position and of their base appointment are in accord.

Instructors also are eligible for parking, bookstore, recreation center, library, and University ID privileges as permitted by specific campus policies.

Sufficient support for the instructional responsibilities of Instructors will be provided, including library privileges, reasonable use of office staff support, and space for meeting with students. Instructors are encouraged to participate in faculty governance to the full extent permitted by department or primary unit bylaws.

5. **EVALUATION:** Evaluation for annual merit will be based upon the merit weighting defined at the time of appointment unless it is subsequently modified in writing. The criteria used for annual evaluation must be available in writing to all faculty. Instructors need to maintain currency in their area of teaching, and such currency should be demonstrated during the annual evaluation. Each unit should determine the appropriate measures to be used and any appropriate support for faculty development that may be provided. Annual merit evaluations will be conducted by the unit using procedures established in writing.
6. **PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF SENIOR INSTRUCTOR:** Instructors will normally be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor after a period of six years of continuous appointment at the rank of Instructor at greater than 50% time. Up to three years' credit towards promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. Promotion after six years is not mandatory, nor is it a right. Units will establish the criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor. The review for promotion should include a rigorous accounting of the candidate's teaching record, using multiple measures, an evaluation of the individual's service, and a demonstration of the individual's continued currency in the field.

III. SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

1. **DEFINITION:** The title of Senior Instructor is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Senior Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the discipline. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time. Senior Instructors generally teach undergraduate courses and may have advising responsibilities and some administrative responsibilities in addition.
2. **APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT:**
Appointment as a full-time Senior Instructor is made through the CU System's Instructor Employment Agreement (available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website), assuming the Senior Instructor meets the qualifications for placement on such an agreement, described above. A letter of initial appointment should be for three years. This agreement is accompanied by a CU Boulder campus letter of offer that describes, among other things, annual merit weights. Senior Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process.

Senior Instructors must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of

their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. After the first three-year appointment, the Senior Instructor will undergo a formal, but expedited review. The chair and/or dean will review the Senior Instructors file. If the Senior Instructor has been meeting or exceeding expectations, as indicated by appropriate measures of teaching, for example, then a new three-year contract may be issued. If the chair and/or dean see the need for a full review, that review will be conducted.

In all cases, after the first six years as a Senior Instructor, the faculty member will undergo a full formal review by the department. If the Senior Instructor continues to be employed by the university, reviews will alternate between expedited reviews and full reviews, with this six year timeline for and rigor of the full review being in rough parallel to post-tenure review for tenured faculty. The unit should establish the criteria for successful reappointment, which should include an evaluation of teaching and other duties. A faculty committee should be involved in this review.

In most cases, reappointments of senior instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a three year reappointment or non-reappointment.

3. **SALARY:** Initial salaries for senior instructors will normally be greater than those earned by instructors in their initial appointments.
4. **BENEFITS:** Benefits for senior instructors are the same as those of instructor-rank faculty, plus the following:
Senior instructors who have completed six years (twelve semesters) in rank (at 100% time appointment) either as an instructor appointed as a Senior Instructor or as a Senior Instructor will be eligible to apply for a differentiated workload for one semester. If granted, the differentiated workload will reduce the formal teaching responsibilities of the senior instructor to one 3-credit course (or its equivalent) for that semester. The purpose of this workload adjustment is to allow senior instructors time to update their pedagogy and instructional skills, develop new curriculum, or incorporate instructional technology activities into their teaching. The faculty member on differentiated workload is expected to remain on campus and serve the campus full-time as otherwise defined by the appointment letter. Senior instructors with appointments of less than 100% (but at least 50%) full-time shall be eligible for this benefit on a pro-rated basis. For example, a 50% senior instructor will be eligible to apply for a differentiated workload after 24 semesters. Application for a differentiated workload assignment is made to the unit chair or director and must be approved in writing by the dean. Senior instructors are eligible for emeritus status upon retiring.
5. **EVALUATION:** Same as for Instructors (above).
6. **PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF TEACHING PROFESSOR:** Senior Instructors with at least three years in rank may be considered for the honorific working title of Teaching Professor as described below.

IV. TEACHING PROFESSOR

Definition:

1. **DEFINITION:** The title of Teaching Professor is a working title. A Teaching Professor will still hold the rank and position of Senior Instructor, which is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Senior Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the discipline. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time. Teaching Professors generally teach undergraduate courses and may have advising responsibilities and some administrative responsibilities in addition.

2. **APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT**

After a minimum of three years at the rank of senior instructor, senior instructors who have been exemplary teachers and members of the university community may be considered for the title of “*Teaching Professor*.” The working title of Teaching Professor will be given to a limited proportion of senior instructors to recognize a record of distinction. Since this third title is an honor, there is no expectation that the granting of this title will occur at a particular point in the individual’s career after three years in rank as senior instructor, nor is there an expectation that each senior instructor should seek this title. Although senior instructors may, as a matter of convenience, seek promotion to Teaching Professor at the point of regular reappointment and contract renewal, a senior instructor may seek promotion at any time after three years in rank. Promotion materials should be submitted to the primary unit in the early fall, on a schedule consistent with normal reappointments and promotions to senior instructor. If someone is nominated for the title of “Teaching Professor” and then is not approved, that decision has no implications for the individual’s status as a senior instructor; that individual could be nominated for promotion to Teaching Professor again.

Expectations for Promotion to Teaching Professor

To determine whether an individual should be named Teaching Professor, faculty committees will examine the nominee’s teaching record, together with his/her service and leadership (including outreach and engagement), to determine whether this is a record of distinction.

A “record of distinction” typically carries the expectation that the individual has made a major impact in the disciplinary unit and its students (e.g. on pedagogy and curriculum), one that likely extends to considerable impact on the campus generally and/or a role in national discussions.

Multiple measures of exemplary performance constituting a record of distinction should be used. Examples of multiple measures may include, but are not limited to:

- A record of exemplary classroom teaching, including the following:
 - FCQs
 - Peer evaluations of teaching
 - Letters from students
- Contributions to course and curriculum development
- Contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning, including the following:
 - Contributions to local or national workshops on teaching
 - Relevant publications such as textbooks, lab manuals, articles on pedagogy, etc.
 - Work that improves teaching across multiple units
 - Papers, posters, or presentations on pedagogical topics delivered at conferences
- Evidence of student engagement, as evidenced, for example, through mentoring of students or service on honors thesis committees.
- Leadership and service that have an impact on the unit, school/college, campus and/or national communities.
- Outreach to communities and partners beyond the university, including non-profits, or disadvantaged groups, that draws upon the instructor's expertise.
- Practitioner experience that supplements a teaching career.

Review Process

Unit-Level Review. When a senior instructor wishes to apply for promotion to Teaching Professor, or when the unit wishes to nominate that person, the chair/director of the unit should call upon the appropriate faculty committee (e.g. the committee typically convened to review instructors) to review and advance a nomination packet which will include:

- a letter of nomination from the chair,
- one or more supporting letters (which may be from outside the unit or campus),
- a vita,
- a teaching statement,
- a service statement, and
- a teaching portfolio that speaks to multiple measures of exemplary performance (see above for examples of multiple measures of exemplary performance).

The department will vote on the granting of the title. If the vote is positive, the case will be forwarded to the school/college.

School/College Review. Given the endorsement of the unit, the nomination packet will be reviewed at the school/college level by the appropriate committee. If that committee

ratifies the nomination, it goes to the dean. The dean will consider the nomination and, if s/he approves it, s/he will write a letter of support and send the case to the Provost.

Campus-Level Review. The Provost will convene a committee composed of three vice provosts and four faculty members, selected by the provost with the approval of BFA; initially, the four faculty members will all be tenured faculty members, but as instructors receive the title of “Teaching Professor” they will provide at least two of the four faculty members. The Provost, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, will grant the title. Only positive recommendations move from level to level.

3 SALARY: Upon promotion to Teaching Professor, the individual will receive a salary increment to be added to the base academic-year salary. Initial salaries for Teaching Professors will normally be greater than those earned by Senior Instructors in the same unit in their initial appointments.

4 BENEFITS: Benefits for Teaching Professors are the same as those of Senior Instructor-rank faculty,

V. GRIEVANCE PROCESSES FOR INSTRUCTORS AND SENIOR INSTRUCTORS

All employees of the University of Colorado Boulder are guaranteed freedom of speech. Reappointment will not be jeopardized by exercise of that freedom.

Where an instructor feels that s/he has been subject to discrimination or harassment, s/he should pursue remedy through the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance.

If an instructor is dismissed for cause, grievances are handled in the normal manner for such dismissals.

Non-renewal is not dismissal. To preserve the employee’s rights to grieve non-renewal, rostered instructors on multi-year letters of offer or CU System Instructor Employment Agreements must be notified at least six weeks before the end date in the letter of offer whether (a) s/he will be renewed; (b) s/he will not be renewed; or (c) his/her renewal is still pending.

If an instructor feels s/he has been denied reappointment unfairly, by a process that has been arbitrary, capricious, retaliatory, inconsistent with the treatment of peers in similar circumstances, or based on personal malice, s/he can grieve the non-renewal.

A fast-track grievance procedure will be established in all schools and colleges to hear grievances while the instructor is still a member of the university community.

Addendum II

provide funding for a specified program.

The exact amount of money necessary to create a named professorship or an endowed chair is a matter of negotiation between the campus and the Foundation; the money needed to create an endowed chair may vary from college/school to college/school and, if necessary, within a college/school.

Funding agreements for named professorships and endowed chairs are a delicate matter; they will in most cases be negotiated between a donor, the Foundation, and a dean (though in some cases, a chair as well as a dean may be involved). To insure that any restrictions on such positions are in accord with campus policies and practices, these agreements should be reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Named and chaired professorships are reviewed at least every four years by the department (where appropriate), the dean, and the Office of Faculty Affairs. Faculty may be reappointed to a named or chaired professorship for an unlimited number of terms, unless such a reappointment is restricted by the gift agreement.

Professor of Practice of ____, Boulder Campus

In some programs, particularly in the professional schools, it may be desirable to make appointments to the faculty from among individuals who have substantial expertise in a profession or discipline gained outside the academy that is still of particular importance to the program's mission. As this title is "Professor of Practice" (there are no other ranks), an individual holding it will nominally have the terminal degree and will be someone whose work in the field is recognized by peers as significant; since this person will be appointed as a "Professor of Practice" rather than as an instructor, he or she should have made outstanding contributions to the discipline, field, or profession. Such individuals will contribute to teaching students the skills, methods, and values of their field, discipline or profession, provide leadership in service activities, and/or contribute to the research/creative work of the unit.

Professors of Practice are appointed for terms up to four years; they are subject to formal evaluation in their final year for possible reappointment to another term. Appointments and reappointments of Professors of Practice should be reviewed by the appropriate dean and by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Professors of Practice are "at will" employees not eligible for tenure and thus have a different status than tenure track faculty. All faculty are expected to follow the guidelines of the BFA's document on *Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members*, Part II, "Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Faculty Conduct."

"At will" faculty, like other faculty, receive such privileges as library access, parking, access to office and research space, and other resources that are necessary to carry out their university responsibilities. Voting rights (except in the case of decisions involving tenure and promotion which are reserved for the appropriate ranks of the tenured and tenure track faculty) for "at will" faculty are determined by the bylaws of the department and/or school or college with which they are affiliated. A major responsibility of the University is to protect and encourage faculty in its teaching, learning, research, and public service activities, and it will make every effort to protect the academic freedom of "at will" faculty. Where an "at will" faculty member's complaint or

grievance does not involve academic freedom and where it is not covered by federal or state statute or by existing university or campus policies and procedures, such complaints and/or grievances will be heard by the unit with which the faculty member is affiliated and, if necessary, by the appropriate dean whose ruling in such cases will be final. Professors of Practice are eligible for the same benefit as those holding the title of instructor.

BY-LAWS
 Department of Advertising, Public Relations and Media Design
 College of Media, Communication and Information
 UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER
 [Approved December 9, 2015]

These by-laws are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other University policies and procedures as described generally in the Faculty Handbook and as subsequently revised. These by-laws are intended to be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with current Regents laws and actions and other University policies and procedures. In the event of a conflict, Regent laws and actions and other policies and procedures of the University shall control.

I. General rules and definitions

A. Department Meetings:

A-1 Regular Meetings

Department meetings for the purpose of conducting business and sharing information will be held frequently, twice a semester at a minimum.

Department meetings generally will not occur during the summer months.

Meetings will be called by the Chair or at the request of one-third or more of the voting members of the department.

A-2 Emergency Matters

In “emergency situations” (situations where it is impossible to convene a quorum of the faculty or obtain a vote of sufficient members to have a quorum), the department chair may take action on matters otherwise delegated by these bylaws to faculty for action. Actions on such matters shall be reported to the faculty for review at the earliest possible date that a quorum can be convened or a majority of the votes can be obtained.

B. Quorum

A quorum is defined as fifty percent plus one of faculty members eligible to vote on matters before the faculty. If a quorum is physically present at a meeting, absentee ballots will be counted from absent faculty members eligible to vote. A voting member who wishes to cast an absentee ballot must initiate the process through a voting member who will attend the meeting.

C. Voting Members

C-1 Voting Privileges of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members may vote on all matters affecting APRD. All tenure-track faculty members are eligible to vote on the appointment of tenure-track faculty members. In the case of reappointment,

tenure, and/or promotion of tenure-track faculty, only tenured faculty members with the tenure status and rank equal to or higher than the rank for which a candidate has applied are eligible to vote.

C-2 Voting Privileges of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members who hold multiple-year appointments at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor have voting privileges on faculty governance and programmatic activities after completing the first year of their initial appointment.

C-3 Role of Visiting Faculty Members and Part-Time Lecturers

Visiting Faculty members and part-time lecturers may be invited by the department chair to attend meetings of the faculty and, when in attendance, may vote, but only on matters connected with administration of their courses during the period in which they are actively teaching.

C-4 Graduate Faculty

The graduate faculty consists of those voting members of the department who also are members of the graduate faculty at the University of Colorado at Boulder. On matters of the graduate curriculum and personnel matters pertaining thereof, members of the graduate faculty have the privilege of the vote. On matters of the graduate curriculum and policy, the graduate student representative also has the privilege of the vote.

D. Faculty Procedures

D-1 Decision Making

Except as otherwise provided in these bylaws or other APRD policies or procedures, decisions by a simple majority of the voting members of the faculty present at a meeting at which a quorum is present will constitute the action of the faculty.

D-2 Minutes of Faculty Meetings

A person appointed by the department chair (staff or faculty) will prepare minutes of all meetings of the APRD faculty and circulate them within a reasonable time after each meeting. Minutes will include the following:

- a. The agenda
- b. Copies of all written proposals and the text of all motions made orally, together with the action taken thereon
- c. Copies of all relevant correspondence or similar documents considered at the meeting
- d. A summary of discussion and announcements made at the meeting
- e. Action points involving necessary activities prior to the next meeting
- e. A record of the persons in attendance

II. Chair

A. Selection and Term of Office

A-1 Selection

In the fall semester of a Chair's final year of service, the Chair and Associate Chairs shall arrange with two faculty members to serve as a balloting committee; this committee will include at least one tenured faculty member and one untenured faculty member. The tenured member on the balloting committee is not eligible to run for chair. Those interested in running for chair will decline to serve on this committee.

A-2 Term of Office

The term of office for the Chair will be three years, renewable once.

B. Role and Responsibilities

The Chair is responsible for the general administration of the unit, including but not limited to the following: budgetary planning and the allocation of available funds; faculty assignments and workloads; faculty and staff personnel policies and decisions, including promotions and salary increments; curriculum planning and revision; course changes. In fulfilling his/her responsibilities, the Chair shall consult with the faculty as appropriate and act in accordance with applicable sections of the policies, rules, and procedures of these Bylaws, the laws and policies of the Board of Regents, and the laws and regulations of the State of Colorado.

C. Conflicts between Chair and Faculty

When the Chair disagrees with the legitimately expressed will of the faculty on a matter of academic governance, he/she is responsible for communicating to the CMCI Dean the disagreement and for making, to the best of his/her ability, both the Chair's case and the faculty's case to the Dean. The Dean is responsible for deciding such matters.

D. Evaluation

The Chair and Associate Chairs will be evaluated annually as required by College and University policies.

III. Faculty Committees

III-A. Standing Committees

- a. Executive Committee
- b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- c. Graduate Affairs Committee

III-B. Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees may be appointed by the Chair upon consultation with the Executive Committee.

III-C. Limitation on Committee Membership

No faculty member may serve simultaneously as chair of more than one standing committee

III-D. Vacancies on Standing Committees

When vacancies occur in standing committees, by reason of faculty leave or otherwise, the Chair in consultation with remaining members of the affected committee, will appoint a faculty member to serve on an interim basis, or, in the event of a vacancy lasting more than one academic year, to serve out the remainder of the term of service.

III-E. Executive Committee (EC)

The Executive Committee shall advise the Chair on matters regarding faculty hiring, annual merit evaluations, post-tenure reviews, forming primary unit evaluation committees, grievances, and related matters as appropriate. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair and four elected members, one from each rank (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor). Members of the Executive Committee will serve two-year terms with a minimum of one year hiatus required after each term. Election of the Executive Committee will be by secret ballot.

The Executive Committee members shall also coordinate with the Chair in reviewing the eligibility of faculty for various awards sponsored by the College, campus, CU system, and professional associations, and in preparing related nominations. These responsibilities will be assumed by the Executive Committee until there are three faculty members at each rank (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor) represented in the APRD faculty. At that time, a standing Faculty Merit Review Committee will be formed.

III-F. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)

In accordance with Board of Regents rules and university polity, “the faculty takes the lead in decisions concerning educational policy related to teaching, curriculum, research, academic ethics, and other academic matters” (Laws of Regents, Article 5.E.5 <https://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/article-05.html>). Therefore, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is responsible for oversight of the APRD undergraduate curriculum. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate the overall undergraduate program and make recommendations to the faculty. The committee shall be comprised of representatives from each of the three tracks (Advertising, Public Relations, and Media Design) appointed at the initiation

of the Chair with faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent. The Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies will serve on UCC in an ex officio capacity.

III-G. Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC)

The Graduate Affairs Committee is responsible for oversight of all the graduate programs in the department. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate both Master's and PhD Programs and make recommendations to the faculty. The Graduate Affairs Committee shall also review applications for admission to the APRD graduate programs and make recommendations to the faculty. The committee shall be comprised of graduate faculty appointed at the initiation of the Chair with faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent. The Associate Chair for Graduate Studies will serve on GAC in an ex officio capacity.

IV. Amendments to the Bylaws

Amendments to these by-laws may be proposed by any voting member of the department. Written copies of any proposed amendment will be circulated to all voting members not less than three days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered. A two-thirds majority of those voting will be required for passage of an amendment. If the Chair disagrees with an amendment passed by the faculty, he/she will follow the procedures described in section II.C of these by-laws.

V. Parliamentary Authority

The most recent edition of Roberts Rules of Order, Revised will govern the proceedings of the department.



Advertising, Public Relations and Media Design College of Media, Communication and Information

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Department of Advertising, Public Relations and Media Design College of Media, Communication and Information University of Colorado Boulder

The Department of Advertising, Public Relations and Media Design explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members for reappointment, tenure (for tenure-track faculty only), and promotion.

This document is guided by the college-wide CMCI Personnel Policies and Procedures document approved Nov 16, 2016 that establishes broad expectations of meritorious and excellent performance for faculty but determines that each primary academic unit within CMCI, by necessity, implements its own policies and procedures:

“Primary units develop criteria that explicate the teaching, research and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for articles, books, and/or research grants, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field. These primary unit criteria, once reviewed for rigor, fairness and consistency with regent requirements and approved by the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs, are included in the candidate’s dossier and shall guide evaluation at every level of review.”

This policy statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes and Procedures (SPP) document, and is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty.”

Policies for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty Members

1. **RULES OF THE REGENTS.** Rules of the Regents, as given in the CU Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations. The basic question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of any candidate is as follows: Is the faculty member’s performance consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

Reappointment. For initial reappointment, a faculty member is expected to have begun a promising research program. The University requires comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

Promotion and Tenure. According to the Faculty Handbook, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate “excellence” in either teaching or research/creative work and “meritorious” achievement in the other category, plus meritorious service (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>) Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires according to the resolution adopted at the February 17, 1994 Board of Regents meeting, that “Associate Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and increasing accomplishment in research, scholarship/creative activity or clinical service/professional practice, as articulated in the primary unit criteria.”

Every fifth after year tenure is granted, faculty members undergo a post-tenure review. The purpose is to (1) facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of the university and the most effective use of institutional resources and (2) to ensure professional accountability to the university community, the Board of Regents, and to the public (<http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/post-tenure-review>) This review takes into consideration a faculty member’s performance in teaching, research and creative work (<http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/atoz/ofaindex.html>) (faculty performance rating form).

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires according to the resolution adopted at the February 17, 1994 Board of Regents meeting, that Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent and (a) “a record that, taken as a whole,” is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a greater emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicate substantial significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work or service.

The purpose of departmental evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the subdisciplines that are represented within the Department of Advertising, Public Relations and Media Design.

2. **ALLOCATION OF EFFORT.** Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department for tenure-track faculty is 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year. This allocation will be assumed to apply unless

specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary with the concurrence of the dean and in consultation with faculty leadership.

3. **PERFORMANCE.** The following factors are considered in evaluating the candidate's annual performance, as well as qualifications for tenure and promotion.

I. Evaluation of Research

The Department participates in the research mission of the university. Achievement in research is an important component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Faculty members are expected to excel in their intellectual contributions to the academy and/or to professional practice. As such their work is expected to lead to a new understanding or appreciation of advertising, public relations and media design. All faculty members are expected to continue throughout their careers to contribute to the academic mission of the department using their distinctive academic strengths. All scholarship should contribute to an individual's personal development as a scholar through the reinforcement of a coherent and substantial body of work, as well as contributing to a national reputation for the Department. Beyond the record of publications, presentations and related activities, the review process also includes an assessment of an individual's intellectual development, which includes the strength of an emerging and/or growing coherent body of work, the frequency and regularity of scholarship activities, and the individual's reputation in the field. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research activity.

Promotion decisions will be based on criteria, standards and evidence as defined in the university Faculty Handbook (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>). "Criteria" refers to the specific dimensions of teaching, research or creative work, and service listed in this document and university documents. "Standards" refers to the level of performance, which will be determined to be (a) not meritorious, (b) meritorious or (c) excellent.

Measures to Assess Research: Publication is an important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. According to the Faculty Handbook, the primary evidence of scholarship is peer-reviewed journal articles and recognition by other scholars of the candidates' research and publication records. More specifically, the candidates may present evidence in such areas as:

- Refereed journal articles
- Analytical, critical and interpretive books
- Book chapters breaking new ground and advancing new concepts
- Articles, reviews, research reports and commentaries in respected professional publications, particularly articles advancing the knowledge of the profession
- Monographs
- Peer-reviewed online books and journal articles
- Textbooks breaking new ground and successfully advancing concepts and ideas that transcend ordinary instructional material
- Published reports and studies for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations
- Encyclopedia entries
- Review of scholarly works

- Invited lectures and presentations in symposia, conferences and professional meetings
- Scholar-in-residence programs
- Competitive research awards and grants
- Refereed conference papers

Criteria for Research. Scholarship will be evaluated based on judgment by peers and taking into account the publications' and organizations' reputations. Although quality of scholarship takes precedence over quantity, the amount of work produced cannot be ignored. It is easier to count than judge, but the Department does both, attempting to determine if the work represents meritorious or excellent performance. Both quality and quantity are important factors in distinguishing between meritorious and excellent.

Some weighting is standard in academic circles. In general:

- Books rank higher than textbooks.
- Textbooks presenting new concepts carry more weight than monographs
- Refereed monographs are more significant than refereed articles.
- Refereed articles are more significant than work in non-refereed journals.
- Publications scholarship is more important than papers presented at scholarly meetings.
- Published works are more important than working papers, works in process or works in production.
- Single authorship is more important than joint authorship. Joint authorship is welcome, of course, but it should be balanced by single-authored publications.
- In terms of venue, international is more important than national, and national is more important than regional or local, although these determinations should be moderated by considerations of the reputation of the publication or organization.

Indicators of Research Performance. A record of excellence in research requires publications that are high quality with the number of published pieces being one that merits a judgment of outstanding by Department peers and outside reviewers. Generally, a meritorious research record is one that includes a good number of publications but either fewer than is expected for a judgment of excellence or where outlets may be less prominent or the candidate may be second or third author in a large proportion of pieces. A record of below meritorious in research involves either scholarship that has clear limitations and/or a small number of publications.

The following factors are considered in evaluating the candidate's research as meritorious:

- Does the candidate's work contribute to society's understanding of the discipline?
- For scholarship in professional areas, does the work improve professional practice?
- Does the scholarship bring recognition to the department and university?
- Is the work judged significant by experts in the fields as evidenced by publication in respected journals and by external reference letters?
- Has the candidate demonstrated independence as a researcher?
- Has the work been regular and continuous?
- Has the work been organized, focused and systematic?

- Has the candidate participated in team or group-based research that bring visibility and respect to the department, college or discipline?
- Is the work original?
- What is the quality of the publication and nature of the review process?

Candidates whose work represents excellence in performance will have a research record that moves beyond the standards of meritorious performance and represents advanced research leading to national/international recognition of the faculty member. Scholarship meeting the excellence standards will be recognized as contributing to the candidate's recognition as a national or international expert or leader in an area or discipline. Other indications of excellence in research may include answers to such questions as:

- Has the work had a significant impact on the field or discipline?
- In the list of relevant weighting standards, is more of the scholarship in the higher ranked categories?
- Has the candidate established a leadership role in research through mentoring, collaboration or team-based research?

II. Evaluation of Creative Work

Whether a faculty member is pursuing research, creative work, or both, the work is expected to be highly regarded nationally. In the case of creative work, editors, art and design juries, and other reviewers typically review and approve any piece of work before it is published, exhibited, or otherwise publicly distributed. Accordingly, participation in respected, national or international venues for creative work are considered peer-reviewed in a way that is analogous to the peer review of scholarly journals. The quality and quantity of the work are judged together, although quality is more important than quantity.

Measures to Assess Creative Work. Original creative work includes various imaginative and innovative contributions that can have artistic, social, and economic value. Having a clear and consistent focus of creative work makes it more likely that faculty members will achieve their goals and make substantive contributions to their fields. Productivity should be evaluated in the context of norms for original creative works in specific fields. Candidates should have well-received works of which he/she is the primary creator or author. Creative work can take a variety of forms:

- Juried competitions for publication, performance, or exhibition
- Invitation or commission for an original work from respected individuals or organizations
- Documentation of significant, distinctive, and developing achievement in creative work
- Creativity awards and/or other special recognition
- Papers presented at discipline-appropriate scholarly conferences accepted through a peer review process
- Creative activities relevant to a certain field, as deemed appropriate by the department head and senior faculty in the academic department
- Creative activity funded/grants
- Books
- Text books
- Edited book chapters
- Reviews in discipline-appropriate scholarly journals
- Reviews and articles related to the appropriate discipline in publication for a non-academic audience

Criteria for Creative Work. A candidate should demonstrate an emerging national reputation in his or her field by means of a sustained record of high-quality juried exhibitions, publications, or work distributed in another medium. The expected number of exhibitions, publications, and work distributed in other media will vary greatly depending on the candidate's medium, the scale and complexity of the work, and the costs involved in production, distribution, and exhibition. In general:

- The scope of a publication or an exhibition influences how the work will be judged. National and international publications or exhibitions are considered more significant than regional or state publications or exhibitions.
- The acceptance rate of a publication or venue status of an exhibition, such as the reputation of the venue (festival, exhibition, publication, etc.), acceptance standards, audience, reviews, awards, collections, competitions, gallery affiliations, et al, influence how the work will be judged.
- The citations and recognition of works, such as awards or reviews, influence how the work will be judged. Recognitions and awards will be judged in a similar manner to the scope of the work.
- Solo work is considered more significant than collaborative work.
- In the case of collaborative work, the candidate's contribution to a work or exhibition will impact how the work will be judged. If the work is not solo-authored or created, then percentage of contribution will be considered.
- For creative works, the length of time and labor involved, as well as the production and distribution costs will be considered when assessing productivity.
- Juried or peer-reviewed works will weigh more significantly than invited works.
- The extent and scope to which a candidate's work has achieved a national/international reputation will be considered.
- Should an applicant include a book, the reputation of the publishing house, type of audience, quality of reviews, and awards will be considered. Vanity press and/or self-published books are not considered toward promotion.
- Textbooks will be considered in the event that the text makes a significant and impactful contribution to a body of knowledge.

Indicators of Creative Work Performance. The evaluation of creative work is based on the visibility, productivity, scope, depth, and quality of the candidate's work. Overall, the effort is to be evaluated in terms of its scope and judgment by professional peers. The organizations' and publications' reputations and consequent competitiveness in accepting work, as well as reviews and reactions to the work, will be taken into account. Professional peer review is accomplished through methods as a review panel or an editorial process. A record of excellence requires a body of creative work that is openly available, of high quality and significance, demonstrates an evolution of ideas and artistic development, and must be recognized within his or her field. Creative work may be deemed meritorious if it represents the active pursuit of an organized and focused body of work that meets the standards below. A record of below meritorious in creative work involves work that has clear limitations in terms of quality, visibility, and sustainability.

In general, the following factors are considered in evaluating the candidate's research as meritorious:

- Does the work break new ground or successfully advance state-of-the-art concepts, ideas and approaches that transcend ordinary professional practices?

- Has the work been published, juried or competitively recognized?
- Evaluation of these works should consider not only the competitiveness of the forum, but also critical reaction to the work and reputation or standing of the individuals making these judgements.
- What is the quality of the exhibitions, publications, or distribution in another medium and what is the nature of the review process?
- Has the candidate's creative work demonstrably enhanced his or her teaching and service?
- Does the creative work bring recognition to the department and university?
- Has the creative work been regular and continuous?
- Does the creative work demonstrate growth over a period of time?

Creative work shall be deemed excellent if it moves beyond the standards of meritorious performance. It should represent advancements in the field. In these ways, the work should lead to national or international recognition of the faculty member. Other indicators might be determined by asking such questions as:

- Has the candidate's work been significant within his or her field?
- Has the work been organized, focused and systematic?
- In the list of relevant weighting standards, is more of the creative work in the higher ranked categories?
- Has the candidate established a leadership role in creative work through mentoring and collaboration?

III. Evaluation of Teaching

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of Regents? Faculty should create a file that will contain their written records pertaining to teaching. The file will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching.

Measures to Assess Teaching. No single measure of effectiveness in teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be used by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services students, independent study or independent research projects 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 seem appropriate for a particular individual.

The following are examples of multiple measures of teaching that are considered in evaluating a candidate's overall teaching performance. These items represent a compilation of indicators that can be found in the Faculty Handbook:

- Faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes
- Statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching including descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework
- Peer and self-evaluation of classroom instruction

- Examples of course outlines, syllabuses, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction
- Student letters solicited in an unbiased manner
- Contributions to curriculum development
- Evaluating teaching and curriculum practices outside the department and at other universities
- Innovations in teaching
- Publications that make substantive and innovative contributions to teaching
- Refereed journal articles on teaching
- Nomination for and receipt of teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Grants received for teaching innovation
- Mentoring of junior faculty members on teaching
- Evaluating faculty teaching in the department or outside
- Helping colleagues document their teaching as part of the promotion process
- Student advising
- Undergraduate, graduate and individualized instruction
- Supervision of theses and dissertations, and professional projects
- Work with the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP), and/or the Graduate Teacher Program
- Student wards at national competitions
- Internship or job placement of students

Indicators of Teaching Performance. In general, a meritorious teaching record is one that evidences strong, competent classroom teaching as well as reasonable involvement with mentoring of students. Less than meritorious teaching is made evident through a record of weak student evaluations, problematic student letters, and peer observations, especially when paired with inattention to addressing areas of teaching weakness. Two questions may serve as a general guideline in such evaluations:

- Has the candidate's teaching progressed over time?
- Has the candidate taken steps to improve teaching?

A record of excellence in teaching involves receipt of university or professional awards in teaching, publication of pedagogy scholarship, or implementation of innovative efforts in addition to a record of strong classroom teaching and mentoring.

IV. Evaluation of Service

The Department recognizes the importance of providing service in all fields and levels of expertise represented on the faculty. Evaluation of service can extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college 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, the public, or internationally. Service is generally evaluated on the basis of its significance, quality, 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, reappointment, or tenure.

Measures to Assess Service and Outreach. Service and outreach work can take a variety of forms. The list below is intended to be suggestive and is by no means exhaustive:

- Department, college and university committees: Participation in and membership on department, college and university committees including standing, ad-hoc, advisory and search committees.
- Participation in professional and educational organizations, consultation, research and contributions to workshops and conferences.
- Government and industry consulting: Scholars as well as respected professionals are encouraged to serve as expert advisors to governmental and non-governmental organizations and professional bodies, particularly in the area of policy development, research and/or creative work.
- Community service: Participating in community activities related to the candidate's academic expertise—for example, membership on education boards, serving on non-profit organizations' boards of directors, providing creative and professional services to non-profit organizations without remuneration.
- Professional education: Conducting workshops for professionals in the fields represented on the faculty if that work entails teaching professional skills and practice.
- Public education: Assisting the public in using information technology and communication media to their fullest potential.
- Professional, scholarly and creative association activities: Providing leadership in professional associations, organizing conferences, serving as an officer of professional organizations and undertaking peer reviews of conference papers and submissions to electronic journals and multimedia outlets.
- Administrative services: Journal editorship, member of editorial boards.
- Evaluative work: Jurying exhibitions, competitions and presentations, serving as external reviewer for academic and professional programs, reviewing journal articles, book proposals and government grants/fellowships.

Indicators of Service Performance: Participation in department and/or university services and outreach activities is a minimum requirement for reappointment. Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires at least meritorious service. Meritorious performance in service and outreach includes participation and involvement in professional and educational activities, institutions and associations as well as activities relating to participation in and membership on university and departmental committees.

Policies for Reappointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members

Faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor are to undergo an annual review based on the criteria established by the terms of their initial contract (e.g., 75 percent teaching, 25 percent service) and by the measurements outlined in this document. The guidelines set forth by the University of Colorado – Boulder's Office of Faculty Affairs for the appointment, evaluation and promotion of lecturer and instructor rank faculty apply in these cases and can be found [here](#).

I. INSTRUCTORS

1. **DEFINITION:** The title of Instructor is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the discipline. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time.

Instructors usually teach undergraduate courses and may have advising responsibilities and some limited administrative responsibilities in addition. Application to the Graduate School for graduate faculty status is required in order for instructors to teach at the graduate level, including service on graduate committees.

2. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT: Appointment as a full-time Instructor may be made through a CU System Instructor Employment Agreement (available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website). Full-time instructors with at least 50% teaching in their annual merit formulas qualify for placement on this Agreement. The appointment should be for three years. An appointment for less than three years is permitted if a probationary period is needed, or if the need for teaching is less than three years. This Agreement is accompanied by a CU Boulder campus letter of offer that describes, among other things, annual merit weights and the 50% teaching requirement. Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year.

Formal Review for Reappointment

An instructor undergoing a formal review for reappointment (preferably during the first semester of their final year of appointment) will submit the following materials to the department chair for evaluation by a primary unit evaluation committee:

- a current vita
- FCQ reports for all courses taught
- a teaching statement
- a peer evaluation of teaching by a tenure-track or tenured faculty member from within the department
- a service statement
- a teaching portfolio that includes all course syllabi and may also include:
 - letters from students
 - sample assignments
 - documentation of student achievements / placements
 - documentation of extracurricular student experiences developed by the instructor as a supplement to classroom instruction

In most cases, reappointments of instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a multi-year reappointment or non-reappointment. Appointments as a 1) part-time instructor and 2) full-time instructor not qualifying for placement on a CU System Agreement are at-will appointments and are subject to the limitations and restrictions defined by Colorado Statute and by the University's "at-will" policy. A letter of offer for the initial appointment must be for more than one year and may be up to four years. Annual merit weights will be defined in the letter of appointment. Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual

merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year.

3. EVALUATION: Evaluation for annual merit will be based upon the merit weighting defined at the time of appointment unless it is subsequently modified in writing. The criteria used for annual evaluation must be available in writing to all faculty. Instructors need to maintain currency in their area of teaching, and such currency should be demonstrated during the annual evaluation. Annual merit evaluations will be conducted by the unit using procedures established in writing.

4. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF SENIOR INSTRUCTOR: Instructors will normally be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor after a period of six years of continuous appointment at the rank of Instructor at greater than 50% time. Up to three years' credit towards promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. Promotion after six years is not mandatory, nor is it a right. The review for promotion should include a rigorous accounting of the candidate's teaching record, using multiple measures, an evaluation of the individual's service, and a demonstration of the individual's continued currency in the field.

II. SENIOR INSTRUCTORS

1. DEFINITION: The title of Senior Instructor is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Senior Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the discipline. Appointment may range from less than 50% to full-time. Senior Instructors generally teach undergraduate courses and may have advising responsibilities and some administrative responsibilities in addition.

2. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT: Appointment as a full-time Senior Instructor is made through the CU System's Instructor Employment Agreement (available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website), assuming the Senior Instructor meets the qualifications for placement on such an agreement, described above. A letter of initial appointment should be for three years. This agreement is accompanied by a CU Boulder campus letter of offer that describes, among other things, annual merit weights. Senior Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process. Senior Instructors must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. After the first three-year appointment, the Senior Instructor will undergo a formal, but expedited review. The chair and/or dean will review the Senior Instructors file. If the Senior Instructor has been meeting or exceeding expectations, as indicated by appropriate measures of teaching, for example, then a new three-year contract may be issued. If the chair and/or dean see the need for a full review, that review will be conducted.

Formal Review for Reappointment

An instructor undergoing a formal review for reappointment (preferably during the first semester of their final year of appointment) will submit the following materials to the department chair for evaluation by a primary unit evaluation committee:

- a current vita
- FCQ reports for all courses taught
- a teaching statement
- a peer evaluation of teaching by a tenure-track or tenured faculty member from within the department
- a service statement
- a teaching portfolio that includes all course syllabi and may also include:
 - letters from students
 - sample assignments
 - documentation of student achievements
 - documentation of extracurricular student experiences developed by the instructor as a supplement to classroom instruction

In all cases, after the first six years as a Senior Instructor, the faculty member will undergo a full formal review by the department. If the Senior Instructor continues to be employed by the university, reviews will alternate between expedited reviews and full reviews, with this six year timeline for and rigor of the full review being in rough parallel to post-tenure review for tenured faculty.

A faculty committee should be involved in this review. In most cases, reappointments of senior instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a three year reappointment or non-reappointment.

3. EVALUATION: Same as for instructors.

4. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF TEACHING PROFESSOR: Senior Instructors with at least three years in rank may be considered for the honorific working title of Teaching Professor as described in the CU Boulder Office of Faculty Affairs guidelines for the appointment, evaluation and promotion of lecturer and instructor rank faculty, found [here](#).

**BY-LAWS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
COLLEGE OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO**

These by-laws are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other University policies and procedures as described generally in the Faculty Handbook and as subsequently revised. These by-laws are intended to be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with current Regents laws and actions and other University policies and procedures. In the event of a conflict, Regent laws and actions and other policies and procedures of the University shall control.

I. General rules and definitions

- A. **Department Meetings:** Department meetings for the purpose of conducting business and sharing information will be held frequently, twice a semester at a minimum. Department meetings generally will not occur during the summer months. Meetings will be called by the Chair or at the request of one-third or more of the voting members of the department.
- B. **Quorum:** A quorum consists of those voting members who attend the meeting. Absentee voting is permitted with the consent of a simple majority of those attending the meeting and voting. A voting member who wishes to cast an absentee ballot must initiate the process through a voting member who will attend the meeting.
- C. **Voting Members:** Voting members of the department are those persons (a) holding the academic rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, (b) holding the academic rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor, provided they have an appointment in the Department with either the length of the appointment contract or the cumulative length of continuous appointments being 3 years or longer and with the majority of teaching and service assignments resting in the Department, and (c) the current chair or co-chair of the Communication Graduate Student Association. Voting members do not include temporary faculty, such as lecturers, faculty at visiting, adjoint, or adjunct ranks; research faculty; emeritus faculty, or other students.
- D. **Graduate Faculty:** The graduate faculty consists of those voting members of the department who also are members of the graduate faculty at the University of Colorado at Boulder. On matters of the graduate curriculum and personnel matters pertaining thereof, members of the graduate faculty have the privilege of the vote. On matters of the graduate curriculum and policy, the graduate student representative also has the privilege of the vote.
- E. The current chair and vice chair of the Communication Graduate Student Association (CGSA) are invited to attend and participate in faculty meetings; in cases, where the chair and/or vice chair cannot attend, other CGSA elected representatives may attend in their place. The CGSA chair is authorized to cast a

single vote; if the chair is unable to attend, the co- or vice chair is authorized to cast the vote; if the chair and the co- or vice chair are unable to attend, a designated CGSA elected representative attending the faculty meeting is authorized to cast the vote. Any CGSA representatives, however, will be required to absent themselves from faculty meetings when graduate admissions and personnel matters are discussed (after providing their viewpoints, if appropriate to do so; see F below) and voted on, or when the faculty votes by a majority to go into executive session to discuss any other item of business.

- F. In the event of a faculty search at the rank of Instructor or above, the Chair will appoint a Search Committee, normally including all voting faculty and a graduate student representative who may or may not be the chair of the CGSA. The Chair will also appoint a Screening Committee, normally including four faculty members, one of whom will chair the committee, and the graduate student representative from the Search Committee. All members of the Search Committee have the privilege of voting on motions related to that faculty search.
- G. The Department from time to time may adopt specific policies (as it has, e.g., on Differential Workloads for Faculty and on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure). Such policies may be discarded, replaced, or amended by normal procedures and do not require a two-thirds majority.
- H. The faculty may request that a Staff Assistant or another individual attend meetings and take minutes or may elect a secretary from among its own members. Minutes will show motions made and passed and topics discussed but will not attempt to reproduce arguments and discussion.

II. Chair

- A. The Chair's general responsibilities are as described in Faculty Handbook, pp. I: 21-26.
- B. The Chair shall be appointed according to the following procedures:
 - 1. In the fall semester of a Chair's final year of service, the Chair and Associate Chairs shall arrange with two faculty members to serve as a balloting committee; this committee will include at least one tenured faculty member and one untenured faculty member. The tenured member on the balloting committee is not eligible to run for chair. Those interested in running for chair will decline to serve on this committee.
 - 2. The balloting committee will prepare a list of all faculty members eligible to serve as chair. The committee will discuss with each eligible member whether they would like to be included on the ballot. Any eligible faculty member who wishes to be included on the ballot shall be.

3. The faculty will convene in a special faculty meeting without the candidates present to discuss the candidates on the ballot. One week after this meeting, the faculty as a whole will convene to cast secret ballots for chair. Each voting member of the faculty will have one vote. The chair is elected by simple majority of votes cast. If there are more than 2 candidates on the ballot, and the first vote does not yield a majority for one candidate, the two candidates getting the most votes will be placed on a second ballot. A second vote will then be taken.
- C. Conflicts between the Chair and the Faculty: Rules of the Regents give the Chair responsibility for virtually all operations of the department. But good academic practice requires a substantial faculty role in matters of academic governance, especially curriculum decisions, decisions on evaluation of students and other faculty, and decisions on hiring and dismissing academic personnel.
1. When the Chair disagrees with the legitimately expressed will of the faculty on a matter of academic governance, he/she is responsible for communicating to the relevant Dean the disagreement and for making, to the best of his/her ability, both the Chair's case and the faculty's case to the relevant Dean.
 2. The relevant Dean is responsible for deciding such matters.
- D. Normally, the term of office for the Chair will be less than or equal to four years, renewable once.
- E. The Chair will be evaluated annually as required by College and University policies.

III. Standing Committees

- A. **Executive Committee:** The Executive Committee shall advise the Chair on matters of department finances, and on other issues of department policy and procedure falling outside the purview of its other standing committees. The Executive Committee shall consist of four faculty members, two of whom shall be the Associate Chairs directing the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs. Two other faculty members nominated from the ranks of Instructor and above shall be elected by majority faculty vote. Members of the Executive Committee will typically serve 2-year terms.
- B. **Faculty Personnel Committee:** The Faculty Personnel Committee is responsible for all reviews of faculty, and consists of tenured associate professors and tenured professors. For this purpose, the Faculty Personnel Committee constitutes "the department." The Faculty Personnel Committee will carry out these responsibilities in accordance with the department's policy on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. This committee shall have a standing Awards Subcommittee, consisting of two members, elected biannually by the Personnel Committee for two –year appointments. Those

subcommittee members shall coordinate with the Chair in reviewing the eligibility of faculty for various awards sponsored the College, campus, CU system, and professional associations, and in preparing related nominations.

- C. **Faculty Merit Review Committee:** The Faculty Merit Review Committee is responsible for annually reviewing and evaluating the performance of faculty members, and for documenting those evaluations in the Performance Rating Form for each faculty member. The Department chair is an Ex-Officio, nonvoting member who offers his/her input into the Committee's deliberation. The Committee will include one representative from each of four faculty ranks (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor), provided that there are three or more faculty members rostered at that rank in the Department, and who are able to serve. Should there be less than three faculty members eligible to serve at any rank, the faculty may vote to combine that rank with another rank immediately above or below it in its representation on the merit committee. Committee membership rotates annually, in alphabetical order by last names, within each of these rank categories, except where membership is restricted by University policies regarding conflicts of interest or where the faculty member is otherwise precluded from fulfilling this commitment, in which case an individual's membership will be delayed until she or he is eligible and able to serve. In any given year, the term for each committee member shall be one year, with the exception of the most recently designated senior faculty member, who shall serve two years, and who shall serve in their second year as committee chair. The faculty will ratify the committee membership for a given year by majority vote to be taken in the fall semester.
- D. **Undergraduate Program Committee:** The Undergraduate Program Committee is responsible for oversight of the undergraduate program in Communication. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate the overall undergraduate program and make recommendations to the faculty.
- E. **Graduate Program Committee:** The Graduate Program Committee is responsible for oversight of the Graduate Program in Communication. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate the overall graduate program and make recommendations to the faculty.
- F. **Graduate Admissions Committee:** The Graduate Admissions Committee is responsible for reviewing applications for admission to the graduate program in Communication and making recommendations to the faculty. The Director of Graduate Studies serves as an ex officio voting member and committee chair.
- G. **Diversity Committee:** The Diversity Committee is responsible for oversight of diversity in the department. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate policies and activities to advance the university's and department's diversity goals. In the event of a shortage of available faculty members, this function may be performed by a single Diversity Coordinator, appointed by the Chair, in keeping with College policy.

IV. Committees and Department Administration

- A. The Department of Communication in general has a preference for conducting business as a committee of the whole. However, the Chair may from time to time appoint ad hoc committees (including committees of one) for the efficient and responsible conduct of department business. Standing committees, other than the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Faculty Merit Review Committee, will be appointed at the initiation of the Chair with faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent.
- B. The Chair may from time to time appoint faculty members to administrative roles (e.g., Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Associate Chair, Summer Chair). Such appointments will include faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent, either to the role or to the individual to occupy it.
- C. Terms of office for committees and administrators other than the Chair will be at the discretion of the Chair.

V. Disputes and Grievances; Generally, the Department seeks to address faculty members' disputes and grievances in a direct and timely manner, and to resolve them at the lowest possible administrative level. Here, "dispute" is taken to include conflict between two or more faculty members that disrupts generally-accepted norms of collegiality; "grievance" includes a faculty member's disagreement with formal decisions made by Departmental Committees that affect his or her interests, and an accompanying desire for review and reconsideration of that decision. Faculty members engaged in dispute shall follow procedures outlined in the separate "Communication Department Conduct Policy." Faculty members advancing a grievance shall, as a matter of courtesy, first request a meeting with the Committee and/or Departmental Chair bearing primary responsibility for that decision to discuss related questions and concerns (e.g., that the Committee did not consider relevant information or evidence). Those Chairs shall attempt to explain the decision as best they can. If the faculty member is not satisfied by this response, he or she may proceed as follows: In the case of a Merit-based grievance, she or he shall follow the separate "Faculty Merit Review Procedure." In the case of grievance concerning Reappointment, Promotion, and /or Tenure, he or she shall follow related College and/or campus-based policies.

VI. Amendments: Amendments to these by-laws may be proposed by any voting member of the department. Written copies of any proposed amendment will be circulated to all voting members not less than three days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered. A two-thirds majority of those voting will be required for passage of an amendment. If the Chair disagrees with an amendment passed by the faculty, he/she will follow the procedures described in section II.B of these by-laws.

VII. Parliamentary Authority: The most recent edition of Roberts Rules of Order, Revised will govern the proceedings of the department.

Approved 2/31/1991

Amended 4/1994

Amended 2/7/97

Amended 2/25/04 and 3/17/04

Amended 1/26/05 and 3/16/05

Amended 04/20/11

Amended 11/07/12

Amended 9/16/2015 kt

Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
Department of Communication
College of Media, Communication, and Information
University of Colorado, Boulder

The Department of Communication explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel and instructors for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes and Procedures (SPP) document. It is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty," as well as "Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty" (revised 1 June 2017).

Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Rules of the Regents. Rules of the Regents, as given in the C.U. Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

The University requires comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials the Faculty Handbook and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

According to the Faculty Handbook, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate "excellence" in either teaching or research and meritorious" achievement in the other category, plus meritorious service.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires according to the resolution adopted at the February 17, 1994 Board of Regents meeting, that Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent and (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a greater emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other and (c) a record since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicate substantial significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work or service. The Communication Department, working within the framework of the Laws of the Regents, makes the following clarifications respecting how those rules apply to its faculty:

1. The department understands the requirement of an excellent record as whole to apply to both teaching and research.
2. A record of significant contribution to both undergraduate and graduate education is the normal expectation of the Department. It does not anticipate that conditions of an individual or of the Department itself will require an emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other in determining a faculty member's level of achievement in teaching.

The purpose of the departmental evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the disciplines that are represented in the Department of Communication.

2. **Allocation of Effort.** Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department is 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. This allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord with the Department's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.
3. **Evaluation of Teaching.** In the first year after being appointed to a tenure-track position, faculty should create a file that will contain their written records pertaining to teaching. The file 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 file is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.
 - a. **Undergraduate teaching.** Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:
 1. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
 2. faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
 3. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
 4. examples of course outlines, syllabuses, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
 5. descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
 6. written "statements *that may* have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to Curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate 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 seem appropriate for a particular individual.

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. Faculty members are not required to use those mechanisms of self-improvement, but are encouraged to do so.

- b. **Graduate instruction.** Graduate instruction is an important component of teaching evaluation. All faculty members are expected to advise MA and/or PhD students, serve on committees of students sponsored by other faculty members, participate in the screening of new students and assessment of ongoing students, and instruct graduate students through regular courses or seminars. Faculty members should document their involvement with graduate students as part of their teaching file.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of Regents? A meritorious teaching record is one that evidences strong, competent classroom teaching, as well as reasonable involvement with mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. A record of excellence in teaching involves receipt of university or professional awards in teaching, publication of pedagogy scholarship, or implementation of innovative programs in addition to a record of very strong classroom teaching and mentoring. Less than meritorious teaching is made evident through a record of low student

evaluations, problematic student letters, and peer observations, especially when paired with inattention to addressing areas of teaching weakness.

4. **Evaluation of Research.** Achievement in research is an important component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research activity.

Publication is an important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. Publication of books in academic presses, articles in peer reviewed journals, and chapters in prestigious volumes will be considered especially significant. Published work should show evidence of originality and importance.

A second important criterion for evaluation of research is the candidate's national or international reputation for achievement in research. The Department will gather evidence of reputation from authoritative reviewers external to the University; these will include some individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation and some, individuals who are, selected independently by the departmental evaluation committee rather than by the candidate.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit, or the Department may consider, other evidence of achievement in research that seems appropriate to a particular individual's case for promotion, reappointment, or tenure. In particular, in areas of the field where grants are common or possible, a record of grant-funded research will be taken as a significant mark of achievement. A record of excellence in research requires publications (book, journal articles, chapters) that are high quality with the number of published pieces being one that merits a judgment of outstanding by department peers and outside reviewers. A meritorious research record is one that includes a good number of publications but either fewer than is expected for a judgment of excellence or where outlets may be less prominent or the candidate may be second or third author in a large proportion of pieces. A record of below meritorious in research involves either scholarship that has clear limitations and/or a small number of publications.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

5. **Evaluation of Service.** A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college 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, reappointment, or tenure. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

Instructors

1. **Rules of the Regents.** Rules of the Regents, as given in the C.U. Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements for reappointment and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

With regard to both reappointment and promotion, the Department follows the guidelines specified in the Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty.

The University requires that instructors be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. According to University guidelines, evaluation for annual merit will be based upon the merit weighting defined at the time of appointment unless it is subsequently modified in writing. Instructors need to maintain currency in their area of teaching, and such currency should be demonstrated during the annual evaluation.

For the reappointment of instructors, the Department operates with a PUEC consisting of the entire Personnel Committee of tenured professors. By October of the final year of appointment, the instructor should submit a dossier of supporting materials that include a current c.v., statements of teaching and of service, and multiple measures of teaching effectiveness (as delineated below). The Department Chair will then write a letter summarizing the Personnel Committee's determinations and the instructor's record. That letter, along with the dossier, then go to the CMCI Dean's Office, where a final decision on reappointment is made, typically in the spring semester.

CU Boulder Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) guidelines state that Instructors will normally be considered for **promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor** after a period of six years of continuous appointment at the rank of Instructor at greater than 50% time. Up to three years' credit towards promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. The review for promotion should include a rigorous accounting of the candidate's teaching record, using multiple measures, an evaluation of the individual's service, and a demonstration of the individual's continued currency in the field.

A Senior Instructor may also be **nominated to become Teaching Professor**, which is not formally a promotion in rank (a Teaching Professor retains the rank of Senior Instructor) but rather a "working title" of honor. A Senior Instructor needs to hold that rank for a minimum of three years and demonstrate a record of distinction as an exemplary teacher and member of the university community. In OFA language, "A 'record of distinction' typically carries the expectation that the individual has made a major impact in the disciplinary unit and its students (e.g. on pedagogy and curriculum), one that likely extends to considerable impact on the campus generally and/or a role in national discussions." It is determined by multiple measures, such as those listed in the Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty.

2. **Allocation of Effort.** Each non-tenure track faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching and service. Allocations may vary among instructors as specifically stipulated in their contracts. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.
3. **Evaluation of Teaching.** In the first year after being appointed to a position as instructor or lecturer, faculty should create a file that will contain their written records pertaining to teaching. The file 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 file is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

- a. **Undergraduate teaching.** Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
3. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
4. examples of course outlines, syllabuses, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
5. descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
6. written "statements *that may* have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate 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 seem appropriate for a particular individual.

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. Faculty members are not required to use those mechanisms of self-improvement, but are encouraged to do so.

- b. **Graduate instruction.** In cases where an instructor is appointed to the graduate faculty, their work in advising, serving on graduate student committees, and/or graduate classroom instruction will also be taken into account for reappointment and promotion. Given the particular focus of instructor-rank faculty on undergraduate teaching, however, graduate instruction will in general be considered as an activity done above and beyond normal assigned teaching duties. However, instructors' duties may well include supervision or mentoring of graduate students in their roles as classroom teachers. To the extent that this mentorship falls under an instructor's assigned teaching duties (e.g. as Director of Public Speaking or instructor of record in a lecture course with graduate-student taught recitations), then it shall be considered under the heading of Teaching.

The questions to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Does the faculty member's performance achieve the standards of meritorious teaching as established through departmental norms of performance? Does it rise to the level of excellence as determined by those same norms of performance? A meritorious teaching record is one that evidences strong classroom teaching as demonstrated through multiple measures. A record of excellence in teaching consists of both strong classroom teaching and additional contributions to the educational mission of the Department, College, or campus as evidenced by some subset of the following: significant student mentoring of students outside the classroom; advising honors theses; contributions to course and curriculum development; contributions to the scholarship of learning and teaching (through e.g. work that improves teaching across multiple units, conference presentations or publications on pedagogical topics); and/or teaching awards. Less than meritorious teaching is made evident through a record of low student evaluations, problematic student letters, and peer observations, especially when paired with inattention to addressing areas of teaching weakness.

5. **Evaluation of Service.** A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service often extends beyond the

Department to include the candidate's work in CMCI and its centers, on the Boulder campus, to the academic discipline or professional societies, or professionally related service to communities or organizations outside the academy. 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 reappointment and promotion. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

The questions to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Does the faculty member's performance in service achieve the standards of meritorious as established through departmental norms of performance? Does it rise to the level of excellence as determined by those same norms of performance? Determinations are made with attention to the faculty member's service workload (e.g. a 40% service appointment would be expected to do considerably more than a 20% service appointment). A meritorious service record will be reflected in competent performance in the faculty member's service assignments over the contract period. Excellence in service would be reflected in some of the following ways: service performed outside the Department, including off-campus engagement that draws upon an instructor's expertise; leadership in service roles; and/or particularly impactful performance in assigned service roles (e.g. through mentoring in the role of course supervisor, engagement with a Residential Academic Program, or work conducted with a CMCI center).

Approved by the Department of Communication: 14 August, 1995: GAH

Revised 2/5/2014 kt

Revised 11/5/2014 kt

Revised 11/11/2015 kt

Draft revisions 3/19/18 pds

March 3, 2017

BYLAWS

**DEPARTMENT OF CRITICAL MEDIA PRACTICES
COLLEGE OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION (CMCI)**

APPROVED BY FACULTY DATE: March 3, 2017

APPROVED BY DEAN DATE _____

(To be Reviewed By Department Faculty By April 28, 2017)

I. General Policies.

1. Only tenured faculty may vote on comprehensive review, promotion, and tenure. On all other matters, tenure-track faculty and Instructors with a 100% appointment, of which at least 50% is in the department, may also vote.
2. Department meetings are held at least twice each semester. All faculty of whatever rank and percentage appointment are expected to attend. The Chair can call additional meetings as needed, as can the Executive Committee.
3. The Chair circulates an agenda at least one week before meetings, except in cases of personnel decisions or proposed Bylaws changes, when the notification period is three weeks. Any member may place an item on the agenda of a regular meeting by contacting the Chair at least a week in advance. Due to meeting time constraints the item may need to be discussed at the next faculty meeting. Matters requiring a vote must first be placed on the agenda.
4. For votes to be official, a quorum must be present. A quorum is the physical (not electronic) presence of a simple majority (i.e. greater than 50%) of voting members.
5. Faculty unable to attend a meeting may participate and vote via distance communication if a quorum is physically present. The same is true for faculty on leave. Whether on leave or not, any faculty member may vote by proxy. A proxy is a written vote submitted by a member who will not be present at the meeting. Proxy votes must be clearly labeled as such and given to the Chair prior to a vote. In matters involving a secret ballot, proxy votes will be counted by the Chair and remain secret to the rest of the voting faculty.
6. If there is disagreement or uncertainty about a procedure, Robert's Rules of Order applies except when these Bylaws establish procedures different from those in Robert's Rules, in which case the Bylaws take precedence (as Robert's Rules itself specifies).
7. Except as otherwise specified herein, matters brought to a vote are decided by a simple majority of votes cast, a quorum having been established. Before discussion begins on a matter requiring a vote, a motion must be made and seconded. At any time during the discussion a member may move the question (that is, move to close the discussion and vote). Such a motion must be seconded, is non-debatable, and requires a simple-majority vote to carry. If the Chair feels the discussion has been adequate, he or she may ask if the

members are ready to vote, in which case assent may be by consensus. The normal method for voting is by secret paper ballot. Faculty may request a show of hands to vote on minor issues. Requests for a secret ballot vote are automatically honored. In personnel matters, such as comprehensive review, promotion, and tenure, voting is always by secret paper ballot. The Chair will actively solicit votes on the following important matters by members not able to attend the meeting:

- Reappointment, tenure, and promotion
- Changes to the curriculum
- Proposed changes to the Bylaws.

8. The Chair may appoint a member of the faculty or staff as secretary to take minutes, identifying the subjects discussed, motions made, and tallies of votes taken. The secretary distributes the minutes by email to all faculty no more than a week after the meeting along with a call for additions or corrections. At the next meeting, the Chair quotes any proposed additions or corrections, calls for further additions or corrections, and entertains any resulting discussion. When the assembly is satisfied that the minutes are accurate, the Chair declares them approved by consensus. A complete set of approved minutes and agendas is kept on file in the Department main office and may be consulted by any member.

9. Faculty meetings shall be conducted in a civil manner, with all participants respecting their colleagues' rights to hold and express differing points of view in accordance with the CU Academic Affairs policies *Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs* (January 16, 2013). Sanctions for uncivil conduct may be applied as specified in Part IV, Section D of that document.

II. The Department Chair

1. Eligibility

The Chair must be a full-time, tenured faculty member, preferably at the rank of full professor and rostered in the Department. The term is three years. When practicable the Chairship will rotate among tenured faculty. Preferably no faculty member will serve as Chair for more than six consecutive years, two normal terms. He/she is eligible to succeed himself/herself through a formal election. Chairs are subject to a reappointment review by the Dean at the end of the term in accordance with the aforementioned Academic Affairs policies *Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs*. If the review is favorable, the Chair may stand for re-election. The position of Chair is an "employee-at-will" position. This means that the Chair's employment contract is subject to termination by either party to such a contract, Chair or Dean, at any time during the contract's term, and they shall be deemed to be an employee-at-will.

2. Election

The process for electing a Chair is governed by the Laws of the Regents. The first step, as stated in the Laws of the Regents, is that the faculty meets with the Dean to "discuss the needs and expectations of the department as they relate to the appointment of a new chair, the role of the chair, and the type of search (i.e., internal or external) that will most likely assure that an appropriate candidate is recommended, and to discuss any budgetary considerations related to the search for and appointment of a new chair." This meeting is arranged by the incumbent Chair.

Should an internal search be decided upon, the Executive Advisory Committee (defined

below) solicits nominations and sets a deadline. Tenured and tenure-track faculty and full-time (100% university appointment) Instructors are the eligible voters and hold a meeting for this purpose, called by the incumbent Chair. If the incumbent Chair is a candidate, he or she appoints a member of the Executive Advisory Committee to preside. Candidates may attend the meeting and address the group to make their case for election and answer any questions but must leave before the general discussion and vote. Voting is by secret ballot. Before leaving the meeting, candidates provide their secret ballot to the presiding faculty member. To be elected, a candidate must receive a simple majority of votes cast. If no candidate receives a simple majority, discussion and balloting continues until one candidate receives a simple majority. If the Dean does not concur with the department's choice, the Dean explains why and the department holds another election. If another election is not possible, the Dean consults with the faculty to appoint an interim Chair.

3. Responsibilities

The Chair's responsibilities are described in the Laws of the CU Regents, Appendix B: "Roles And Responsibilities of Department Chairs," and in Administrative Policy Statement #1026 from the Office of Policy and Efficiency. According to the Laws of the Regents, the Chair is responsible for "providing leadership toward the achievement of the highest possible level of excellence in the teaching, research, and service activities of the Program (Laws of the CU Regents, Appendix B: "Roles And Responsibilities of Department Chair). The Chair is specifically responsible for the following:

- The assignment of teaching and other duties within the program, including summer teaching (faculty are not required to teach in the summer)
- Preparation of the schedule of courses
- Preparation of the budget and administration of the financial affairs of the program
- Recommendation to the Dean of sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence
- Recruitment of staff and oversight and evaluation of their work
- Recruitment of temporary and part-time faculty
- Assignment of office space
- Support of faculty in their professional development
- Recruitment of new tenured and tenure-track faculty
- Evaluation of faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and for salary increases based on merit
- Appointment of faculty members to committees
- Creation and charging of *ad hoc* committees
- Management of departmental affairs in compliance with college and university policies and the Laws of the Regents

In performing these duties "the chair is expected to seek the advice of departmental faculty colleagues in a systematic way" (Laws of the CU Regents, Appendix B: Roles And Responsibilities of Department Chair).

4. Acting Chair

In consultation with the faculty, the Chair may recommend to the Dean an Acting Chair to serve during summer session. If the Chair goes on leave, an Acting Chair is elected according to the procedures in II.2 above.

5. Interim Chair

In consultation with the faculty, the Chair may recommend to the Dean an Interim Chair to

serve temporarily if the Chair is unable to serve for a brief period. If the Chair goes on leave, an Interim Chair is elected according to the procedures in II.2 above. Interim Chairs may, if circumstances warrant, come from a cognate department.

III. Associate Chairs

1. Appointment

In consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean, the Chair may appoint an Associate Chair of Graduate Studies and an Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Chairs must be tenured members.

2. Duties

Associate Chairs perform such duties as may be assigned by the Chair. Generally, an Associate Chair assists the Chair in maintaining and improving academic programs and promoting the general welfare of the students. Specific duties may include resolving student complaints; organizing and overseeing the mentoring of pre-tenure faculty as outlined in section V. below; assisting in the drafting of proposals, reports, reviews, and grant proposals; and serving as liaison with other programs and departments and with College and University offices and officers. Specific duties are detailed in letters of appointment.

3. Terms and Review

Associate Chairs are appointed for a two year term. Their performance is reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process.

IV. Committees

The Chair is assisted in the work of the Department by several standing committees designed to help the Department pursue its academic mission in an orderly and collegial fashion. The standing committees are the formal and systematic means through which the Chair seeks the advice of the faculty. Normally, committee elections are held in the spring. In accordance with the Laws of Regents, the Chair “has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the committees carry out their functions in an equitable, efficient, and timely manner.” (Laws of the CU Regents: Appendix B: Roles And Responsibilities Of Department Chairs.)

Curriculum Committee

In accordance with Board of Regents rules and university policy, “the faculty takes the lead in decisions concerning educational policy related to teaching, curriculum, research, academic ethics, and other academic matters” (Laws of Regents, Article 5.E.5 <https://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/article-05.html>). Therefore, the Curriculum Committee is responsible for oversight of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate the overall program, to review faculty proposals relating to curriculum, and to make recommendations to the faculty as a whole. The Curriculum Committee shall also review applications for admission to the CMDP graduate programs and make recommendations to the faculty, and will manage and oversee student applications and nominations for fellowships and awards. The committee shall be comprised of representatives from each rank, appointed at the initiation of the Executive Advisory Committee. The Chair and Associate Chairs for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies will serve on the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee will meet and make a report to the full faculty at least once per semester.

Executive Advisory Committee

The Executive Advisory Committee (EAC) advises the Chair on matters affecting the Department and its governance. In addition to the Chair, the EAC is composed of three faculty, one tenured, one tenure-track, and one Instructor with a 100% appointment of which at least 50% is in the department. The committee assists the Chair in such matters as hiring, including Instructors; preparing reports; creating agenda for department meetings; and nominating faculty for college and university awards. The committee keeps minutes and publishes them to the full faculty. The Chair convenes the EAC no less than three times a semester and distributes an agenda prior to the meeting. Members of the committee may place items on the agenda and request meetings on urgent matters.

Diversity Committee

The Diversity Committee is responsible for oversight of diversity in the Department. Its function is to develop, implement, and evaluate policies and activities to advance the university's and department's diversity goals, in consultation with departmental faculty. In the event of a shortage of available faculty members, this function may be performed by a single Diversity Coordinator, appointed by the Chair, in keeping with College policy, and will report back to the full faculty no less than once a semester.

Merit Committee

The Department Faculty members of the Merit Committee are elected each spring semester. Membership is, when practicable, rotated among the faculty each year. The main duty of this committee is to conduct yearly merit reviews for possible salary increments. It is comprised of a minimum of one Instructor with a 100% university appointment, one Assistant Professor, one Associate Professor, and one Full Professor. The Chair presides and is a voting member. To increase diversity and/or ensure representation of all ranks, the Chair, after consulting with the committee, may augment the committee by appointing, as needed, qualified tenured faculty from cognate units.

Faculty will review other faculty at their own rank. Additionally, tenured and non-tenured faculty and 100% Instructors will review faculty at the rank of Instructor. Members review faculty at their own rank or below—that is, Full Professor members review faculty at the rank of Full Professor and below; the tenured members review tenured faculty holding the same rank and, in addition, all non-tenured faculty; the non-tenured members review non-tenured faculty holding the same rank and below. This provision is designed to avoid conflicts of interests that may occur in matters of evaluation for reappointment and promotion and tenure.

Regent policy requires that each unit develop criteria for assessing annual merit. These criteria exist as a separate document. The Committee shall be guided by these criteria. Committee members shall leave the room when their own merit review is conducted and shall not refer in any way to their own case during discussions of other cases. Decisions are made by a simple-majority vote. If a faculty member disagrees with a merit rating, he or she may appeal the rating to the Chair, in which case the Chair takes it to the committee for reconsideration. Faculty may comment on their rating in a statement appended to the rating form.

In consultation with the Merit Committee, the Chair translates merit ratings into recommendations for salary adjustments in each individual case and conveys these

recommendations to the Dean. If the committee or the Chair detects inequity, the inequity may, insofar as possible, be corrected by the Chair and/or Dean. The Dean conducts the Chair's own merit review.

Salary disputes involving alleged inequity may be appealed to the campus Salary Equity Appeals Committee. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs chairs the committee. (For details, see the Faculty Affairs website.)

Post-Tenure Review Committee

The Department views post-tenure review as a process supporting professional development. In consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, the Chair appoints a committee for each person being reviewed. It is comprised of two members of the tenured faculty at or above that person's rank. To ensure representation of the appropriate tenured faculty ranks, the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, may appoint, as the second member, a qualified tenured faculty from a cognate unit. Before the review, the Chair meets with each faculty member undergoing review to discuss his or her required Professional Plan. The committee reviews the faculty member in a manner consistent with the policy and process described on the Faculty Affairs website. The results are communicated in writing to the faculty member and discussed with the faculty member in a meeting with the Chair. During the year in which a faculty member is undergoing post-tenure review, he or she may not serve on a Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Grievance Committee

In consultation with the faculty, the Chair appoints a Grievance Committee in the spring semester. The committee is composed of three faculty: one tenured, one tenure-track, and one 100% university appointment Instructor. The committee follows the procedure outlined in Section VIII ("Grievances") of this document and meets as necessary.

Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair may form, appoint members to, and charge *ad hoc* committees as needed and when appropriate will consult with the Executive Advisory Committee about such committees. All tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as Instructors with 100% appointment, are eligible to serve. Where practicable, membership on *ad hoc* committees will include at least one full professor, one associate professor, and one assistant professor. *Ad hoc* committees will dissolve upon completion of their charge.

External Advisory Committee

In consultation with the Executive Advisory Committee, the Chair may appoint an External Advisory Committee of tenured faculty from cognate units as a non-voting group providing advice to the Chair and advocating for the Department. Members will serve for a one-year renewable term.

V. Mentoring of Pre-Tenure Faculty

The Department recognizes mentoring of pre-tenure faculty as important service and a valuable contribution to overall academic excellence and success. A Lead Mentor is appointed annually by the Chair to assist with this process. The Lead Mentor is a tenured faculty member from the Department or a cognate unit. He or she meets individually with all new faculty in their first semester to establish a tentative mentoring plan that suits the faculty member's interests with regard to research / creative work, teaching, and service and to identify a tenured faculty member from the Department or a cognate unit to serve as

mentor. The initial mentoring plan may be revised at any time by agreement among the mentor, the mentee, and the Lead Mentor.

A mentor is most broadly defined as a trusted teacher or counselor. In a university context, a mentor provides career-development advice and assistance for a pre-tenure faculty member. Mentors help mentees acclimate to university life, offering information about the explicit and implicit aspects of surviving and thriving as a scholar and teacher. They also aid in learning about campus resources and opportunities, understanding departmental and institutional policies and procedures on tenure and promotion, balancing professional and personal responsibilities, and networking both within the university and the profession at large.

Pre-tenure faculty meet with their mentor at least once each semester to discuss all three components of the job: research / creative work, teaching, and service. The mentor makes specific recommendations for success in all three areas. The content of the mentoring sessions is kept confidential. Mentors or mentees may request a new pairing should the initial pairing be unsuccessful or incompatible. If this situation arises, both parties agree to a “no-fault” dissolution, in which case the Lead Mentor, in consultation with the mentee, pairs him or her with a new mentor.

Each pre-tenure faculty member meets with the Lead Mentor at least annually to ensure the integrity of the mentoring process, address any concerns, and suggest changes in the mentoring process if needed. (Additional mentoring resources may be found on the Faculty Affairs website.)

VI. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Candidates for reappointment are evaluated by the tenured faculty; candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure by tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor; candidates for promotion to Professor by tenured faculty holding the rank of Professor.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

In consultation with the tenured faculty, the Chair appoints a three-person primary-unit evaluation committee (PUEC) from among tenured faculty of rank higher than that of the candidate being reviewed. To ensure representation of the appropriate faculty ranks, the Chair may, in consultation with the faculty under review and with the approval of the Dean, augment the committee with qualified tenured faculty from cognate units.

In accordance with University requirements, the department has established a separate document stating the department's criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Those criteria must guide the evaluation. In addition, the PUEC must be guided by the general policies and procedures detailed on the Faculty Affairs web site. The PUEC coordinates and reviews the case, votes on a recommendation, and reports its vote and the basis for it to the tenured faculty, who discuss and vote on PUEC's recommendation. In each case, only tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the candidate's may vote. A vote breakdown is required as to whether or not tenure should be awarded on the basis of excellence, meritorious, or less than meritorious productivity in the areas of teaching, research, and service. There must be a minimum voting membership of at least five eligible faculty members. Supplementing the voting membership of the primary unit requires the review and approval of the Dean. (Faculty Affairs website)

The Chair reports the vote of the PUEC and the tenured faculty to the department and to the Dean and forwards to the Dean the appropriate documentation and the Chair's own recommendation.

VII. Recruitment of New Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty

The Chair appoints a search committee and committee chair for new tenured or tenure-track appointments and may augment the committee with no more than two qualified tenured faculty from cognate units. In consultation with the committee, the Chair advertises the position(s) in the appropriate venues.

The Chair, the committee, and any member of the faculty may solicit letters of application. The committee sifts the applications and arrives at a list of candidates to be interviewed by phone or video. Before conducting these preliminary interviews, the committee shares the CVs and letters of application with the tenured and tenure-track faculty and solicits their opinions and advice.

On the basis of preliminary phone/video interviews, the committee presents to the tenured and tenure-track faculty a slate of acceptable candidates—at least five if possible, and in priority order—and requests that the tenured and tenure-track faculty study the CVs and letters of application. At least a week should be allowed for perusal of this material. In a meeting called by the Chair, the tenured and tenure-track faculty decides by discussion and simple-majority vote which ones to invite to campus for an interview and presentation (“job talk”).

With the Dean’s concurrence, the Chair arranges the visits. Candidates invited to visit must submit, at least a week before the visit, samples of research/creative work and evidence of success in teaching for perusal by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

After the visits, the tenured and tenure-track faculty meet to rank the candidates on the basis of their overall record and on-campus performance. The ranking is by secret ballot. In collaboration with the Dean, the Chair negotiates with the first-ranked candidate and extends a written offer. If that candidate declines, the Chair negotiates with the next-ranked candidate, and so forth. If the entire slate fails, the Chair may either declare the search a failure or return the matter to the search committee for new recommendations.

For a member of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to receive a ballot for voting on the finalists, he or she must attend each candidate’s campus interview and / or presentation (“job talk”).

VIII. Grievances

Informal Resolution

A faculty member with a complaint must make a reasonable effort to resolve the complaint through direct discussion with the other party or parties involved. If that effort is unsuccessful, all parties should together take the matter to the Chair for another attempt at informal resolution before petitioning for formal action by the Department.

Informal resolution may be facilitated by the Faculty Ombudsperson or the Director of Faculty Relations. If the grievance cannot be resolved informally, the grievant may use the formal process described below.

Formal Resolution

If a grievance cannot be resolved by informal means, the complainant may submit a formal grievance petition to the Chair. The grievance must be of a substantive nature, involving alleged policy violations. It must be submitted in writing within fourteen working days of the last attempt at informal resolution.

The formal petition must cite the specific Department, College, or University policy alleged to have been violated or inappropriately applied and explain how it has been violated or misapplied. The burden of proof is on the grievant. Upon receipt of the petition, the Chair convenes the Grievance Committee.

In a meeting within ten working days from receipt of the formal grievance, the Grievance Committee meets to review the grievance and any supporting documentation and interview the parties involved. If a member of the Grievance Committee has a conflict of interest, he or she shall recuse himself or herself. In the event of recusal, the remaining members, in consultation with the Executive Advisory Committee, appoint a replacement from the tenured faculty. The committee makes a written recommendation to the Chair within 15 working days of its first meeting. The Chair reviews the recommendation and makes his or her decision known to all parties within ten working days from receiving the committee's report.

Within ten working days from receipt of the Chair's decision, any of the parties involved may appeal to the CMCI Faculty Council Grievance and Appeal Committee. The appeal must be submitted in writing and specify the basis of the appeal. The written decision of the Grievance and Appeal Committee shall be communicated to all parties.

Appeal to the Dean and Beyond

If any of the parties involved are still dissatisfied, they may appeal to the Dean. If the Dean's ruling does not satisfy all parties, any of them may take the complaint to a higher level and should check with Faculty Affairs to determine the appropriate path. It may include Faculty Assembly, Graduate Dean, Provost, Chancellor, and/or President. At all levels of review, those in authority may employ such procedures as they deem appropriate for resolving the grievance, such as referring the matter to the University Ombudsperson or the Director of Faculty Relations for mediation if that step has not been taken previously.

(If a faculty member has a dispute with or complaint about the Chair, he or she must, as a first step toward resolution, attempt resolution by direct discussion with the Chair and/or request mediation by the university Ombuds Office and/or the Office of Faculty Relations. If such attempts at informal resolution fail and the grievant wishes to pursue the matter, he or she must submit a formal complaint to the Dean. The complaint must be of a substantive nature, be in writing, and must cite the specific Department, College, or University policy. The burden of proof is on the grievant. If the Dean's decision fails to satisfy either or both parties, the Dean may, at his or her discretion, advise the parties how to pursue the matter further within the University system.)

All matters pertaining to the grievance and its adjudication shall be kept strictly confidential.

IX. Professional Conduct

The Department observes high ethical standards, guided both by the *AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics* and CU's *Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs* (January 16, 2013).

Every faculty member has professional obligations and expectations deriving from membership in a community of teachers and scholars. Prominent among these is collegiality, which includes civility, mutual respect, common courtesy, personal accountability, and willing contribution to the effective functioning of the unit. Every faculty member shall respect and defend free inquiry; show due respect for the opinions of others in every exchange of criticism and ideas; acknowledge academic debt; maintain fairness and objectivity in evaluating colleagues and staff members; refrain from discrimination against or harassment of colleagues or staff members; respect the privacy of colleagues and staff members; accept the responsibility of faculty for the governance of the institution; and, when speaking or acting as a private person, avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for the University. (Modeled on 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics, as revised 1987). CU's *Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs* establishes similar expectations and specifies possible sanctions.

X. Service

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to engage in service to the Department; to respond in a timely manner to any request for service; and to deliver in a timely manner any service-related documents such as reports, evaluations, and the like, whether for the Department, the College, or the University. Instructors and adjuncts may also be asked to help the Department through service.

XI. Amendments to Bylaws

The Executive Advisory Committee will review the Bylaws annually and bring proposed amendments to the faculty for discussion and a vote. In addition, any faculty member may propose amendments. In either case, a notice of motion must be sent to the faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which it is to be considered. Amendment requires a simple majority of votes cast. A complete revision of the bylaws requires a two-thirds majority of votes cast.

XII. Statement of Compliance

The Department complies with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the Regents of the University of Colorado and the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Policy and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
Department of Critical Media Practices
9/14/2015

General Principles

These policies and procedures are subject to the laws and actions of the Regents and other pertinent governing bodies and subject to any agreed-upon differentiated expectations for individual faculty regarding research / creative work, teaching, and service.

All evaluations observe the core values of The College of Media, Communication and Information (CMCI) and especially its emphasis on interdisciplinary and collaborative work. Public engagement, international activities and initiatives, technological innovation and sharing, and other special kinds of professional activity are accorded full parity with traditional scholarly or creative work when such parity can be successfully demonstrated. (For examples of publicly engaged scholarly and creative work, see Appendix 2). A faculty member may choose to emphasize either scholarly or creative work or to engage in both and may also choose public engagement as a major emphasis in scholarship, or creativity, or both. In any case, there must be evidence of substantial achievement and active and continuing engagement. In evaluating the three areas of research / creative work, teaching, and service, the department considers the type of work, its quantity, and its quality and assigns the most importance to quality. In all three areas, work should be appropriate to the faculty member's current or developing interests and expertise and must be of high caliber and recognized by peers (and, if appropriate, by the public) as such.

Productivity in scholarly research can consist of such things as books (including edited books and textbooks); book chapters; journal articles; anthology essays; encyclopedia articles; reviews; curatorial projects; and / or papers and lectures presented at scholarly conferences, at other universities, and / or in broadcasts or other public forums. In assessing research, the department may draw on any applicable sources, including evaluations solicited from experts, published reviews (if available), and newspaper and other media coverage (if available). Generally, dissemination that has passed peer review counts more, and online dissemination counts equally with print, with peer-reviewed, again, generally counting more. All publication and other productivity since completion of the highest degree count toward reappointment, promotion, and tenure, with the expectation that significant new work will be presented for each new review.

In creative work, productivity can consist of dissemination via appropriate venues and activities such as journals devoted to creative work, exhibitions, screenings, and performances. Exhibiting, presenting, or performing is treated as equivalent to refereed publication so long as it takes place in appropriate venues such as museums, galleries, festivals, art centers, or public cultural events. In assessing both traditional and non-traditional venues and activities, the department considers the reputation or importance of the venues as determined by experts, evaluations solicited from experts and / or the knowledgeable public, published reviews (if available), newspaper and other media coverage (if available), and so on. For reasons explained in Appendix 1, exhibitions, presentations, and performances of the same creative work in separate venues and on

separate occasions are counted as separate events equivalent to a new scholarly publication. As with scholarship, all creative productivity since completion of the highest degree counts toward reappointment, promotion, and tenure, with the expectation that significant new work will be presented for each new review.

In addition to these general principles, the department applies its own adaptation of the University Film and Video Association's statement "The Evaluation of Faculty in Creative Specialties for Promotion and Tenure" (Appendix 1) and is guided as appropriate by the aforementioned "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University (Appendix 2).

Specific Criteria

The University's "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, and Promotion" (hereinafter "Standards") establish guidelines for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. For tenure-track reappointment ("The Comprehensive Review"), the "Standards" are general: a candidate must demonstrate that he or she is on track to meet the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In this department, being "on track" means, at the least, some research and / or creative work already disseminated, with substantial research and / or creative work in progress and evidence of success in teaching as evidenced by student input such as FCQs and peer class observations. There should also be evidence of service. For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the "Standards" require "demonstrated excellence" in research / creative work or teaching (or both) and meritorious performance in the remaining category or categories—for example, excellence in research / creative work, meritorious performance in teaching, and meritorious performance in service. For promotion to Full Professor, the "Standards" require excellence in the record as a whole.

Within these general guidelines, the "Standards" leave it to each department to define "meritorious performance" and "demonstrated excellence." Our definitions follow.

Meritorious Performance

1. Meritorious performance in research primarily means active and significant dissemination such as publishing with research presses or in scholarly journals. It can also mean delivering talks and papers at conferences or other universities and / or engaging in public scholarship as described in Appendix 2. In addition, applying for grants or fellowships or being nominated for significant research awards counts as evidence of active engagement, and receiving a major award or grant or fellowship as evidence substantial achievement.

2. Meritorious performance in creative work likewise means active and significant dissemination, which can take such forms as presentations, performances, exhibitions, screenings, notable readings of creative writing, or other sharing with peers or the public locally, nationally or internationally. As with research, applying for grants or fellowships or being nominated for significant awards counts as evidence of active engagement and receiving a major award or grant or fellowship as evidence of substantial achievement.

3. Meritorious performance in teaching normally means favorable review by both peers and students. Typically, peers will review a statement by the candidate of his or her teaching philosophy and plans for developing as a teacher; the candidate's

classroom performance (by means of classroom observation;) FCQ's and narrative evaluations solicited from students; and the work produced by the candidate's students. There should also be broad and substantial success in supervising theses, dissertations, and / or independent study, developing new course content and methods, contributing to curricular development, and advising and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students. Finally, there should be evidence of professional development such as, for example, leading or participating in teaching-effectiveness workshops.

4. Meritorious performance in service normally means serving on departmental or university committees recognized by faculty peers as active and significant (election or appointment to a committee will not in itself be regarded as meritorious). It also means engaging successfully in external service, such as serving on juries or selection committees or on the editorial board of an academic journal or as a reader for a press or as an external evaluator in tenure or promotion cases. It can also mean engaging successfully in public service or outreach. In all cases there should be evidence of broad and substantial achievement and not simply participation.

Demonstrated Excellence

1. Demonstrated excellence in research means, first of all, meeting the requirements for "meritorious." In addition, it is expected that the candidate will have disseminated, on average, at least one major piece of research per year: a peer-reviewed scholarly article or its equivalent. At tenure review, faculty conducting mainly scholarly work are normally expected to have at least one scholarly book published and in hand or to have disseminated an equivalent amount of demonstrably well received research in such forms as articles or book chapters. A book published by a major commercial press will be considered equivalent to a scholarly book, as will a major annotated bibliography, a major exhibition catalog, or other work that the departmental review judges to be equivalent.

2. Demonstrated excellence in creative work means, first of all, meeting the requirements for "meritorious." In addition, it is expected that at tenure review a faculty member engaged mainly in creative work will have the creative equivalent of a book, which could be one major and substantial creative work in any genre or the total of creative works since the award of the highest degree so long as the total includes substantial new work since the last review. It is also expected that the candidate's body of work will have achieved national and, ideally, international recognition as demonstrated by published reviews and / or peer-reviews.

3. Demonstrated excellence in teaching means, first of all, meeting the requirements for "meritorious." In addition, both peer review and student review should be strongly favorable, and the dossier should evince transformative success in all of the following: publishing or otherwise disseminating significant and substantial scholarly or creative work on teaching; originating and developing new course content and methods; originating and developing curricular improvement at both the departmental and the university level; supervising theses, dissertations, and / or independent study; and advising graduate or undergraduate students.

4. Demonstrated excellence in service means successful leadership (not just participation) in most and ideally all the possibilities for "meritorious."

Records Divided Between Research and Creative Work

When a candidate's record is divided between research and creative work, the candidate should be able to meet the standards for "meritorious" or "excellent," as the case may be, with research alone, or creative work alone, or with a combination that in the judgment of peers meets the requirements as a combination. As in all other cases, the department considers both quantity and quality, assigning the most weight to quality.

Appendix 1

Evaluating Research and Creative Work

In addition to the criteria mentioned above for evaluating research / creative work, the department will be guided as appropriate by its own adaptation of the University Film and Video Association's statement "The Evaluation of Faculty in Creative Specialties for Promotion and Tenure." The original is available at <http://www.ufva.org/resources/policy-statement-on-faculty-evaluation>. The department's adaptation is as follows.

Parity of Research and Creative Work

Consideration for academic promotion and tenure traditionally involves evaluating the candidate's contribution in research/creative work, teaching, and service. Since procedures for evaluating creative work are generally less well established than those for evaluating research, this statement offers additional methods for ensuring equivalence.

Creative work should be fully accepted as part of the faculty evaluation process when such work is appropriate to faculty interests. The fine arts, among other disciplines, have established clear precedents. Exhibitions of paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs, etc., are accepted as evidence of professional contributions in the visual arts. Musical compositions, recitals, and solo performances are accepted in the field of music. Creative writing, choreography, directing and designing plays and dance performances are likewise accepted as evidence of faculty contributions in other creative fields. Building on these precedents, our department not only accepts but encourages creative work relevant to our mission, including work whose relevance has not before been recognized but becomes apparent in the work itself and / or in the artist's explanation of it.

Comparison of Criteria for Evaluating Research and Creative Work

Over the years a clear set of criteria has evolved for evaluating scholarly publications. Value and importance can be determined by the prestige of the publisher, the pre-publication comments of peer reviewers, and post-publication reviews. Articles are sometimes judged on the basis of the reputation of the journal in which they appear, with articles in refereed journals traditionally given more weight. Journals, refereed or not, can be rated on the basis of their reputations, the reputations of their editors and peer evaluators, and their acceptance rate. Invitations to write for a noted journal or anthology or encyclopedia can be viewed as recognition of status within a specialization.

Creative works can be evaluated in similar ways but with some caveats. They can, for example, vary greatly in length, and so lengthiness should not be taken as ipso facto evidence of value or importance. A faculty member might be involved in the production

of a feature-length dramatic film, a half-hour documentary, or a three-minute animated work. Many possibilities exist. Length can be significant but is not in itself an indication of value or quality or the skill and effort required to complete the project. A short experimental video or multimedia production might require more time and effort than a relatively straightforward hour-long documentary. When peers evaluate creative work, it is important that they consider, in addition to quality, both the skill and the effort required. Their task may be analogous to that of judging the importance of a multi-year study in the social sciences: such a study might require many years of effort, yet result in an article of only modest length.

Joint Authorship and Collaborative Creation

Instances of joint authorship occur in traditional scholarship. In such cases it is sometimes appropriate to establish the contribution of each author if the work is included in a promotion or tenure dossier. Because creative works are likewise sometimes collaborative, it can be useful to know how much each contributor contributed. In some cases, one contributor will have had almost total responsibility. In others, his/her role might have been that of writer or editor. It can be appropriate to give varying levels of credit for varying levels of responsibility.

In cases of shared responsibility, it is best to rely on testimony from the contributors or, if appropriate, on that of experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual's contribution when individual roles need to be sorted out for whatever reason. At the same time, it is important to recognize that in some cases it might be impossible to determine the exact contribution of each collaborator and undesirable even to try. Sometimes, the most successful collaborations involve a true melding of minds and skills so that the collaborators speak with a combined voice at once farther reaching and more significant than they could have mustered as individuals. In other words, some successful collaborations have to be done as collaborations or not at all, and in such cases it is conceivable that each collaborator could receive credit for the whole work. Such indissoluble collaboration can happen in creative work just as surely as in scholarly undertakings. The reality of such indissoluble collaboration and the need to recognize it as such when it exists is eloquently stated in David Damrosch's book *We Scholars*, where Damrosch points out:

In every field known to me, there are seminal works of joint authorship—certainly a small minority of work in most fields, but fully sufficient to show that the thing can be done. The prefaces to these works regularly testify to their authors' pleasure in formulating their ideas together and redrafting chapters in light of each other's comments. The resulting work may either retain their differing voices or else blend them. René Wellek and Austin Warren, for example, wrote in the preface to the first edition of their *Theory of Literature* that their book was "a real instance of collaboration in which the author is the shared agreement between two writers."

Such indissoluble collaboration needs to be recognized when it exists and treated as a special case in which each collaborator receives credit for the entire work. Collaborative work is, after all, a primary goal of the CMCI and of this department, and recognizing the possibility of indissoluble collaboration is one way of encouraging and welcoming truly collaborative work.

Dissemination and Evaluation

Public showings or performances of creative work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, on the model of the well-established precedent of accepting a musical recital for a knowledgeable audience as the equivalent of publication. Certain forms of creative work—film, video, music, multimedia—can be disseminated and adjudicated in festival competitions. Many festivals have rigorous selection procedures. Selection of creative work for a festival having a good reputation can be considered an indication of quality. Festivals can be of local, regional, national, or international importance, and some local festivals can be more important or influential than some national or international festivals. Because the reputation of festivals is not static, it is important for the festival's current reputation to be specified if a festival presentation is a part of a promotion and tenure dossier.

The quality of creative work may also be indicated by awards bestowed upon it. In evaluating the importance of an award or prize, it is important to consider the reputation of the awarding body and, if appropriate, the size of any cash award, while keeping in mind that some cashless awards can be just as significant, or more so, than some that come with cash.

Sometimes museums, media-art centers, and universities invite showings or performances of creative work, and these customarily include in-person appearances where the artist introduces the work and responds to questions, comments, and criticisms. Such presentations should be considered the equivalent of a scholarly paper presented for discussion at a conference or other academic setting, with due attention to the reputation and prestige of the body inviting the presentation.

Multiple presentations or screenings or performances of the same creative work for different audiences and on different occasions should be considered separate creative acts equivalent to separate scholarly publications and not the mere equivalent of a scholarly reprint. In the case of reprints of books or articles, the original printing is often still available through libraries, and so an unrevised scholarly reprint, while not without value, generally will not have a value fully equivalent to that of the original. With creative works not available in multiple locales, each showing or performance makes the work available to a new audience and thus should be counted as a separate creative act.

Distribution Agencies

Creative works are sometimes disseminated through distribution agencies or companies. Some distributors are highly selective, and the inclusion of a work within their inventory can be an indication of quality. However, most film and video distributors are commercial, and the exclusion of a faculty member's work from such distribution is not necessarily an indication of little or no value. Faculty works have to compete for such distribution with works by individuals whose careers are exclusively dedicated to creative production and to monetary gain from it. Hence, commercial distribution can be a mark of quality but absence of it should not be taken negatively.

Sources of Written Evaluations

Meaningful reviews of creative work appear in scholarly and professional publications, library publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. In evaluating

such reviews, the status of the reviewer and the reputation of the periodical are important. Some professional associations, including the University Film and Video Association, regularly provide written evaluations of works selected for showing at their conventions. The judges of some festivals will often provide written critiques, if requested.

Letters evaluating creative work can be requested from experts at museums, media centers, colleges and universities, and institutions at which the work has been shown. As in the case of scholarly reviews, it is important to consider the reputation of the individual or institution doing the evaluation.

Fairness of Peer Evaluation

It is important that peer evaluators, both internal and external, be knowledgeable about and sympathetic toward the type of work completed by the faculty member. For instance, an evaluator whose sole interest is narrative film should not be asked to evaluate an experimental video work. In some cases an institution might wish to include non-academic professionals as external peer evaluators. It must be remembered, however, that non-academic professionals may not be attuned to the requirements of the promotion and tenure process. If they are included, they should be carefully instructed in the goals, methods, and expectations of the review.

Conclusion

In sum, creative work, like scholarly publication, should undergo both external and internal peer review with due attention to its similarities to and differences from scholarly work. It should never be regarded as ipso facto inferior to scholarly work. Even though precedents exist for evaluating creative work, methods may sometimes have to be invented during the review to accommodate any unique or controversial aspects of the work under review. In other words, the review itself may need to become creative in order to fairly assess unique or experimental or controversial work. Such challenges should be welcomed with the goal of according creative work full parity with scholarly publication.

Appendix 2

Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Work

The department defines publicly engaged research / creative work as the creation of knowledge and / or understanding about, for, and with public communities through the production of artifacts and experiences of intellectual and / or artistic value—a definition adapted from pages 1 and 6 of Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (2008). That document follows in this appendix and is used as appropriate by the department to guide both faculty who wish to pursue publicly engaged work and evaluators charged with judging the value of that work. As in other areas, the department values quality more than quantity, although quantity should of course be substantial and in keeping with expectations for other types of research / creative work. Faculty who present publicly engaged work prepare a dossier that contains an introductory statement describing the work, establishes its originality, relates it to one or more fields, explains its role in the candidate's own development, and documents its contributions to the public good. The dossier also presents evidence of public and / or scholarly dissemination and presents the work itself by whatever appropriate means (photographs, videos, links to web sites or other online reproductions, and so on). As in

other cases, the department uses external reviewers as one means of evaluation and also draws on any other relevant sources such as reviews, citations, and interviews with organizers and participants.

Because publicly engaged work has only recently come to be nationally valued in tenure and promotion cases, procedures are still being standardized at universities that do so recognize it. In other words, precedents and models are not always readily available. For this reason, a good deal of responsibility rests with the candidate for creating a substantial and persuasive dossier. Guidance is available from Ellison and Eatman in the following report and from the department and the review committee, all of which recognize that every case may be unique.

Appendix 3
Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University (2008)

Addendum
Approved by Faculty 12-8-17

**Department of Critical Media Practices
Reappointment of Instructor-Rank Faculty**

According to the **“Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty”** (Approved in Dean’s Council, 29 March 2011 Approved by Provost Moore, 29 March 2011, Revised, 1 June 2017):

“Instructors will be reviewed every year as part of the annual merit process and must undergo a formal review for reappointment before the end of their final year of appointment, preferably in the first semester of that year. The unit should establish the criteria for successful reappointment, which should include an evaluation of teaching and other duties. In most cases, reappointments of instructors will be for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that would result in either a multi-year reappointment or non-reappointment.”

For the campus the criteria for evaluation are defined by the terms of the initial contract. A typical workload for instructor-ranked faculty would be 80% teaching, 10% research/scholarly work, and 10% service, but individual workload assignments may vary both within and between units. Upon successful review, an Instructor is eligible for reappointment for periods of one to three years.

The department is charged with evaluating the record as contained within a dossier submitted by the Instructor. The evaluation examines performance in teaching, service and—where applicable – research/creative work. The evaluation is calibrated to the expectations established by the most recent letter of appointment or reappointment.

Teaching is evaluated using multiple measures—not just FCQs but also such measures as peer review of classroom performance and of work produced by students. Other activities that count as teaching include participating in advising and mentoring such as supervising theses, dissertations, and/or independent study; developing new course content and methods; contributing to curricular development; participating in workshops to improve teaching; organizing and conducting field trips; teaching within the community; curating student exhibitions; publishing student work on-line and off-line; and publishing about pedagogy. The department considers co-teaching a valuable contribution to pedagogy as well.

Service normally means serving on departmental, college or university committees recognized by faculty peers as significant. It may also mean serving in an administrative position such as Associate Chair For Undergraduate Studies; engaging successfully in external service (such as serving on juries or selection committees); serving on the editorial board of an academic journal or as a reader for a press; mentoring other instructors in teaching or research; or engaging successfully in public service or outreach.

Research is understood as publishing with research presses or in scholarly journals; delivering talks and papers at conferences or other universities; creating scholarly projects using emergent technology; engaging in public scholarship; applying for fellowships or grants or receiving them; or being nominated for or receiving an award. Evidence of active research also includes work in progress.

Creative work is likewise understood to include active dissemination, which in this case can take such forms as presentations, performances, exhibitions, screenings, readings of creative writing, creative projects created and distributed utilizing emergent technologies, or other sharing with peers or the public locally, regionally, nationally or internationally. As with research, applying for fellowships or grants or receiving them, being nominated for or receiving an award, or showing evidence of work in progress counts as active engagement. Instructors may choose to emphasize either scholarly or creative work, or to engage in both, and may also choose public engagement as a major emphasis in scholarship, or creativity, or both. To receive Graduate Faculty membership, Instructors are required to provide evidence of their activity in research/creative work.

In evaluating all three areas (teaching, service, and research/creative work), the department considers the type of work, its quantity, and its quality and assigns the most importance to quality. Evaluation may also include the impact of the research/creative work, the standing of collaborators (if appropriate), and the status of the venue/format for which the work was presented. In all cases, instructors should provide appropriate information in their dossier. The more information about an activity, such as its significance or impact, the more likely it is to receive appropriate consideration

A positive recommendation for reappointment means that the Instructor has received an overall evaluation of "meets expectations" or better. Instructors who meet expectations are those judged to have performed their duties, as outlined in their appointment or reappointment letter, in such a way as to have made competent and worthwhile contributions to the program.

Senior Instructors

Instructors are normally considered for promotion to Senior Instructor seven years of continuous appointment at greater than 50% time. Up to three years credit towards promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial

appointment. Promotion after seven years is not mandatory, nor is it a right. Instructors promoted to Senior Instructor will have achieved a level of accomplishment sufficient to be judged as superior or better in teaching, service, and – if applicable – research/creative work. The department deems “superior” in this context, to mean that the quality of an instructors’ performance has been judged to excel and demonstrate continued growth and competency in the areas of review. Instructors promoted to Senior Instructor continue to be “at-will” employees as defined by Colorado Statute and University policy.

For promotion to Senior Instructor or reappointment as Senior Instructor, a candidate should exemplify all the traits necessary for “meets expectations” (as described above) and, in addition, present evidence of teaching expertise of value beyond the primary unit (campus-wide or nationally/internationally). This level of achievement can be documented through, for example, publication of textbooks, leadership in campus-wide educational programs, and/or leadership in pedagogical societies or educational arms of professional societies.

Further information regarding evaluation and promotion to Senior Instructor is available at: <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/node/426/attachment>

Teaching Professor Promotion and Review

According to campus policy, after a minimum of three years at the rank of Senior Instructor, those who have been exemplary teachers and members of the university community may be considered for the title of “Teaching Professor.” This title will be given to a limited number of Senior Instructors to recognize a record of distinction. A Teaching Professor still holds the rank and position of Senior Instructor, which is a non-tenure-track faculty position. Senior Instructors normally hold a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline, and Teaching Professors must hold an appropriate terminal degree. Appointments may range from less than 50% to fulltime.

To determine whether a Senior Instructor should be named Teaching Professor, a faculty committee examines the entire record for evidence of overall distinction, looking especially for evidence of leadership and innovation. Multiple measures of exemplary performance are used. A “record of distinction” typically carries the expectation that the individual has made a major impact on the unit and its students (e.g. on pedagogy and curriculum), one that likely extends to considerable impact on the campus generally and/or plays a role in national discussions.

More information on the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Teaching Professors can be found here: <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/node/426/attachment>

Review for Reappointment

Review for reappointment occurs preferably during the first semester of the final year of appointment. An Instructor undergoing review submits to the department Chair a

dossier containing the following materials, which are then evaluated by a primary-unit committee:

- Current vita
- A statement on teaching
- A statement on service
- A statement on research/creative work, if applicable
- A teaching portfolio that includes all course syllabi and may also include other documentation such as sample assignments and student achievements
- FCQ reports for all courses taught
- Any additional materials the candidate may wish to submit

In most cases, reappointments of Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors are for more than one year and may be for up to three years. However, when a reappointment review results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment will be permitted; during the course of that year, another evaluation should take place that results in either a three-year reappointment or non-reappointment.

The departmental review process is as follows:

- In the final year of the reappointment, preferably at the start of the first semester, the candidate submits the above materials to the Chair in the form of a dossier
- The Chair solicits letters from students and peer reviews of teaching and adds them to the dossier. At least one peer review should be from a member of the tenured and tenure track (TTT) faculty.
- The Chair appoints a Primary Review Committee composed of TTT faculty and which may also include a Senior Instructor.
- The committee's recommendation letter is placed in the dossier. If there are recommendations regarding changing the Instructor's workload percentage, this would be included in this letter.
- The TTT faculty and Senior Instructors review the dossier and vote on reappointment.
- The Chair writes a letter of recommendation to the Dean which includes a report of the faculty's vote and adds the letter to the dossier.
- The Chair shares the Chair's letter and the letter from the review committee with the candidate. Within five days of receiving these letters, the candidate may provide a letter and/or appropriate materials commenting on the review to the Chair. After which time the Chair forwards the dossier to the Dean.

According to campus policy, "If an instructor feels s/he has been denied reappointment unfairly, by a process that has been arbitrary, capricious, retaliatory,

inconsistent with the treatment of peers in similar circumstances, or based on personal malice, s/he can appeal the non-renewal.” More information about the grievance process can be found here: <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/node/426/attachment>

Full Formal Review

According to campus policy, after the first six years as a Senior Instructor or Teaching Professor, the faculty member undergoes a full formal review by the department. If the faculty member continues to be employed, reviews then alternate between expedited reviews and full formal reviews. The six-year timeline and the comprehensiveness of the full formal review are analogous to post-tenure review for tenured faculty. A faculty committee conducts the review.

For additional information, all campus policies cited in this document can be found at: <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/node/426/attachment>

Department of Information Science
College of Media, Communication and Information
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Policy Title: **Information Science Department Bylaws**
Functional Area: **Information Science Faculty**

Brief Description:	Department of Information Science Bylaws
Effective Date:	10/26/2016
Approved by:	Department of Information Science Faculty
Last Reviewed/Updated:	11/22/2016
Applies to:	Department of Information Science

Version 5 – 22 November 2016

Department

The responsibilities of the department include administering the programs leading to the degrees of B.S., professional M.S., non-terminal M.S., and Ph.D. in Information Science; serving the College of Media, Communications, and Information and the university as a whole through courses and service; and conducting research in the area of information science.

Jurisdiction

The departmental faculty shall have jurisdiction over all matters that concern only the department. This includes, but is not limited to, responsibility for developing its own working structure, defining how personnel and budgeting matters shall be handled, and determining how responsibilities for other departmental matters shall be determined.

Voting

Only tenure-track members (including Institute faculty who have their tenure home in the department) and professors of the practice in information science are eligible to vote. Each person eligible to vote has one vote. No proxy votes are allowed. Upon request of any person eligible to vote, voting will be conducted anonymously by written or electronic ballot. In order to record a final vote, a quorum must be reached for the vote. A quorum is any number greater than 50% of those eligible to vote.

Department Meetings

Periodic meetings are scheduled during the academic year, as agenda items require. All members of the graduate faculty are invited to attend. The chair may invite others to attend a particular meeting or on a regular basis.

At the request of the chair or a verbal vote of a majority of the faculty eligible to vote, the department may go into executive session for part or all of a meeting in order to discuss sensitive issues. During executive sessions, visitors are typically asked to leave and minutes are not taken.

Issues pertaining to department policy and documents, or asking for expressions of opinion, are eligible for verbal voting by those involved in the discussion.

Department meetings are governed in accord with the latest edition of Robert's *Rules of Order*.

Minutes. The minutes of each departmental regular or special faculty meeting will be kept and made available in the departmental office for a period of at least three years. If the faculty votes not to keep to minutes at a meeting or a portion of a meeting, a record of this action shall be entered with the next recorded meeting. Minutes shall be taken by a staff member selected by the chair.

Lecturers, Adjunct Professors, and Visiting Professors

Lecturers, adjunct professors, and visiting professors may be appointed by the chair for a one-year term. Lecturers and adjunct professors who have established successful extended relations with the department may be appointed by the chair for terms of up to three years with the advice and consent of the executive committee. [For the university's official definition of and policies on lecturers, see "Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty", approved 29 March 2011, https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/Lecturer_Instructor_Appointment_Evaluation_Promotion_Guidelines_3-2011.pdf.] Before an adjunct appointment lasting more than three years can be made, the

candidate must circulate a curriculum vita and make a research lecture to the faculty, and the faculty must have a chance to discuss and vote on the candidate.

Research Professors

Appointment to the research professor ranks, including research professor of all ranks and professional research assistant, is made by the graduate school based upon a positive vote of the faculty and approval of the chair. [For the university's definition of and policies concerning research professors, see "Research Professor Appointments - Procedures for Policy Implementation on Research Professor Series and Adjoint Professor Series," revised June 16, 2014, <http://www.colorado.edu/innovate/hr/research-professor-series/procedures-policy-implementation-research-professor-series>; on professional research assistants, see job definitions, Research Faculty, <https://www.cu.edu/employee-services/human-resources/job-definitionspostdoc>; for university information and regulations about postdocs, see CU Boulder Postdoctoral Handbook, http://www.colorado.edu/postdoctoralaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/postdoctoral_handbook_june_2016.pdf.]

Instructors

Instructors may be appointed or reappointed by a vote of the faculty for terms up to three years. Senior instructors may be appointed or reappointed by a vote of the faculty for terms of up to the maximum time allowed by the university and the college. [For the university's official definition of and policies concerning instructors, see "Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty", approved 29 March 2011, https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/Lecturer_Instructor_Appointment_Evaluation_Promotion_Guidelines_3-2011.pdf.]

Chair

The chair shall be the executive officer of the department and shall have the authority, within the rules of the Regents, the policies of the university, and the rules of the college, to conduct the administration of the department. The chair shall provide leadership toward achievement of the highest possible level of excellence in the teaching, research, and service activities of the department.

The chair is charged with the administration of the department. S/he is responsible for the assignment of teaching and other duties within the department; preparation of the schedule of courses and of times and places for class meetings; arrangement and assignment of duty for counseling of students, and for the training and supervision of teaching assistants; preparation of the budget and administration of the financial affairs of the department; acquisition and management of space and other resources for the department; salary recommendations; recommendation of sabbatical leaves and other

leaves of absence; recruitment of new staff members, the assignments of duties to individual staff members, and the evaluation of the staff, custody and authorized use of University property, and enforcement of University rules and regulations. The chair is also ultimately responsible for the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of the academic personnel of the Department, in accordance with the Laws of the Regents. In addition, the chair brings new business to the attention of the department, facilitates discussion and follow-up, represents the department as need or occasion arises, and serves as a channel of communication within, to, and on behalf of the department.

The chair will be appointed or reappointed as per the Laws of the Regents and all other pertinent university regulations. The chair serves at the will of the dean of the College of Media, Communication, and Information. Length of appointment is determined by College and University policy. A typical term, which may be renewed, is for four years – or for three years if the most viable candidates are not willing to serve for as many as four years. Nominations will be solicited by the faculty. Voting is by secret electronic ballot of all faculty eligible to vote.

Evaluation of the chair will be conducted by the dean of the College of Media, Communication, and Information.

The chair will call for an election at the beginning of the spring semester of the last year of his/her term. Only tenured faculty members who regularly teach full-time in the department are eligible for nomination. It is preferable to select a full professor.

In the event of temporary absence of the chair, the chair will appoint one of the tenured members of the department to assume the duties of the chair as the acting chair, with majority approval of the entire voting faculty of the department.

Associate Chairs

One or more associate chairs may be appointed by the chair to assist in his/her duties. The associate chair serves at the discretion of the chair who made the appointment. If the term of the appointment is not explicitly specified, it is aligned with the term of the current chair.

Executive Committee

The executive committee consists of the department chair, the associate department chairs, the graduate and undergraduate advisors, and the professional master's program director.

Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

In addition to the executive committee, there are two standing committees: the graduate committee and the undergraduate committee. As needed, the chair may also appoint (and disband) various ad hoc committees and delegate specific responsibilities and authority to those committees. The department will document the responsibilities and authority of each ad hoc committee in a separate policy document. The charter of an ad hoc committee expires at the end of the term of the department chair that created the committee, unless otherwise specified.

Graduate committee

The graduate committee shall consist of at least three members of the graduate faculty appointed by the department chair. The graduate advisor, who is one of these faculty members, serves as chair of the committee. The department chair may also appoint one or more graduate students to the committee as non-voting members. This committee is responsible for all policy matters relating to graduate study within the department.

The committee will, as the need arises, make recommendations on revising existing graduate study policy or creating new graduate study policy and will send these recommendations to the voting faculty for their review and approval. Approval is granted by a majority vote of those voting, with a minimum of one-half of the voting faculty participating in the vote.

Specific responsibilities of this committee include: selecting teaching assistants and research associates to fill graduate fellowships under the control of the department; recommending candidates for fellowships and scholarships administered by the Graduate School; handling admission of graduate students and determining their appropriate degree status; advising graduate students and administering graduate examinations; defining course content for information science graduate level courses; and reviewing all changes to the information science graduate curriculum.

Undergraduate Committee

The undergraduate committee shall consist of at least three voting faculty members appointed by the department chair. One of these faculty members is the undergraduate director, who will chair the committee. At the discretion of the chair of the committee, one information science graduate student and one information science undergraduate student may serve on the committee as non-voting members. This committee is responsible for all policy matters relating to undergraduate study within the Department.

The committee will, as the need arises, make recommendations on revising existing undergraduate study policy or creating new undergraduate study policy and will send these recommendations to the voting faculty for their review and approval. Approval is

granted by a majority vote of those voting, with a minimum of one-half of the voting faculty participating in the vote.

Specific responsibilities of this committee include: reviewing and, when warranted by the policies and practices of the undergraduate committee, approving student petitions pertaining to their progress in the department's undergraduate degree programs; recommending candidates for fellowships, scholarships and department, college and campus awards; advising undergraduate students; reviewing all changes to the information science undergraduate curriculum; and compiling the information required to produce the College's annual assessment report and submitting that report to the College and to the executive committee at the required time each year.

Strategic Plan

The department, under the direction of the chair, will develop a strategic plan that includes goals for the size of the undergraduate and graduate programs, the priorities for faculty hiring, research and teaching goals, and other matters of importance to the department. The strategic plan will be the guiding document for department investments. The plan will be developed in consultation with the entire faculty and be approved by a majority vote of those voting, with a minimum of one-half of the voting faculty participating in the vote. The strategic plan will be refreshed every four years.

Annual Faculty Performance Evaluations

Annual faculty performance evaluations shall be conducted by the executive committee and are advisory to the department chair. Data will include the annual faculty report on professional activities, student evaluation forms, and other information deemed appropriate by the executive committee. Recommendations regarding a member of the executive committee shall be made by the other members of the committee with the evaluated member absent from discussions. The chair represents the department in any discussions of the evaluations with the dean. The chair shall offer to meet individually with each faculty member to discuss that member's performance, the evaluations, and the goals and plans for that faculty member for the coming year.

Post-tenure Reviews

Post-tenure reviews shall be carried out according to university and college criteria and schedules. These reviews shall be carried out as part of the annual review process, with the addition of a statement of future plans by the reviewed faculty member.

Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Early Tenure, and Comprehensive Review

Procedures for these decisions are described in a separate document approved by the faculty. In cases where these procedures are inconsistent with the rules of the college or university, the rules of the college and university are determinative.

Faculty Recruiting

Faculty recruiting is the responsibility of the executive committee. Once the department in consultation with the dean has determined it is allowed to recruit for the following academic year, the faculty discusses search areas and makes recommendations to the executive committee, which in turn narrows as appropriate and recommends search area priorities to the voting faculty for approval. An ad hoc search committee is then formed by the chair from the voting faculty.

The ad hoc committee is responsible for advertising the position(s), for evaluating candidates and recommending to the chair and the faculty a slate of candidates to be interviewed. Diversity along many dimensions is valued by the department, and all searches are intended to consider ways in which appointments might maintain or expand the faculty's diversity. The search committee will organize the campus visit by the finalists and provide the faculty with an evaluation and ranking of the candidates after all visits are complete. The voting faculty shall discuss the candidates and vote on which candidate to recommend to the dean.

Assignment of Teaching Duties

Assignment of teaching duties is performed using the following procedures. The department should strive to achieve a two-year forecast of teaching assignments for both undergraduate and graduate classes. Therefore, at the start of an academic year, the chair in consultation with the executive committee initiates the process of defining courses to be taught in the academic year that will begin in two years' time. These two-year forecasts are tentative and can be changed by the chair of the undergraduate committee or the chair of the department as circumstances warrant (such as a change in sabbatical plans, leaves, retirements, etc.). The specific allocations of courses to individual faculty members is made by the chair in consultation with the executive committee. These allocations are made in a way to ensure that each faculty member is meeting his or her teaching load for that academic year. If and when conflicts arise as to what each faculty member will teach, the chair of the department makes the final decision. In any event, personal preferences of faculty members shall be followed as far as it is feasible and practical.

Guidelines in Areas Not Covered by these Bylaws

It is the responsibility of the chair, with the advice of the executive committee, to develop policy guidelines in areas not covered by these bylaws. Such guidelines shall be submitted to the faculty for approval before enactment, and copies shall be kept in a physical or online location that is accessible to the faculty.

Revising the Bylaws

Any voting member of the faculty can suggest changes to the bylaws. The executive committee will consider these suggestions and prepare any proposed changes to the bylaws. Written notice of a proposed amendment shall be given to all members of the faculty at least two weeks prior to the vote. Changes to the bylaws go into effect with an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the voting members of the department.

Adopting or Revising a Policy

If not otherwise specified by these bylaws, the adoption of new department policy, or the revision of existing policy, requires that the proposed new policy be distributed to all members of the faculty, be discussed by the faculty at a department meeting, and be approved by a majority vote of the voting faculty with at least half of the voting faculty participating in the vote.

Department of Information Science
College of Media, Communication and Information
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Policy Title: **Information Science Department Procedures, Policies and Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure**
Functional Area: **Information Science Faculty**

Brief Description:	Department of Information Science Faculty P&T Policies and Procedures
Effective Date:	02/01/2017
Approved by:	Department of Information Science Faculty
Last Reviewed/Updated:	02/01/2017 (Faculty Vote)
Approved by:	CMCI Dean Lori Bergen
Last Reviewed/Updated:	03/02/2017 (Dean Approval)
Applies to:	Department of Information Science

These procedures, policies and criteria are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other university policies and procedures as described on the Faculty Affairs website and as may be subsequently revised. Each policy and rule is to be applied in a manner consistent with current Regents Rules. In the event of conflict, Regental Rules shall govern. Every eligible faculty member will be reviewed in a timely manner with respect to an individual's tenure clock for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Candidates are evaluated on each of Research, Teaching and Service performance cumulatively at each stage of their careers, and determined to be *less than meritorious*, *meritorious* or *excellent* in each category. In addition to outlining the procedures by which candidates are evaluated at each stage of review, this document outlines the criteria along which they will be evaluated. For reappointment, promotion to associate, and tenure, the faculty votes for each area of Research, Teaching and Service along the three dimensions of *less than meritorious*, *meritorious* or *excellent*.

To achieve promotion and tenure, a candidate must achieve *excellence* in Research or Teaching, and be *meritorious* in the other two areas. It is important to note that, at a campus level, tenure on the basis of excellence in teaching is rare. Standards are determined relative to the performance of a candidate's peers at other comparable institutions. Achievement of *excellence* indicates persistently strong performance that would earn the candidate the promotion to the rank or tenure status sought by a majority of peers at comparable institutions. *Less than meritorious* indicates performance that would not earn equivalent promotion or tenure status as a majority of peers.

For promotion to Full, the faculty vote unifies all dimensions and votes on overall excellence. The language from Faculty Affairs explains: "Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their field or its equivalent and (A) a record, which, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent, (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or department circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (C) a record since tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service."¹ Here again, standards are determined relative to the performance of a candidate's peers at other comparable institutions.

1.0 CANDIDATE'S MATERIALS FOR DOSSIER

Candidates for promotion and tenure should prepare a CV, a research statement, a teaching statement, and a service and outreach statement.

1.1 Curriculum Vitae

The CV should have major sections dealing with:

- a. Educational background
- b. Academic employment history
- c. Honors and awards
- d. Research and/or creative works
 - i. List scholarly publications. List publications that have been refereed in a separate section from those that have not been peer-reviewed. Include authors, year, article title, journal or proceedings name, volume, and inclusive page numbers. Include acceptance rates for peer-reviewed papers in conference proceedings, where known. Written work in press or submitted but not yet

¹ Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Rank Faculty, Retrieved Jan 29, 2017 <<http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion>>.

accepted for publication should appear in a separate section and be clearly identified as such.

- ii. Publications in conference proceedings should be distinguished as being peer-reviewed or not peer-reviewed.
- iii. List research funding received and pending proposals. Include agency, title, amount received or requested, beginning and end dates, names of all co investigators, candidate's role (Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, Senior Personnel, Consultant, etc.), and candidate's portion of the funding.
- e. Teaching accomplishments
 - i. List courses taught, how often they were taught, and what the size of student enrollment was for each class.
 - a. Include a listing of courses that were new preparations (first time taught) for the Department or College.
 - ii. List textbooks, study guides, manuals, workbooks, or electronic media produced for student or class use.
 - iii. List individual undergraduate and graduate students mentored. Include names, period mentored, and completion dates (with degrees or honors) of the students for whom the candidate served as primary mentor.
- f. Service activities.
 - i. Provide details on service to professional organizations, government agencies, department, college, and university.
 - ii. Include outreach activities to the community undertaken on behalf of the University or your profession.

1.2 Faculty Statement on Research/Creative Work

This narrative of typically 4-5 pages is the place where the candidate communicates research accomplishments to the various internal and external reviewers who are part of the tenure and promotion process. The narrative should highlight the candidate's major contributions, describing the impact of research/creative work and grant monies awarded to conduct the research, and addressing any unique aspects of the scholarly record. It is particularly valuable to be able to identify how the various research efforts the candidate has made fit together in working toward one or a small number of larger goals.

1.3 Faculty Statement on Teaching

This narrative of typically 2-4 pages is the place where the candidate communicates teaching accomplishments to the various internal and external reviewers who are part of the tenure and promotion process. The narrative should highlight the candidate's major teaching activities, the innovative aspects of this teaching, and the successes in both undergraduate and graduate training and individualized instruction. The narrative should address any unique aspects of the teaching record, including major curricular development, creation of curricular materials, and

participation in teaching-related research or development activities not only in the department but across the university and in the larger professional community.

1.4 Faculty Statement on Service/Outreach

This narrative of typically 1-2 pages is the place where the candidate communicates service accomplishments to the various internal and external reviewers who are part of the tenure and promotion process. The narrative should highlight the candidate's major contributions or activities in the areas of service and outreach to the Department, College, the University, to professional organizations, and to the public.

2.0 REVIEW BY PRIMARY UNIT

The primary unit is normally composed of the faculty members of the Department of Information Science (hereafter referred to as the Department or unit) authorized to vote on matters of appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Only members of equal or higher rank relative to the proposed action are authorized to vote on a given personnel case. The unit must have a minimum voting membership of at least five eligible faculty members. For the first several years of the unit's founding, until the unit has an adequate pool of senior faculty, it will need to supplement the voting membership of the primary unit with external faculty. These members will be selected by the Chair with the approval of the CMCI Dean.

Institute faculty who are tenure-homed in the Department will be evaluated according to terms outlined in an MOU between the Chair, the Dean and the Institute Director. In the absence of an agreement in the MOU, the conditions for evaluating promotion and tenure for Institute faculty are stipulated where appropriate in the sections below.

2.1 Primary Evaluation Unit Committee Composition

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee is a group of at least three faculty from the same or higher rank that the candidate seeks from within the primary unit. They are appointed by the Department Chair. If the unit does not have enough members to meet the criteria, the Chair will invite other CU faculty to support the evaluation. Institute faculty will have one institute faculty serve on the committee to participate in the primary unit faculty review. The PUEC is responsible for assisting the candidate in assembling his or her dossier, soliciting opinions from outside reviewers, and providing an oral and written evaluation of the candidate's dossier to the full eligible membership of the primary unit. The oral evaluation is provided first, to solicit input from the full eligible membership of the primary unit.

The department allows a faculty member who serves on the college personnel committee to also serve as a member or chair of PUEC, given that departmental representatives cannot vote on one of their own faculty members at the college level. Family members should recuse themselves from personnel reviews of immediate family members (see www.cu.edu/policies/Personnel/nepotism.html). Questions on potential conflicts of interest should be directed by the Chair to the Dean or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs. After the founding year, the Department Chair should not serve on the PUEC or write its report (as his or her recommendation is expressed in a separate report).

2.2 PUEC Report and Supporting Materials

The PUEC report, usually several pages in length, is generated based on an evaluation of the materials supplied by the candidate and the materials gathered as listed in items 1-6 below. The report should include a description of the findings of the Committee with regards to (a) teaching performance, (b) scholarly and creative work, and (c) university and professional service and outreach. The written report of the evaluation committee becomes part of the dossier. The names and affiliations of the external reviewers should not be revealed in these materials.

In addition to the candidate's materials, the dossier prepared by the primary unit should also contain the following items:

1. **External Letters of Evaluation.** Six external letters are required for promotion/tenure. External letters are not required for reappointment, though may be obtained at the discretion of the primary unit.
 - a. Letters must be submitted from professional colleagues not affiliated with the University of Colorado. Letters from mentors and direct collaborators are not to be included in the minimum number of required letters, but they may be added at the request of the candidate or review committee.
 - b. Evaluators must be selected by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and chosen to avoid any known or apparent inappropriate biases, either positive or negative.
 - c. All letters received must be submitted with the dossier. Individuals contacted but not able to review must also be listed, along with the reason for the declination.
 - d. Candidates may not select their own evaluators, but they are asked to recommend names to the primary unit. They may also indicate individuals whom they do not want to be contacted. A list of who recommended each reviewer (the candidate, the department, or both) should be included in the dossier. A maximum of three evaluators recommended by the candidate and not less than three evaluators recommended by the PUEC is the ideal balance. In terms of how close the evaluators can be to the candidate, there is only a conflict if the evaluator can be imagined to be benefitting from the candidate's success, which includes the Ph.D. advisor, postdoc mentor, a co-

author or co-PI. On the last role, the Department will follow the rules of the NSF for conflicts, which spans engagement as co-author or co-PI over the last 4 years.

- e. A CV from external reviewers will be requested, though a short biosketch is also acceptable. In addition, a short summary of the qualifications for each reviewer is to be provided at the front of the external reviewer section.
 - f. All contact with outside reviewers should be noted and fully documented. All requests for information from external reviews must go through one representative from the primary unit. External letters should be requested at least three months before the dossier is due in the Dean's office.
 - g. Letter of Solicitation. The template for letters of solicitation to external reviewers is available at: <http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/atoz/ofaindex.html#S> (in the A-Z section look in section "S" for Solicitation of External Letters). Primary units wishing to make substantive changes to the letter should seek permission from the Office of Faculty Affairs.
 - i. Evaluators should be asked to specify clearly if the candidate would be reappointed, promoted, or receive tenure at their institutions.
 - ii. Each evaluator should be asked to state what his/her relationship is to the candidate.
 - h. Confidentiality. Letters from outside reviewers are considered to be confidential and are not to be seen by the candidate. This restriction also includes the names of those external reviewers and their vitae information.
2. **Teaching Performance.** Multiple types of teaching evaluation are required. In addition to the FCQ (Faculty Course Questionnaire) results as a measure of teaching quality, class interviews, peer evaluation, student letters, and portfolios are recommended. If letters from students or alumni are requested, please indicate how the individuals were selected. The candidate should not select them nor be involved with any correspondence requesting letters. Include all FCQs for faculty considered for reappointment or tenure. For promotion to the rank of Professor, include only the FCQs since the last review for the candidate. Fall FCQs should be added when they become available in January. Provide an explanation for semesters that the candidate did not teach. A listing of new course preparations are also to be reported in the report, so as to specifically acknowledge the contribution of founding and early faculty members of the department.

A listing of Ph.D. students in progress and completed is also required. The Department recognizes and credits to the candidate at all levels of his or her career the completion of Ph.D.s under the candidate's supervision both from within the Department, as well as from other counterpart degree programs at the university where the candidate was the primary advisor. The Department also recognizes graduations from students at other universities where the candidate was once the primary advisor and still has a central role in the student's progress. These stipulations are especially important in acknowledging the role of founding and early members of the unit, who have come from other universities, and who

have built up their research labs in coordination with counterpart departments who have supported the Department of Information Science's launch.

The teaching section of the dossier should include:

- a. Faculty Course Questionnaires (required). Submit the complete record of faculty course questionnaire summaries of each course taught and the instructor summary compiled by the Office of Budget, Planning, and Assessment, for the period of review (see above).
- b. In addition to the required FCQ documents, submit three or more additional forms of teaching assessment. Candidates and units are urged to use whatever form of assessment that is most appropriate for the type of instruction. Suggested forms of assessment include:
 - i. Peer reviews of teaching. These reviews, especially for junior faculty, should not be just one or two classroom visits in the semester of the review. They instead should be representing a series of visits over several years, providing opportunity for feedback, improvement, and assessment.
 - ii. Report of class or group interviews. Interviews of a class or group of students should be performed without the candidate present, and the students should be asked to describe both the positive aspects of the course and instructor and areas for improvement. Feedback for improvement should be provided to the candidate.
 - iii. Confidential letters from randomly solicited students who have taken courses from the faculty member being evaluated, both on the undergraduate and graduate level, including current students and alumni and alumnae. At least six such letters should be included, preferably for a couple different times to gauge development over time, if this measure of assessment is used. Unsolicited comments from students submitted to the Chair, Dean or an advisor may also be included. To maintain confidentiality, students' names will not be reported in written evaluations.
 - iv. Letters from randomly solicited students or former students who have been research advisees of the candidate.
 - v. Significant contribution to curriculum and course development, with internal or external assessment of teaching portfolios or other teaching materials developed by the candidate.
 - vi. External evaluation and promotion of teaching excellence through awards, development of textbooks or other teaching materials used elsewhere, educational grants, teaching publications and presentations, and/or significant participation in activities of the American Society for Engineering Education or in the educational functions of the professional societies of which the candidate is a member.
 - vii. Additional ongoing teaching contributions and outreach activities, such as participation in college or campus programs for students.
- c. Listing of new course preparations taught by candidate by course number, title, and semester of first offering.

The Department also recognizes the value of civic engagement in teaching, research and/or service (anticipating Items 3—research—and 6—service—below). There are many ways this might be achieved, and faculty will have different emphases according to subdiscipline and personal strengths. On the matter of teaching, the university provides specific guidance: “The campus's strategic plan, Flagship 2030, advances as one of its goals civic engagement by faculty, staff, and students. Teaching is one area in which the faculty can stress civic engagement, which includes service learning pedagogy. Faculty who employ service learning pedagogy or focus on civic engagement as an important part of one or more courses are encouraged to speak to these efforts in building their teaching dossier. Such efforts speak not only to a faculty member's commitment and dedication to a core campus goal but also indicate that a faculty member is drawing on research literature on innovative teaching methodologies.”²

3. **Scholarly and Creative Work.** The primary unit report will comment on the quality and significance of the reviewed papers or other research and creative work published by the candidate, and on the quality, reputation and appropriateness of the publication venues selected by the candidate. Because peer-reviewed conference proceedings are often part of an Information Science faculty member's record as they are an important and even sometimes the primary publication modality in the field, the report will evaluate and communicate the prestige of the conference, selectivity, paper length, review process, and whether the proceeding papers are considered equivalent to top journal papers in the field (“journal-equivalent”).

In addition, because much of Information Science research is performed in collaborative teams with other internal and external faculty, and with graduate students—a configuration which is to be rewarded—the committee will describe these research and authorship collaborations to college and campus committees. The Department recognizes that in team-based research, it is also typical for graduate students to take the lead authorship when distribution of work is otherwise approximately equivalent. In team-based research, it should be clear that many of the contributions made by the faculty candidate are critical to the initiation and development of projects. Occasionally, research conducted by some candidates is more individual, as in the humanities and social sciences, which is appropriate as long as it is consistent with their subdiscipline of Information Science.

The primary unit report will also comment on the national landscape of sponsored grant funding in terms of competitiveness and changes over the years of a faculty member's tenure. The report will comment on the effort of the faculty member's pursuit of grants in this context, and describe how their awarded grants supported their and their graduate

² Cox, Jeffrey N. (Nov 6 2007). Multiple Measures of Teaching, Office of Faculty Affairs manuscript. Retrieved Jan 29, 2017. <<http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/relevant-policies-and-procedures-0>>

students' research agenda, and/or the departmental-level research agenda, curricular agenda, or infrastructural goals.

4. **Examples of Publications.** In most cases, three representative examples of scholarly work are sufficient. When photographs, videos, CDs, or other materials (such as web-based publications, standards, or policy documents) are the appropriate record of scholarly or creative work, candidates are urged to note that and, if appropriate, to submit examples.
5. **Research Funding History.** The candidate's research funding history must be included in the dossier, either as part of the candidate's CV (see item 5) or in a separate list. Include all funded grants, unsuccessful proposals, and pending proposals. Indicate whether the candidate is the Principal Investigator or a Co-Principal Investigator and his/her portion of the funding.
6. **Service and Outreach.** The primary unit will comment on the quantity and quality of service to the Department, college, campus, and national and international professional communities. The Department holds as a core value that its members undertake service to share in the advancement of the name and reputation of the Department, and share in the provision of an infrastructure that allows all to excel individually and collectively in research, pedagogical and civic endeavors. This core value will be a point of discussion in the service and outreach portion of the report.

In addition, the Department notes that during the first several years after the department's founding, junior faculty are needed to offer more departmental service than typically required, and that this will be an important part of a candidate's record to acknowledge and to communicate to the college and campus. Senior faculty members may also be providing more service proportionately to the Department than to college or Campus during several years following founding, compared to others at equivalent rank.

In addition to the PUEC report, items 1-6 above, and the candidate's materials, the primary unit should include these two items for submission to the College:

7. **Copy of the Primary Unit's Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.** A document describing the procedures, criteria, and evidence that the primary unit has agreed upon for evaluating comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion cases is to be included in the dossier.
8. **Summary of Personnel Action Form.** The Chair should sign the Summary of Personnel Action Form before the dossier is sent to the Dean.

2.3 Primary Unit Review of Dossier

All faculty members who are eligible to vote on a particular case must be allowed to review the entire dossier before they are asked to vote on the case. Letters and teaching evaluations will be analyzed for the degree to which societal biases influence judgments. Votes should be recorded in the categories of “in favor of” the proposed action, “opposed to” the proposed action, “abstain” or “excused absence.” Excused absences should be limited to faculty members who are on leave and unable to participate in the review and vote. For tenure cases, there must also be three additional votes taken, where each member casts a vote of “excellent”, “meritorious,” or “less than meritorious” for the candidate’s performance in each of teaching, research, and service. The Department Chair does not vote but should be present during the discussion by the primary unit.

2.4 Report of the Chair

The Department Chair should write a report, independently of the primary unit evaluation committee report, to the Dean on the actions taken by the primary unit, including the results of the vote, reasons for the recommendation, and explanations of any dissenting opinion as expressed in the vote. The report should include a description of the review and voting processes that were followed. It should also include the recommendation of the Chair on the proposed personnel action, along with reasons for disagreement if this recommendation differs from the majority vote of the primary unit (i.e., the majority of those voting). The report or letter from the Chair to the Dean must not identify the external reviewers by name or in any other way. This report becomes a part of the dossier.

3.0 GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

3.1 Reappointment Guidelines

Initial appointments for probationary tenure-track faculty members are usually for a period of four years, and they are usually reviewed during the last year of the appointment period. Following campus policy, a faculty member who starts in the spring semester has the option of delaying his/her review to the fourth full year rather than the third full year. Upon successful review, normal reappointment for tenure-track faculty is for three years.

General Principles for Reappointment. The comprehensive review of an Assistant Professor focuses upon whether or not the candidate is making normal progress towards meeting or exceeding the standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In particular, the standard for reappointment is that the candidate is on a trajectory to achieve at the time of tenure an evaluation of meritorious in teaching, research and service, and excellence in research and/or teaching, or that the candidate has a high likelihood of achieving these evaluations with reasonable corrections to the trajectory.

Research Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate have a vigorous research program?
- b. Are research and authorship collaborations consistent with the style of research the candidate conducts?
- c. Has the candidate selected problems that are recognized as significant by experts in the field?
- d. What is the candidate's record in previous positions at other institutions?
- e. What is the candidate's record in attracting graduate students and directing their research work?
- f. Does the candidate have refereed publications that have appeared or been accepted in appropriate venues of high stature, including highly respected conference proceedings or journals, based on work done in the current position? Are additional articles under review?
- g. Is the candidate active in presenting scholarly work at professional conferences that will advance the goals of the candidate's research program?
- h. What external funding has the candidate received to support his/her research program? What additional proposals are pending for major support of this program?

Teaching Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses he or she has taught?
- b. Does the candidate keep his or her courses up-to-date by incorporating new material?
- c. Has the candidate demonstrated an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones? At the undergraduate level? At the graduate level?
 - i. Has the candidate been a good citizen by teaching an appropriate number of courses that help to fulfill the department and the college's teaching obligations?
- d. Is the candidate an enthusiastic teacher?
- e. Do the students consider the candidate to be an effective teacher?
- f. Is the candidate willing to spend adequate time with students outside the classroom?
- g. Is the candidate a conscientious and effective mentor and advisor of individual students in research at the undergraduate level? At the graduate level? Who has the candidate graduated at the Ph.D.level, and what are their post-graduate prospects?
- h. Has the candidate introduced examples of contemporary information science design where appropriate in courses or supervised student design or independent-study projects?
- i. Has the candidate made effective use of peer evaluation and programs or training to improve teaching?

Professional Activities and Service Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate willingly cooperate with his or her colleagues in teaching, research, outreach, curricular development, and other academic activities?
- b. Does the candidate participate in Department, college, and/or university activities intended to improve the quality of the University's program?
- c. Has the candidate participated effectively in external professional activities while in the current position, such as chairing sessions at conferences and serving on program boards or review panels?

3.2 Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure Guidelines

The mandatory tenure and promotion evaluation for tenure-track faculty normally occurs during the seventh year of the probationary period. Generally, the recommendation of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and a recommendation of tenure will be concurrent. Thus, the criteria for this promotion and for tenure are similar and normally considered at the same time. Early promotion to Associate Professor without tenure will be considered only in exceptional cases in which the Assistant Professor has exhibited highly successful performance and is clearly "on track" toward tenure. Early tenure may also be considered for those candidates who have met the requirements for tenure prior to the mandatory review time. The comprehensive review of an Assistant Professor must be successfully completed prior to undertaking a tenure review. The person considered for early promotion and/or tenure should have had at least five years of experience beyond his/her Ph.D. and at least three years of academic experience at the time of promotion.

General Principles for Promotion to Associate. The Rules of the Regents state that "Associate Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and promising accomplishment in research." The standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is defined as demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research and creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research and creative work. The granting of tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of the University and is, consequently, the most critical decision made regarding a faculty member. Such commitments must be limited to persons who are judged most likely to remain valued assets to the University for the rest of their careers. The granting of tenure is to be based primarily on the quality of the candidate's research and effectiveness of his or her teaching.

Professional activities and service on and off campus should be considered to a lesser degree. Implied in a recommendation to grant tenure is the judgment that the candidate's future performance will lead to promotion to Professor after a suitable period of time as Associate Professor. In particular, this judgment would be based on evidence that the candidate, if

granted tenure, will achieve the distinguished reputation in research, the effectiveness in teaching, and the level of activity in professional service required for promotion to Professor. Implicit in any tenure consideration is the possibility of selecting and appointing someone else. The recommended person must be one of the best people the University could expect to attract to this position.

Research Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate have a vigorous research program?
- b. Has the candidate selected problems that are recognized as significant by experts in the field?
- c. What is the candidate's record of contributed and invited presentations, and of publication in refereed journals, conference proceedings, books and other outlets? How does this record compare to that of peers? Has the candidate published significant papers based on research at this university? How many of them are in top journals or other venues of equivalent quality and impact?
- d. What is the candidate's record in previous positions at other institutions?
- e. What is the candidate's scholarly reputation at other universities and in industry? Has s/he received any major awards for research?
- f. Has the candidate established him or herself as a scholar able to thrive independently of the faculty on his or her dissertation committee?
- g. Will the candidate be able to develop new areas of research in the future and establish competence in them?
- h. What is the candidate's record in attracting graduate students and directing their research work?
- i. An important component of peer evaluation of one's research work is obtained through funding support from sponsoring agencies. What is the candidate's record in seeking and attracting such support for his or her research program? How does
- j. his/her funding level compare to that of peers? Is it sufficient to support the kind of research group, including graduate students, needed to carry out the work effectively?
- k. If the research is part of a group effort, what contributions has the candidate made to the initiation and development of projects?

Teaching Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses he or she has taught?
- b. Does the candidate keep his or her courses up-to-date by incorporating new material?
- c. Has the candidate demonstrated an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones? At the undergraduate level? At the graduate level?
- d. Is the candidate an enthusiastic teacher?

- e. Do the students consider the candidate to be an effective teacher?
- f. Is the candidate willing to spend adequate time with students outside the classroom?
- g. Is the candidate a conscientious and effective mentor and advisor of individual students in research, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels?
- h. Has the candidate introduced examples of contemporary engineering design where appropriate in courses or supervised student design or independent-study projects?
- i. Has the candidate displayed the flexibility and cooperativeness required to carry a full share of his or her department's teaching responsibilities over the long term?
- j. Is the candidate an effective teacher at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, or at one of the levels if dictated by the nature of the program? Has s/he received any teaching awards?
- k. Has the candidate had national or international impact on improving education, such as in the development of textbooks or other teaching materials used by others or in the presentation and publication of educational advances cited by others?

Professional Activities and Service Criteria:

- a. Does the candidate willingly cooperate with his or her colleagues in teaching, research, outreach, curricular development, and other academic activities?
- b. Does the candidate participate in department, program, college, and university activities intended to improve the quality of the University's program?
- c. Does the candidate participate in professional activities and leadership intended to promote the development of his or her field?
- d. Has the candidate engaged in outside industrial or governmental activities that have contributed to his or her effectiveness as a faculty member?
- e. Do the outside professional activities of the candidate enable him or her to keep up-to-date with the current developments in his or her field in academic, industrial, and governmental institutions?

3.3 Promotion to Professor Guidelines

There is no standard or mandatory time at which consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor occurs. For faculty who develop their careers along a very fast and steep trajectory, promotion may be considered in six years, or even less in exceptional cases, after the previous promotion. For faculty members whose career trajectory is less steep, or whose scholarly work, by its nature, requires a longer period of development, the period between promotions may be a decade or longer. Review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the same manner as is the tenure and promotion review, including the solicitation of external letters of assessment.

General Principles for Promotion to Full. Consideration of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is to be based on his or her research, the effectiveness of his or her teaching, and the scope of his or her professional activities and service on and off campus. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should have the terminal degree appropriate for his or her field or its equivalent and (a) a record, which, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or department circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (c) a record since tenure and promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

The following items are some of the factors to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

Research Factors:

- a. The quality and quantity of the candidate's research contributions, as evidenced by a strong record of invited and contributed presentations and of publications in recognized journals and other appropriate venues of high caliber.
- b. The evaluation by recognized authorities outside the University of the candidate's national and international reputation and innovative contributions in scholarly accomplishment, including awards received.
- c. The candidate's record in attracting graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis/dissertation research.
- d. The initiation, development, funding, and direction of significant research projects by the candidate, including in new areas that represent substantial growth from the candidate's earlier work.

Teaching Factors:

- a. Effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher in the classroom and/or laboratory at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This effectiveness includes adopting efficient teaching styles appropriate to each course environment, motivating the students, and reacting with sensitivity to the students' responses. Measurements of effectiveness include course questionnaires, student letters or interviews, peer evaluations and teaching awards.
- b. Maintenance of knowledge of current developments in the candidate's field and application of them to teaching through timely development of new courses and modernization of existing courses.

- c. Publications and presentations by the candidate related to teaching, including textbooks, new teaching methods and aids, and the introduction of new laboratory experiments.
- d. Active interest in student affairs and welfare, and demonstrated effectiveness of the candidate as a mentor and advisor of individual students, both on the undergraduate and the graduate levels.
- e. Flexibility and cooperation by the candidate to carry a full share of the unit's teaching responsibilities over the long term.
- f. Effectiveness of the candidate in mentoring junior faculty in the teaching enterprise, as well as support the Department's teaching practices and policies.

Professional Activities and Service Factors:

- a. Participation and leadership by the candidate in leadership in the Department.
- b. Professional recognition of the candidate outside the university community, as evidenced by membership and leadership in significant professional and scientific committees, conferences, councils, boards, and review panels.
- c. Development by the candidate of major college initiatives or facilities that contribute to research and teaching activities in the College or University.
- d. Participation and leadership by the candidate in important faculty assignments and committees within the University or College.
- e. Outside industrial or governmental experiences of the candidate to the extent that they contribute to his or her effectiveness as a faculty member.

Given the spectrum of differences in individual attitudes and preferences, it is not expected that an individual would rate highly on every point in each of these categories. However, the overall quality of the candidate's performance in regard to the listed items and the number of those in which he or she has proved successful should make for reasonable uniformity of judgment in considering promotion. Age shall not be considered a factor. The fundamental objective is to recognize the likelihood of continued high quality academic performance throughout the individual's career. For promotion to Professor, the individual's record as an Associate Professor must be more than an extension of his or her work as an Assistant Professor, and there must be a clear indication that the candidate's previous promise has matured to scholarly stature of national and international standing.

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

BY-LAWS
DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM
COLLEGE OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Adopted April 29, 2016

Revised Sept. 28, 2016

These by-laws are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other University policies and procedures as described generally in the Faculty Handbook and as subsequently revised. These by-laws are intended to be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with current Regents laws and actions and other University policies and procedures. In the event of a conflict, Regent laws and actions and other policies and procedures of the University shall control.

I. **General rules and definitions**

A. **Department Meetings:** Department meetings for the purpose of conducting business and sharing information will be held frequently, twice a semester at a minimum and more often as needed. Department meetings generally will not occur during the summer months. Meetings will be called by the Chair or at the request of one-third or more of the voting members of the department.

B. **Quorum:** A quorum consists of those voting members who attend the meeting. Absentee voting is permitted with the consent of a simple majority of those attending the meeting and voting. A voting member who wishes to cast an absentee ballot must initiate the process through providing his or her proxy to a voting member who will attend the meeting.

C. **Voting Members:** Voting members of the department are those persons (a) holding the academic rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, and (b) holding the academic rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor, provided they have an appointment in the Department with either the length of the appointment contract or the cumulative length of continuous appointments being 3 years or longer and with the majority of teaching and service assignments resting in the Department. Voting members do not include temporary faculty, such as lecturers, faculty at visiting, adjoint, or adjunct ranks; research faculty; emeritus faculty, or students.

D. **Graduate Faculty:** The graduate faculty consists of those voting members of the department who also are members of the graduate faculty at the University of Colorado at Boulder. On matters of the graduate curriculum and personnel matters pertaining thereof, members of the graduate faculty have the privilege of the vote.

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

E. In the event of a faculty search at the rank of Instructor or above, the Chair will appoint a Search Committee, normally including four faculty members, one of whom will chair the committee, and both a graduate and undergraduate student representative. The student representatives will provide input from students regarding the job candidates, but will not vote on the candidates. The Search Committee will screen the applicants and determine which candidates to bring to campus for interviews. The Search Committee also will coordinate those campus visits and will contact references for the candidates. The Search Committee, including the student representatives, will report their findings to the faculty at a meeting to be held at the conclusion of the campus visits.

G. The Department, from time to time, may adopt specific policies (as it has, e.g., on Differential Workloads for Faculty and on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure). Such policies may be discarded, replaced, or amended by normal procedures and do not require a two-thirds majority.

H. The faculty may request that a Staff Assistant or another individual attend meetings and take minutes or may elect a secretary from among its own members. Minutes will show motions made and passed and topics discussed but will not attempt to reproduce arguments and discussion.

II. Chair

The chair has the responsibility for providing leadership toward the achievement of the highest possible level of excellence in the teaching, research, and service activities of the department. The chair is expected to articulate the goals of the department, both within and without the department, to articulate the department's actions or requests in pursuit of these aims, and to maintain a climate that is hospitable to creativity and innovation. The chair has the responsibility to inform the department of the stances and actions of the dean and other administrators that might affect the department.

A. The Chair's general responsibilities are as follows:

1. Assignment of teaching and other duties within the department consistent with appropriate FTE levels, and consistent with the concept that the appropriate mix of teaching, research or creative work, scholarship, and service may differ from person to person, and from time to time in the career of an individual.
2. Preparation of the schedule of courses and of times and places for class meetings.
3. Arrangement and assignment of duty for counseling of students, and for training and supervision of teaching assistants and other student teachers and teacher aides.
4. Preparation of the budget and administration of the financial affairs of the

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

department, in strict accordance with dollar and FTE allocations and in accord with University rules and procedures.

5. Recommendation of sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence to the dean, and for ensuring that their scheduling is consistent with departmental needs.
6. Promptly reporting the resignation or death of any member of the department.
7. Custody and authorized use of University property charged to the department.
8. Departmental observance of proper health and safety regulations, in coordination with the campus environmental health and safety officer.
9. Maintenance of department records and preparation of reports in accordance with the University and college procedures.
10. Reporting to the dean, or appropriate administrators - whenever a problem cannot be expeditiously resolved at the departmental level - any failure of an academic or staff member of the department to carry out responsibilities, and recommendation of appropriate remedial and/or disciplinary action.

In the performance of the duties listed above, the chair is expected to seek the advice of departmental faculty colleagues in a systematic way, to provide for the conduct of department affairs in an orderly manner through department meetings and the appointment of appropriate committees, and to keep department members informed of his or her actions in a timely manner. The chair is also expected to seek student advice on matters of concern to students enrolled in the department's programs. The chair may appoint either one or two associate chairs, each with a discrete, explicit set of duties, or otherwise seek the assistance of other colleagues in the tasks involved in the completion of his or her responsibilities.

B. The Chair shall be appointed according to the following procedures:

1. In the spring semester before a Chair's final year of service, the Chair shall accept nominations from the faculty for the next term. Those nominated should be tenured members of the Journalism faculty. Both nominations from colleagues and self nominations will be accepted. Should the Chair be running for reappointment to the position for a second term, the nominations will be accepted by the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. Should that person also be interested in becoming Chair, the nominations will be accepted by the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies. In the instance that all three of those people are seeking the job of Chair, the faculty will select from among its tenured members someone to solicit and accept the nominations.
2. The person in charge of accepting nominations (see Item II.B.1 above) will

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

prepare a list of all faculty members nominated to serve as chair. The person will discuss with each nominated member whether they would like to be included on the ballot. Any nominated faculty member who wishes to be included on the ballot shall be.

3. The faculty will convene in a special faculty meeting – without the candidates present – to discuss the candidates on the ballot. After this meeting, the faculty as a whole will convene to cast secret ballots for chair. Each voting member of the faculty will have one vote. The chair is selected by a simple majority of the votes cast. If there are more than two candidates on the ballot and the first vote does not yield a majority for one candidate, the two candidates getting the most votes will be placed on a second ballot. A second vote will then be taken, and the person receiving the majority vote will be selected for appointment by the Dean.

4. The vote of the faculty will be reported to the Dean. If the dean does not concur with the department faculty's recommendation, the Dean will meet with the department faculty to discuss his/her reasons for disagreement. In the event of disagreement from the Dean, the nomination and selection process will be reopened, and new candidates may be considered.

C. Conflicts between the Chair and the Faculty: Rules of the Regents give the Chair responsibility for virtually all operations of the department. But good academic practice requires a substantial faculty role in matters of academic governance, especially curriculum decisions, decisions on evaluation of students and other faculty, and decisions on hiring and dismissing academic personnel.

1. When the Chair disagrees with the legitimately expressed will of the faculty on a matter of academic governance, he/she is responsible for communicating to the relevant Dean the disagreement and for making, to the best of his/her ability, both the Chair's case and the faculty's case to the relevant Dean.

2. The relevant Dean is responsible for deciding such matters.

D. Normally, the term of office for the Chair will be three years, renewable once.

E. The Chair will be evaluated annually as required by College and University policies.

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

III. Standing Committees

- A. Faculty Merit Review Committee: The Faculty Merit Review Committee is responsible for annually reviewing and evaluating the performance of faculty members, and for documenting those evaluations in the Performance Rating Form for each faculty member. The Department chair is an Ex-Officio, nonvoting member who offers his/her input into the Committee's deliberation. The Committee will be elected by the faculty and will include three members, at least one of whom should be a full professor, and the membership should include representatives across the faculty ranks (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor), provided that there are three or more faculty members rostered at that rank in the Department who are able to serve. Except in the initial two years of the Department, committee members will serve for three years, with one new member being elected by the faculty each year. In the first two years, the committee members will determine who will serve a one-year term and who will serve a two-year term in order to work towards a three-year term rotation, with one new member each year. Committee members are eligible to be re-elected for up to two consecutive terms on the Faculty Merit Review Committee.
- B. Undergraduate Program Committee: The Undergraduate Program Committee is responsible for assisting the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies in the oversight of the undergraduate program in Journalism. Its function is to help develop, implement, and evaluate the overall undergraduate program and make recommendations to the faculty.
- C. Graduate Program Committee: The Graduate Program Committee is responsible for assisting the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies in the oversight of the Graduate Program in Journalism. Its function is to help develop, implement, and evaluate the overall graduate program and make recommendations to the faculty.

IV. Committees and Department Administration

- A. The Department of Journalism in general has a preference for conducting business as a committee of the whole. However, the Chair may from time to time appoint ad hoc committees (including committees of one) for the efficient and responsible conduct of department business. Standing committees, other than the Faculty Merit Review Committee, will be appointed at the initiation of the Chair with faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent.

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

- B. The Chair may from time to time appoint faculty members to administrative roles (e.g., Associate Chair of Graduate Studies, Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies). Such appointments will include faculty consultation but not necessarily faculty consent, either to the role or to the individual to occupy it.
- C. Terms of office for committees and administrators other than the Chair will be at the discretion of the Chair.

V. Disputes and Grievances

Generally, the Department seeks to address faculty members' disputes and grievances in a direct and timely manner, and to resolve them at the lowest possible administrative level. Here, "dispute" is taken to include conflict between two or more faculty members that disrupts generally accepted norms of collegiality; "grievance" includes a faculty member's disagreement with formal decisions made by Departmental Committees that affect his or her interests, and an accompanying desire for review and reconsideration of that decision. Faculty members advancing a grievance shall, as a matter of courtesy, first request a meeting with the Committee and/or Departmental Chair bearing primary responsibility for that decision to discuss related questions and concerns (e.g., that the Committee did not consider relevant information or evidence). Those Chairs shall attempt to explain the decision as best they can. If the faculty member is not satisfied by this response, he or she may proceed as follows: In the case of a Merit-based grievance, she or he shall follow the separate "Faculty Merit Review Procedure." In the case of grievance concerning Reappointment, Promotion, and /or Tenure, he or she shall follow related College and/or campus-based policies.

VI. Amendments

Amendments to these by-laws may be proposed by any voting member of the department. Written copies of any proposed amendment will be circulated to all voting members not less than three days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered. A two-thirds majority of those voting will be required for passage of an amendment. If the Chair disagrees with an amendment passed by the faculty, he/she will follow the procedures described in section II.C of these by-laws.

Appendix 1.2

Department of Journalism Bylaws

VII. Parliamentary Authority

The most recent edition of Roberts Rules of Order, Revised will govern the proceedings of the department.

Appendix 1.2
Department of Journalism Bylaws

**Department of Journalism
College of Media, Communication and Information
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO**

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review**

Revised by the Faculty in Fall 2017

Adopted Dec. 6, 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
II. Faculty Mix, Titles, Teaching and Workload	2
A. Faculty Mix	3
B. Regular Faculty Titles	4
1. Qualifications for Rank	
C. Teaching Workload	5
D. Differentiated Workloads	6
II. Faculty Evaluation	6
A. Personnel Actions and Criteria	7
1. Tenure	7
2. Promotion	7
3. Reappointment Assessment	8
4. Post-Tenure Review	9
5. Reappointment of Instructor Rank Faculty	9
B. Performance Indicators	9
1. Teaching	10
2. Academic Research and Professional/Creative Scholarship	13
a) Academic Research	14
b) Creative/Professional Work	17
3. Professional Service and Outreach Activities	20
a) Measures to Assess Professional Service and Outreach Activities	
b) Indicators of Meritorious Service and Outreach	
c) Indicators of Excellence in Service and Outreach	
C. Evaluation Procedures	23
1. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment: The Review Documents	

Introduction

The Department of Journalism follows the criteria and procedures for salary decisions, reappointment, promotion and tenure actions adopted by the College of Media, Communication and Information, and as outlined in the University's Faculty Handbook (<http://www.cu.edu/oaa/faculty-handbook>) and Administrative Policy Statement 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion (<http://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>). The Department as a whole is considered to be the primary unit.

This document describes the criteria upon which personnel decisions are normally based. The criteria, though, are only guidelines. They must be applied with good judgment, with consideration of the Department's and College's missions, and with recognition of individual patterns of achievement. The policies herein are subject to the current laws and regulations of the Board of Regents and to other University policies. If a conflict arises, the laws and actions of the Regents and the University supersede this document. A copy of these operating policies and procedures, or information on where to find them online, will be given to each faculty member at the time of initial appointment. Faculty members are also urged to become familiar with the University's Faculty Handbook and Administrative Policy Statement 1022.

This document is divided into two sections. First, it discusses the concept of a faculty mix, faculty titles, teaching and differentiated workloads. Then it presents criteria for faculty evaluation and the procedures by which evaluations for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review will be conducted.

I. FACULTY MIX, TITLES, TEACHING AND WORKLOAD

As an accredited program the Department is subject to the nine standards of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. One of those standards is of direct relevance to policies for building faculties in programs such as this one, with particular significance for the evaluation of faculty in appointment, promotion and tenure decisions.

According to ACEJMC Standard #4:

"The unit hires, supports and evaluates a capable faculty with a balance of academic and professional credentials appropriate for the unit's mission."

A. Faculty Mix

To maintain accreditation, the Department has to meet the requirement for a faculty with both professional credentials and scholarly skills. Therefore, the Department I seeks a diverse faculty with a blend and balance of academic and professional qualifications. A Ph.D. or other terminal degree normally is considered a prerequisite for faculty status in the academy. In the Department, individuals with distinguished credentials and outstanding professional or creative experience but lacking the Ph.D. or other terminal degree may be qualified for appointment to tenured or tenure-track positions. It is the integration and interplay of academic and professional/creative faculty that invigorate the mission of the University, the College and the Department in particular.

In the creative/professional area, there is a mix when it comes to faculty academic credentials. While there are creative scholars or professionals with earned doctorates, typically the terminal degree for faculty with significant creative or professional experience is the master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, MBA, MFA, and MPA). Securing noted faculty members who can teach professional courses, contribute to the national dialogue associated with issues in the field and publish professionally is indispensable to the Department's mission.

The second group follows the traditional scholarly track and is associated with faculty whose background embraces theoretical and methodological knowledge. Typically, a doctorate is the terminal degree for such a faculty member. These faculty members are often judged by the originality of their research, the soundness of their theory, appropriateness of methodology, scope and depth of their work, impact on the field and the presentation of their work in refereed venues.

The concept of a faculty member who is a hybrid of a creative/professional scholar and a researcher/theoretician is another alternative. These creative/professionals, who are also grounded in traditional research and theory, recognize the practical and theoretical as complementary. While a doctoral degree is typically the terminal degree for these faculty members, the Department also recognizes and values those with other advanced degrees combined with professional credentials who also publish traditional academic research.

B. Regular Faculty Titles

The Board of Regents' "Standards, Processes, and Procedures Document" designates faculty titles according to primary responsibilities, qualifications and accomplishments, eligibility for benefits and other factors of employment. Faculty titles are held by faculty who have been awarded tenure, or are tenure-track faculty or non-tenure track faculty.

1. Qualifications for Rank

The following regular faculty titles are found in the University's Faculty Handbook (<http://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-51-policy-approved-faculty-titles>).

- a) Instructor: Individuals appointed to this rank typically have a master's degree or its equivalent and should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate (primarily lower division) level. Those who have completed all the requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation, or who have other terminal degrees or comparable professional or creative work experience, are appointed at this rank. An instructor rank may change to assistant professor upon completion of the dissertation if this was stated at the time of the initial appointment.
- b) Senior Instructor: The rank of senior instructor gives higher recognition and salary as well as longer periods of appointment than that of instructor. It is awarded to faculty members who do not have the prerequisite for holding the rank of assistant professor but who have special abilities, usually in teaching.
- c) Assistant Professor: Faculty appointed to this rank should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, plus some successful teaching experience. They should be otherwise well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research or creative/professional work in a particular field.
- d) Associate Professor: Faculty holding this rank should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable teaching experience and promising accomplishments in research or creative/professional work. The Department may hire a faculty member as an untenured Associate Professor, and those individuals will be expected to seek tenure within the first six years of faculty employment.

e) Professor: Faculty at this rank should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or Departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant and continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

In addition to regular faculty titles, the University has a number of other faculty titles that the Department, with the consent of the faculty, can use at its discretion for other faculty and/or research personnel. These include: Research Professor Series, Research Associate Series, Visiting Professor, and Special Visiting Professor (See sections F and H in Board of Regents Policy 5L: <http://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-5l-policy-approved-faculty-titles>).

C. Teaching Workload

The Regents' policy on faculty performance is based on a workload distribution of 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research and/or creative work, and 20 percent service. The normal assignment for classroom teaching for instructors and other faculty engaged primarily in teaching and service is three classes each semester.

The Department provides for a number of options in regard to teaching load. For example, a faculty member's teaching load can be adjusted for special administrative assignments. With the consent of the Chair and Dean, and in consultation with the appropriate faculty leadership, faculty members may adjust their teaching workload within an academic year. Such adjustments may occur through a "banking" system in which a faculty member might teach an extra course in one semester (e.g., three courses) with a course reduction in the subsequent semester (e.g., one course). For a faculty member to use "banking," the curricular needs of the Department must first be met, and the faculty member must provide a plan for research or creative work to the Chair. Through the procurement of grants, faculty members may occasionally reduce their teaching loads by providing the Department with course buyouts. This option must meet the requirements listed above as well as having the approval of the Chair and Dean and in consultation with the appropriate faculty leadership. Only in exceptional

circumstances will a faculty member be permitted to buy out a course, semester or academic year from personal funds rather than funds approved as part of a grant.

D. Differentiated Workloads

The Regents acknowledge, “The proportions of teaching, research and service may vary within a full assignment, depending upon the ongoing, existing workload demand at Department level, and consistent...with the concept that the appropriate mix of teaching, research or creative work, scholarship, and service may differ from person to person, and from time to time in the career of an individual.” (Law of the Regents, Appendix B.2). Also, the System administration, interpreting the Regents’ Laws, states that “...the laws of the Regents do not mandate” a 40-40-20 distribution of teaching, research or creative work and service.
(<https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/differentiated-workloads>)

Thus, with the concurrence of the Chair and Dean and in consultation with the appropriate faculty leadership, faculty assigned to substantial administrative work (e.g., managing a center or other specialized program), or who have substantial research obligations, creative work or teaching assignments, may be assigned to a differentiated workload customized to the interests of the faculty member and the Department. Such adjustments should be for a fixed period of time and renewable according to the needs of the faculty member and the Department.

The Faculty Handbook urges assistant and associate professors considering differentiated workloads to be cognizant of the “potential negative impact that such a decision may have on future promotion decisions” (Law of the Regents, Sec. 4 A.3).

II. FACULTY EVALUATION

At the time of hiring, the Department and the new tenure-track faculty member must be clear about expectations that will lead to tenure and/or promotion. The Department and faculty hired as instructors must agree on the instructor’s teaching and service responsibilities. Expectations can be found in the policies of the Department and the CMCI, as well as the university’s Faculty Handbook for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. Any exceptions to the normal expectations should be stated in writing.

A. Personnel Actions and Criteria

The Regents' laws provide for pre-tenure faculty evaluations leading to the award of tenure, annual merit performance review, post-tenure review and the evaluation of teaching for the purpose of making informed decisions regarding all merit-based salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. For policies and procedures regarding annual review, please see the related document "Department of Journalism Policies and Procedures for Annual Merit Performance Evaluation."

1. Tenure

Although salary adjustments are made as part of the annual review process, promotion and tenure considerations place more emphasis upon contributions over several years and patterns of teaching and scholarly performance over time. Granting tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of the university and is, consequently, the most critical decision made regarding a faculty member. Such commitments must be limited to persons who are judged most likely to remain as assets to the Department, College and University and as productive scholars for the rest of their careers. The annual evaluations after promotion and tenure will be based on the individual's continuing productivity.

Granting of tenure must be based on University standards as outlined by Administrative Policy Statement 1022, adopted 2007: "Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and leadership and service to the University and the faculty member's profession, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/creative work."

(<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>)

2. Promotion

As in tenure decisions, meritorious performance is expected in all three areas, and excellence must be demonstrated in teaching, research or creative work before promotion to associate professor will be recommended. According to the APS 1022, "in making comprehensive review, tenure, and/or promotion recommendations, all primary units shall evaluate the candidate's performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a

material bearing on a comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion recommendation in that unit.” (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>).

To be considered for promotion to full professor, a candidate “should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas.” (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>)

Review for promotion to full professor is conducted in the same manner as is the tenure and promotion review, including the solicitation of external letters of assessment.

3. Reappointment

Newly hired faculty members will meet with their faculty mentors and the CMCI Personnel Committee during the first semester of hiring. This meeting is to relay the expectations of the Department, College and University and to advise new faculty members about how to approach research or creative work in light of the demands of a research university. During the new faculty members’ second semester in the Department, and continuing every year until tenure, a peer teaching evaluation will be conducted. The peer evaluations will be used as one of several measures to evaluate teaching performance for reappointment and, later, tenure.

The Department conducts a required comprehensive reappointment review of tenure-track faculty during the faculty member’s fourth year in the Department. At the end of the faculty member’s third year, the faculty member receives reappointment notification from the Chair and CMCI Personnel Committee. This review covers the entire period since appointment and is part of an internal University process. Untenured faculty members are evaluated on their scholarly or creative/professional promise, teaching and service, as well as their demonstrated productivity. The review process determines if the individual is making appropriate progress toward a successful promotion and/or tenure review.

A positive reappointment recommendation will result in a contract renewal through the year the faculty member is considered for tenure. If the reappointment review results in serious concerns, the Department may recommend a shorter reappointment period or non-renewal of the faculty member's contract. If contract non-renewal is recommended as an outcome of the comprehensive review, a tenure-track faculty member will have a terminal year before his/her appointment ends (See section IX, "Comprehensive Review":

<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>).

4. Post-Tenure Review

Every fifth after year tenure is granted, faculty members undergo a post-tenure review. The purpose of this review is to (1) facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources, and (2) to ensure professional accountability to the University community, the Board of Regents, and the public.

(See section XI: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>) . This review takes into consideration a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and creative work and service.

5. Reappointment of Instructor Rank Faculty

Faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor are to undergo a review based on the workload established by the terms of their initial contract and by the measurements outlined in this document. The manner in which this review is to be conducted is outlined in the 2011 Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Lecturer and Instructor Rank Faculty (https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/lecturer_instructor_appointment_evaluation_promotion_guidelines_2017_revisions_remediated_091917.pdf)

B. Performance Indicators

Performance indicators apply to all faculty members and may vary depending upon whether the person is in a research track or creative track or a combination of both. The standards

articulated below are drawn in part from documents prepared by professional associations concerned with accreditation and with faculty appointment and promotion criteria.

In each promotion and tenure case, communication from the Department to the CMCI Personnel Committee and the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee will make clear what role is expected of the candidate and which indicators are important. The following factors are considered in evaluating the candidate's annual performance, as well as qualifications for tenure and promotion.

1. **Teaching**

Accreditation standards leave no doubt about the importance of teaching. A paramount concern for ACEJMC (Standard 4) is an evaluation system to ensure a high quality of classroom instruction.

In accordance with the Board of Regents and University policy, all candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion must be judged on "a minimum of three components" of their teaching ability, one of which "must be a student evaluation, which must include, but is not limited to, the data from the Faculty Course Questionnaire or a similar, campus-approved system and form." (<http://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>). The Department of Journalism strives for the highest standards of teaching and expects all faculty members to be effective teachers. Several factors are employed to determine if a candidate has demonstrated meritorious teaching standards.

a) Measures to Assess Teaching

The following is a list of multiple measures of teaching as outlined in APS 1009 Attachment A, "Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation." As the document states, the list is "representative but not exhaustive."

- Course syllabi and examinations
- Student evaluations as reported on Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ's) or a similar, campus-approved system
- Grade distributions
- Instructional materials
- Scholarly research and publication on teaching

- Self-evaluation or report
- Student examination performance
- Student mid-term evaluations
- Evidence of risk taking to enhance learning
- Curriculum development that enhances learning
- Willingness to take training in teaching effectiveness and new technology
- Evidence of engagement in the online environment
- Alumni opinions within 2-5 years of graduation
- Peer assessments
- Professional awards related to the education process
- Grants in support of teaching and learning
- Student focus groups

In addition, the Department of Journalism may consider additional measures, including those listed below, to assess teaching

- Student letters solicited by the chair or PUEC
- Classroom/student interviews conducted by an faculty interviewer or team of interviewers
- Mentoring and/or supervision of theses or student projects
- Involving students in a substantial and productive way in the faculty member's research and/or creative work
- Presenting on pedagogy or pedagogical research at conferences
- Invited speaking on topics related to teaching or curriculum
- Consulting on curriculum or pedagogy, including design / revision or evaluation, outside the Department or university
- Conducting teacher training within the university or for outside organizations

b) Indicators of Meritorious Performance in Teaching

In general, affirmative answers to the following questions indicate that the candidate's teaching is meritorious:

- Do the quantitative and qualitative measures listed in "a) Measures to assess teaching" indicate an overall pattern of effective teaching that engages and challenges students?
- Does the candidate's curricular contributions advance the Department's goals? These contributions can include new-course design, overall curriculum revision, or innovating new ways to teach existing courses?

- Has the candidate demonstrated an effort to continually improve and develop teaching skills, through training opportunities?
- Does candidate's teaching portfolio, including sample syllabi, assignments, exams, demonstrate thoughtful pedagogy, an awareness of current materials and issues in the field, and innovation in teaching and curriculum?
- Do examples of student work and/or student feedback in letters, narrative evaluations, interviews demonstrate improvement of skills, mastery of concepts and critical thinking?
- Has the candidate's teaching been recognized in the form of internal teaching awards, teaching grants or fellowships?
- Does alumni feedback indicate that the candidate contributed to students' future professional or academic (e.g., in graduate school) success?

c) Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by teaching activities that move beyond the standards of meritorious performance, and beyond the usual activities that support good classroom teaching. Affirmative answers to the following questions indicate that the candidate's teaching is excellent:

- Does the teaching, according to the multiple measures, exemplify the highest level of professional accomplishment?
- Does the candidate have a coherent body of work supported with understanding of pedagogy and the scholarship of teaching?
- Has the candidate made significant contributions to research on pedagogy through peer-reviewed publications, or through professional publications addressing significant issues in teaching and curriculum?
- Does the candidate must have national recognition as a master teacher and in some cases contribute to international discourse on teaching? National and international recognition may be shown by, for example, participation in the Pew National Fellowship Program of Carnegie Scholars or selection through national competition for a Fulbright Teaching Award or other such nationally recognized programs. Winning campus-wide or national teaching awards, such as the AEJMC/Scripps-Howard Teacher of the Year Award or membership on editorial boards of refereed pedagogical journals, also are indicators of national recognition in teaching.

- Has the candidate been recognized and sought out by outside institutions, including other universities or academic associations, as an expert on teaching or curriculum?

2. Academic Research and Creative/Professional Scholarship

The Department participates in the research mission of the University in a broad context. The Department encourages scholarship that illuminates the interplay between academic study and theory-building in professional practice. Regardless of focus, faculty members are expected to excel in their intellectual contributions to the academy and/or to professional practice. As such, their work is expected to lead to a new understanding or appreciation of journalism. All faculty members are expected to continue throughout their careers to contribute to the academic mission of the Department utilizing their distinctive academic and professional strengths.

Due to the diverse nature of faculty activities in the Department, standards of evaluation are necessarily varied. The merit of a faculty member's work should be measured in terms of standards appropriate to the area of performance. Though different criteria exist to assess these activities, all scholarship should contribute to an individual's personal development as a scholar through the reinforcement of a coherent and substantial body of work, as well as contributing to a national reputation for the Department.

Beyond the record of publications, presentations and related activities, the review process also includes an assessment of an individual's intellectual development, which includes an emerging and/or growing coherent body of work, the frequency and regularity of activities, and the individual's reputation in the field. Individuals who are hired at advanced rank or who earn promotion cannot rest there. They must continue to contribute to the Department, College and University in significant and appropriate ways and continue to grow in intellectual leadership.

Promotion decisions will be based on criteria, standards and evidence as defined in University of Colorado APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>).

"Criteria" refers to the specific dimensions of teaching, research or creative work, and service listed in this document ("Primary Unit Criteria") and University documents. "Standards" refers to the level of performance, which will be determined to be (a) not meritorious, (b) meritorious or (c) excellent. According to APS 1022, Primary Unit Criteria "shall include a description of the

level of achievement that warrants the designations 'meritorious' and 'excellent' performance in teaching, research or creative work, and leadership and service as well as in other applicable evaluation areas. It will also provide a description of the types of evidence that will be used to evaluate the candidate against the performance standards."

The following discussion is intended to suggest ways the Primary Unit Criteria and standards for the Department of Journalism may be interpreted.

For initial reappointment after comprehensive review, a faculty member is expected to have begun a promising research or creative program. Before tenure can be recommended, the program must be productive and significant, amounting at least to meritorious quality.

a) Academic Research

1) Measures to Assess Research

According to the APS 1022, the primary evidence of scholarship is peer-reviewed work products and recognition by other scholars of the candidate's research, publication and/or creative/professional record. More specifically, the candidates who focus on academic research may present evidence in such areas as:

- Refereed journal articles
- Analytical, critical and interpretive books
- Book chapters breaking new ground and advancing new concepts
- Articles, reviews, research reports and commentaries in respected professional publications, particularly articles advancing the knowledge of the profession or critically assessing media performance
- Monographs
- Textbooks breaking new ground and successfully advancing concepts and ideas that transcend ordinary instructional material
- Published reports and studies for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations
- Encyclopedia entries
- Memoranda or briefs of law
- Updating or revisions of scholarly treatises

- Reviews of scholarly works
- Invited lectures and presentations in symposia, conferences and professional meetings
- Scholar-in-residence programs
- Competitive research awards and grants
- Refereed conference papers
- Documented results of academic or research consulting

2) Criteria for Academic Research:

Scholarship will be evaluated based on judgment by peers taking into account the organizations' and publications' reputations, as well as critical reactions to articles and presentations.

Although quality of scholarship takes precedence over quantity, the amount of work produced cannot be ignored. It is easier to count than judge, but the Department does both, attempting to determine if the work represents meritorious or excellent performance. Both quality and quantity are important factors in distinguishing between meritorious and excellent.

Some weighting is standard in academic circles. In general:

- Books rank higher than textbooks.
- Refereed monographs are more significant than refereed articles.
- Refereed articles and book chapters are more significant than work in non-refereed journals.
- Published articles are more important than papers presented at scholarly meetings.
- Published works are more important than working papers, works in process or works in production.

Given the range of work produced by faculty in the Department of Journalism and variety of methodologies used in research/creative work, it is important for the faculty member to provide information regarding authorship of his/her work. While the level of contribution in a single authored work is straightforward, the faculty member's contribution to work that is co-authored or co-produced should be described so that the evaluating group can accurately credit the faculty member for his/her work. Additionally, faculty members who often collaborate with others

should try to balance their co-authored research/creative work with single-authored studies and/or projects.

3) Indicators of Meritorious Performance in Academic Research

In general, affirmative answers to the following questions indicate that the candidate's research is meritorious:

- Does the candidate's work contribute to society's understanding of mass communication and/or the various disciplines of professional practice?
- For scholarship in professional areas, does the work improve professional practice?
- Does the scholarship bring recognition to the Department, College and University?
- Is the research judged significant by experts in the fields as evidenced by publication in respected journals and by external reference letters?
- Has the work been regular and continuous?
- Has the work been organized, focused and systematic?
- Has the candidate participated in team or group-based research programs that bring visibility and respect to the Department, program or discipline?

Other characteristics of meritorious work include:

- Originality
- Soundness of theory and appropriateness of literature base
- Appropriateness of methodology
- Scope of depth of work
- Thoroughness and clarity of presentation
- Quality of the forum or publication and nature of the review process

4) Indicators of Excellence in Academic Research

Candidates whose work represents excellence in performance will have a research record that moves beyond the standards of meritorious performance and represents advanced research and critical commentary on significant issues leading to national recognition of the faculty member. Scholarship meeting the excellence standards will be recognized as contributing to

the candidate's recognition as a national or international expert or leader in some area or discipline.

Other indications of excellence in research may include affirmative answers to such questions as:

- Has the work had a significant impact on the field or discipline?
- Is the proportion of major work greater than that of minor work?
- In the list of weighting standards, is more, or most, of the scholarship in the higher ranked categories?
- Is the candidate seen as a leader in the development of team or group-based research programs for the University or industry?
- Is the candidate active in seeking and obtaining research grants and external research support for the Department?

b) . Creative/Professional Work

Whether a faculty member is pursuing scholarly research, creative/professional work or a hybrid of both, the work is expected to be highly regarded nationally. In the case of creative/professional work, editors, producers, and other reviewers typically review and approve any piece of work before it is published or broadcast. The quality and quantity of the work are judged together, although quality is more important than quantity, and the depth and impact of the work on the industry and/or the public also will be considered.

1) Measures to Assess Creative/Professional Work

Creative/professional work can take a variety of forms:

- Professional journalistic writing, designing and producing, such as radio, television, film, and photographic production; video-based or multimedia documentaries; digital and interactive productions, such as websites and databases; newspapers and magazine articles; works of literary or narrative journalism in the form of essays, articles or books; books for general audiences.

- Publication of commentaries and critical reviews about the field and related subjects in popular media, including television and radio, magazines, major newspapers, relevant online outlets, trade publications and journalism reviews.
- Performances, presentations, exhibits or installations, screenings, or speeches about the faculty member's creative/professional work.
- Other creative/professional work of a demanding nature in responsible positions with the media.
- Documented professional consulting.

2) Indicators of Meritorious Performance in Creative/Professional Scholarship

Like research and scholarship, creative/professional work may be deemed meritorious if it represents the active pursuit of an organized and focused body of work that meets the standards below.

Overall, creative/professional scholarship is to be evaluated in terms of its required effort, its quality, its scope and its impact. Consideration will be given to the relative differences in effort and impact between various forms of creative/professional works. For example, writing and producing a 20-minute documentary film or a three-part investigative series or a major, multi-source magazine feature article on the order of 3,000 words or more, likely represents more effort than an 800-word newspaper article or magazine column.

Impact and importance of the piece also will be considered. For example, an article that has led to changes in public policy or that launches a governmental investigation or a collection of photographs selected for a nationally competitive exhibit will be more highly prized than similar output without such impact.

Quality of the creative/professional work will be evaluated primarily based on judgment by professional peers. The organizations' and publications' reputations and consequent competitiveness in accepting work—measured by factors such as acceptance rates for comparable submissions and circulation/audience size of the organization/publication—as well as reviews and documented reactions to the work, will be taken into account. Professional peer review is expected and is often conducted through such methods as a review panel/jury or a publication's editorial process. Reputable external reviews of the work, such as by a major

news-media outlet or a discipline-specific publication or organization, will be considered as further evidence of the judgment of professional peers..

In general, affirmative answers to the following factors indicate meritorious creative/professional scholarship:

- Does the work break new ground or successfully advance state-of-the art concepts, ideas and approaches that transcend ordinary professional practices?
- Has the work been published, juried or competitively recognized? Evaluation of these works should consider not only the competitiveness of the forum, but also critical reaction to the work.
- Has the faculty member's creative/professional work experience demonstrably enhanced his or her teaching, service and professionalism?

3) Indicators of Excellence in Creative/Professional Scholarship

Work is deemed excellent if it moves beyond the standards of meritorious performance. It should represent advancements in creative/professional performance and/or critical commentary on significant professional issues. In these ways, the work should lead to national or international recognition if the faculty member.

Other indicators might be affirmative answers to such questions as:

- Has the candidate's work been recognized nationally within his or her field, as evidenced by awards, reviews, media coverage, and/or other peer acknowledgement?
- Is the entire body of work coherent, well organized, and systematic around approaches to content and / or professional practice that advance new thinking in the field?
- Has the candidate been successful in obtaining grants, fellowships, or other external support for the creative/professional work?

Candidates being considered for excellence in creative/professional work are encouraged to document evidence of quality, scope, effort and impact, in ways that are (to the greatest extent possible) equivalent to such quantifiable measures for academic research. For example, to

document the impact of a print or online magazine article, the candidate might report the circulation or online audience size of the magazine. To document the quality of the article, the candidate might describe the pre-publication review process, the number and credentials of reviewers/editors involved, the acceptance rate at that publication, and/or the circumstances under which the candidate produced the creative/professional work.

c) Academic and Creative/Professional Work: The Hybrid Scholar

The Department recognizes the growing likelihood of dossiers that include a combination of complementary traditional academic and creative/professional scholarship—the dossier of the hybrid scholar.

The hybrid scholar's work products must meet the criteria for meritorious or excellent in the relevant categories (academic or creative/professional), as described above. Hybrid scholars must create an overall coherence in the body of work such that the creative/professional work complements and informs the academic research, and the academic research likewise complements and informs the creative/professional projects. Just as solely academic or solely creative/professional candidates presenting multiple products should explain how they form a body of work, it is incumbent on the candidate presenting a hybrid dossier to outline the relationship between the products of the two (or more) modalities and to make an argument for how their coexistence forwards thinking in the field.

3. **Professional Service and Outreach Activities**

Along with research and creative work and teaching, the Department recognizes the importance of providing service in all fields and levels of expertise represented on the faculty. Professional public service and outreach activities include service in the profession or discipline to international and/or national, state and local communities, as well as to the Department, the College and the University. Service is generally evaluated on the basis of its significance, quality and quantity.

A. Measures to Assess Professional Service and Outreach Activities

Service and outreach work can take a variety of forms. The list below is intended to be suggestive and is by no means exhaustive of the wide possibilities that service and outreach can take:

- Media relations: Maintaining good relations for the Department, the College and the University with the news media through personal contacts, participation in professional and educational organizations, consultation, research and contributions to workshops and conferences.
- Government and industry consulting: Serving as expert advisers to governmental and non-governmental organizations and professional bodies, particularly in the area of policy development, research and/or creative work.
- Department, College and University committees: Participating on and being a member of committees, including standing, ad-hoc, advisory and search committees.
- Community service: Participating in community activities related to the media, or related to the candidate's academic expertise – for example, membership on education boards, serving on non-profit organizations' boards of directors, providing creative and professional services to non-profit organizations without remuneration.
- Professional education: Conducting workshops for professionals in the fields represented on the faculty if that work entails teaching professional skills and practice.
- Public education: Assisting the public in using information technology and communication media to their fullest potential.
- Professional, scholarly and creative association activities: Providing leadership in professional associations, serving as webmaster for organizations, organizing conferences, and undertaking peer reviews of conference papers and submissions to electronic journals and multimedia outlets.
- Administrative services: Being an editor of a journal (print or online), being a member of editorial boards.
- Evaluative work: Jurying exhibitions, presentations, films and electronic media submissions, serving as external reviewer for academic and professional programs, reviewing print or on-line journal articles, book proposals and government grants/fellowships.

There are many indicators for service, but the ultimate determination must be an assessment by the faculty, Chair and Dean of the importance of the activities to the Department, College and University. Other indicators may include evaluations and comments by internal and external colleagues about the nature of service activities, and the number and nature of consultation activities, including evaluation of the activities by clients.

Participation in Department, College and/or University services and outreach activities is a minimum requirement for reappointment. Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires at least meritorious service.

B.) Indicators of Meritorious Service and Outreach

Meritorious performance in service and outreach includes participation and involvement in professional and educational activities, institutions and associations as well as activities relating to participation in and membership on University, College and Department committees. For untenured faculty members, the pacing, type and quantity of service activities should be discussed with the Chair and faculty mentors. The following are examples of activities that constitute meritorious service.

- Service on Department or College committees
- University or campus-level committee work
- Chairing sessions or serving as a respondent at national or international meetings
- A record of reviewing for journals, publishers or funding agencies
- Organizing or jurying exhibitions or conferences
- Guest lectures, serving as a news source, preparing materials and consulting with non-profit organizations without remuneration
- Advising student organizations

C.) Indicators of Excellence in Service and Outreach

In a 2000 memo to faculty on service, former Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Todd Gleeson stated, "Striving to be judged 'excellent' in service is desirable but not required, and

does not substitute for achieving excellence in either or both teaching and research/creative work.” With this in mind, the Department still places value on excellence in service. Excellence in service includes work that moves beyond mere involvement and participation and includes leadership, direction, and program and policy development in significant areas of concern to the local, national and international community. Faculty whose work includes administration must move beyond the expectations of the job to be considered excellent in service. The following are suggestive elements that encompass excellence in service.

- Securing a grant that might involve a significant outreach activity to the State of Colorado.
- Publishing about learning activities relating to service.
- Participation on a local, national or international service-learning project.
- Serving as an officer for a national or international media organization.
- Serving as a member of an accrediting team.

C. Evaluation Procedures

The Department’s tenured faculty is charged with consulting with the candidate’s PUEC as part of its initial review of the candidate, and then making a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair then consults with Dean, who solicits an additional review from the CMCI Personnel Committee. The Dean then makes a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee.

1. The Chair will supervise the processes involved in promotion, tenure and reappointment, and post-tenure review. The Chair’s primary responsibility is to appoint the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) for each candidate. The PUEC’s responsibility is to collect and summarize information, including comments from the Department’s faculty and others, relating to the teaching, research/creative/professional, and service activities of candidates and to make a recommendation to the tenured faculty on this candidate. The PUEC may accept written, unsolicited comments from any faculty member or student for inclusion in the dossier, and the candidate may add such material at any point in the review process. The PUEC will document and justify its recommendation and any dissenting votes.

Each candidate’s PUEC will consist of three members, all of whom are at a rank higher than that of the candidate. The Chair will choose two members. For the appointment of the third

member, the candidate will submit the names of three faculty colleagues who are eligible to serve on his/her PUEC. The Chair will choose one colleague from that list.

Members of the CMCI Personnel Committee may serve on a PUEC. If there are not three faculty members in the Department eligible to serve on the PUEC, eligible faculty from outside the Department must be recruited to vote as if they were members of the Department faculty.

Faculty Review. The candidate's dossier will be made available to faculty members who are senior to the candidate and who are eligible to vote on tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment. Only eligible faculty members may attend a meeting at which tenure, promotion or reappointment decisions are made. Discussion and votes at all meetings discussing personnel decisions must remain confidential.

At the faculty meeting, the PUEC makes recommendations on the candidate to the eligible faculty, including justifications for any dissenting votes. The eligible faculty then votes whether to recommend the candidate, and the Chair reports the faculty vote and summarizes in a written document the discussion, including justifications for dissenting votes. That document will become part of the candidate's dossier.

2. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment: The Review Documents

The Dossier. The candidate is responsible for assembling the initial dossier. The PUEC will add letters from external reviewers (if the case involves a tenure and/or promotion decision and which are confidential, available to faculty members eligible to vote on the case, but are to be summarized by PUEC, the summary to be included in the dossier) and faculty colleagues; peer teaching evaluations; student and alumni letters (which also are confidential, available to faculty members eligible to vote on the case, but are to be summarized by PUEC, the summary to be included in the dossier); an appraisal of the candidate's teaching ability, scholarly and creative work, and University's document checklist.

Personal Statement. Candidates submit separate written statements of philosophy describing their research or creative work program, teaching philosophy and service orientation and activities. These should include a discussion of the role the faculty member expects to play within the Department as a scholar or a scholar/professional.

Teaching Portfolio. Candidates are encouraged to compile documents that describe their teaching philosophy, the learning environment they create, and course development. The portfolio can include such items as syllabi, unusual approaches to testing or course activities, handouts, modules and programs, videotapes of instruction, textbooks, award-winning student work, other evidence of innovation in course development, UROP proposals, independent study projects and other mentoring activities. Other demonstrations of teaching performance include grants and awards for teaching, papers and articles on teaching methods, and other forms of recognition for outstanding teaching.

Research and Creative Work. Candidates will be asked to provide copies of three recent research studies or creative projects that they believe represent their most significant work.

External Reviewers. The PUEC will organize written assessments of each candidate by scholars of national reputation who can comment on the quality of the candidate's research and creative work, the nature of the candidate's professional activities and any other information that would indicate the candidate's qualification for tenure and/or promotion. The candidate being reviewed for promotion and/or tenure will be asked to identify three or more such scholars, and the PUEC also will list three or more external reviewers. The PUEC will request letters from external reviewers selected from both lists. The University requires a minimum of six letters for tenure and promotion dossiers. The external reviewers' names are confidential, available only to faculty members eligible to vote on the case or decision-making groups outside the Department. The PUEC will summarize the external letters and include the summary in the dossier.

No external letters are required for a reappointment dossier.

Faculty Letters. Members of the Department faculty will be encouraged to submit written statements about the candidate. This will be the only opportunity for faculty who are not members of the PUEC or Personnel Committee to comment in writing on the candidate.

Peer Teaching Evaluations. The Department Chair and/or PUEC will select peer reviewers from the Department or, if appropriate, from outside the Department to (as the reviewer chooses) interview the candidate about his or her courses, attend class sessions, talk to students, review syllabi and undertake other methods of reviewing the candidate's teaching.

Attending a class taught by the candidate is the minimum required of a peer reviewer. The reviewers then will write reports individually reporting and explaining their assessment of the candidate's teaching.

Student Evaluations. Candidates are to summarize the data from the University's standardized course evaluation forms and include that information in the dossier. The PUEC may elicit from current or past students other written comments. Any other sources of student information, such as comments from students in exit interviews, also may be included.

CMCI Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will prepare a report including its vote and justifications for its vote, and including justifications for any dissenting votes. That report will become part of the candidate's dossier. The Dean will make a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Faculty Affairs' Advisory Committee (VCAC) based on a review of the candidate's dossier.

DEPARTMENT OF MEDIA STUDIES
College of Media, Communication & Information
University of Colorado, Boulder

BYLAWS

Adopted: January 23, 2017

SECTION 1: PURPOSE, GOVERNANCE and GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1 PURPOSE

The Department of Media Studies is an academic community in the College of Media, Communication & Information (CMCI) that is devoted to fostering intellectual and creative work informed by contemporary socio-political and cultural contexts. We are committed to fostering student success and excellence through teaching, learning and service. Our major provides students with crucial knowledge and critical thinking skills, effective communication competencies, an appreciation for diversity and inclusion and an understanding of the increasingly mediated world in which we live. To that end, we uphold a philosophy of shared governance through open communication, transparency, collaboration, academic freedom and integrity.

1.2 GOVERNANCE

In accordance with the CMCI, the Board of Regents and university policy, all members of the faculty have both the right and duty to participate in the shared governance of all matters concerning the department's decision making, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these bylaws (Laws of the Regents, Articles 4.A.5 and 5.E.5).

The guiding principles of these bylaws is that the operation and administration of the department, all recommendations, decisions, or actions on matters significantly affecting the department will be taken only with the prior approval of the faculty, except in unusual circumstances, or when such prior approval is impractical.

1.3 GENERAL PROVISIONS

In accordance with Regental Laws, Article 5, Faculty and the Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members & Roles and Professional Responsibilities of Department Chairs (Appendix B) as endorsed by the Boulder Assembly, March 4, 2010, and approved by Russell Moore, Provost on January 16, 2013, these bylaws have been adopted by a majority of the

faculty of the Department of Media Studies in the CMCI at the University of Colorado, Boulder. As required by Article 12, these bylaws are subject to review by the College of Media, Communication & Information (CMCI) to ensure that they do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies of the college and university before these bylaws, or their amendments, take effect.

SECTION 2: DEPARTMENT CHAIR

- 2.1 ***Responsibilities.*** The chair shall serve as the academic and administrative leader of the department. He or she is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the department, and represents the department in an official capacity to the college, university administration, and to all outside agencies. The chair shall perform in this capacity in accordance with the duties and responsibilities of this office as spelled out in the Faculty Handbook, pp. I: 21-26. The Chair will be evaluated annually as required by College and University policies.
- 2.2 ***Term of Office:*** The chair of the department must be a tenured member of the faculty of the rank of full or associate professor, who is fully rostered in the department. The term of office shall be not more than three years, renewable once.
- 2.3 ***Election:*** The department's choice of chair shall be made by a simple majority, secret ballot at a physical meeting of the voting members of the department. The election shall be held during March preceding the new term. After each ballot, the individual receiving the fewest votes shall be eliminated from the competition, until one person receives a simple majority of the votes cast.
- 2.4 ***Acting Chair:*** In the absence of the chair for one regular semester or during the summer terms, he or she shall designate an acting chair, to serve as his or her deputy. If the chair is absent for a longer period, the department shall elect an interim chair by the procedures outlined above.
- 2.5 ***Reporting Duties:*** At the beginning of each semester, the chair will present to the faculty the department's budget. At the start of the spring semester, the chair shall inform the faculty on matters concerning the financial status, department performance, enrollments, personnel projections, and other matters concerning the operations of the department.

SECTION 3: FACULTY TITLES, MEMBERSHIP, RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1 ***Voting Members.*** The voting members of the department are those who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor and full-time instructors. Visiting faculty are not voting members.
- 3.2 ***Participation:*** Through faculty meetings the faculty shall participate in the following: (1) decisions pertaining to the hiring of new faculty, including the choice of the department chair, (2) decisions on the media studies curricular and degree programs and requirements, including certificates, minors, and joint degrees with other departments within and outside CMCI, and (3) decisions on systematically evaluating the curricular often in a five year cycle (with a new curriculum, a three-year cycle is preferred).
- 3.3 ***Access & Voting Rights.*** All department faculty shall have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases but may vote only on cases where they have achieved the rank and/or tenure status under consideration for the candidate.
- 3.4 ***Executive Session.*** At times faculty considers business that must remain confidential. When this occurs, the faculty enters into executive session, and only voting members of the faculty may remain.
- 3.5 ***Other Participation.*** The standing rules of the department allow for members outside the regular faculty to attend faculty meetings by invitation, such as undergraduate or graduate students, faculty in other departments, and administrators designated by the dean. These outside members will not have voting privileges.
- 3.6 ***Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.*** Faculty on full-time paid leave (including parental leave and sabbatical leave but excluding sick leave) maintains their rights during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the department. Faculty on full-time paid sick leave and on full-time unpaid leave forfeit their rights of governance for the duration of such leave.
- 3.7. ***Graduate Faculty.*** Only faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matters.
- 3.8 ***Affiliated Faculty.*** The department welcomes affiliated faculty holding academic appointments from CMCI or other colleges and institutes at CU-Boulder, from departments and institutions within the CU-system or external to the University. Affiliated faculty are not eligible for tenure, shall not have voting rights, may not receive a salary in the department and are appointed on an annual basis with indefinite reappointments. At CU-

Boulder faculty affiliates teach courses that are cross-listed with media studies and may engage with collaborative research with department faculty. International faculty appointed to the title Affiliated Professor must hold the equivalent rank of Associate or Professor at their home institution.

- 3.9 ***Adjunct Faculty.*** The department may include part-time faculty teaching a variety of courses. Among the part-time faculty may be some hired for only a class or two, some hired to teach on a regular basis, and some retired faculty who return to teach on occasion. Adjunct faculty are not voting members of the department. They are invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings.
- 3.10 ***Emeritus Faculty.*** Retired faculty who have been granted emeritus status continue to be affiliated with the department and may teach on occasion. Emeritus faculty are invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings.
- 3.11 **Faculty Appointments:** Department faculty shall be elected, through majority vote, to serve on the CMCI Faculty Council and the CMCI Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. If the department has 10 or more faculty members, the department has the option to elect two representatives to the Faculty Council.

SECTION 4: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

- 4.1 Decisions and voting procedures regarding faculty appointments, reappointment, tenure, promotion and salary recommendations shall be made in accordance with the Laws of the Regents as articulated in the Department's document for Promotion and Tenure (see attachment). The Department is committed to the principles and spirit of diversity and inclusion as outlined in the 2010 Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy of the University, and will adhere to such as it applies to departmental action.

SECTION 5: DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

- 5.1 ***Process.*** The chair will schedule and convene meetings of the faculty at the beginning of each academic term. Meetings may also be called at the request of one- third or more of the voting members of the department.

- 5.2 **Meetings:** All faculty of the department are expected to attend all general faculty meetings, and to attend all special meetings, unless on leave or if college or university-related duties conflicts with the special meetings.
- 5.3 **Agenda:** Unless a deadline dictates otherwise, meetings are to be announced two weeks in advance; an agenda will be circulated by the chair no later than four working days prior to the meeting. In case of personnel decisions or proposed changes to the bylaws, the notification period will be two weeks. All voting members may contribute items to the agenda.
- 5.4 **Special Meetings:** Additional meetings may be called by the department chair or by petition of four voting faculty members. Except in emergencies, a three-day notice shall be required for special meetings.
- 5.5 **Rules of Procedure:** All meetings will be conducted according to the most recent version of Roberts' Rules of Order. However, within the spirit of collegiality and mutual respect, the faculty believes that these rules are malleable.
- 5.6 **Quorum:** A quorum shall consist of a majority of voting faculty.
- 5.7 **Minutes:** Minutes shall be taken at each faculty meeting (particularly action items, decisions made and the vote) and will be circulated to all voting members before the next meeting regularly scheduled meeting. Approval of the minutes will be the first order of business.
- 5.8 **Proxy Votes:** On issues requiring a vote of the faculty, votes may be made by written proxy, or electronically, in a method to be determined by the chair.

SECTION 6: DEPARTMENT STANDING COMMITTEES

- 6.1 **Departmental Committees** work to further the business of the department. Their nature and membership are specified below. If members cannot serve their entire terms, new members can be elected or appointed, as is appropriate to the basis for their original formulation. Every effort should be taken to involve undergraduate and graduate students in department committees where their input will be valuable.
- 6.2 **Terms of Office:** The normal appointment or election of faculty members to committees shall be for a term of two years. Student members shall be appointed for one year and may be reappointed.

- 6.3 ***Standing Committees:*** The standing committees of the department shall be the Chair Advisory Committee and the Annual Merit Evaluation Committee. Given the small size of the department, all the faculty will act as a curriculum committee.

6.3.1 **Chair Advisory Committee (CAC)** is responsible for advising the chair on policy decisions, personnel issues, and on matters relating to annual evaluation of faculty. This committee also deals with personnel matters as appropriate. This may include reviewing recommendations relating to contract renewal of instructors and applicants for affiliated status to be presented to the faculty for full vote. The committee's composition includes the chair (ex-officio non-voting member), and three non-administrative faculty members (one full professor, one associate professor, one assistant professor). The chair will schedule and convene meetings of the committee at the beginning of each academic term. It is expected that the committee will meet twice each semester (at the beginning and prior to the end of the semester). The chair can also call additional meetings as necessary

6.3.2 **Annual Merit Evaluation Committee (AMEC)** is comprised of three tenured members of the regular voting faculty. At least one member shall be a full professor who will chair the AMEC. The department chair serves as a non-voting member of this committee. The ACE serves two purposes: (1) carries out the annual review of the rostered faculty, and any members of special faculty and transmits the results of its deliberations to the department chair, and (2) the AMEC has further obligation to review the salary distribution in the department with the objective of identifying inequities that may exist. The committee will make recommendations to the department chair about specific individuals or classes of individuals, as warranted. AMEC will also be responsible for conducting post-tenure reviews of faculty.

AD-HOC COMMITTEES

Ad hoc are established for a specific goal or task and has a clearly defined and stated membership structure. The chair has the authority to establish ad hoc committees. Below is a list of ad-hoc committees that the chair constitutes on a needs base and its membership composition. However, the chair can

constitute additional committees with a clearly defined mission and membership structure as need arises.

6.5.1 Search Committee for New Appointments A majority of the faculty shall approve the desired area or areas of specialization. This is then presented to the dean's office for approval to conduct the search. The chair then appoints a search committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members. The search committee may, but need not, include members from outside of the department. In carrying out the search and hiring responsibilities, the committee will ensure that its duties comply with University policies and Federal and State regulations.

6.5.2 Disputes and Grievances The department follows the grievance policies as stated in the Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members & Roles and Professional Responsibilities of Department Chairs, and the Graduate School Grievance Policy. These policies resolve to handle all disputes or grievances at the lowest possible administrative level.

If a faculty member has a grievance against another faculty, the first goal is informal resolution without resort to a formal grievance procedure. Faculty seeking to resolve a grievance informally may seek advice from the chair. At times, however, informal resolution is not feasible. In this case, the chair shall refer the matter to the department's Grievance Committee, which will be constituted as an ad hoc three-person subcommittee. The chair, in consultation with the CAC, will select two members of the committee. The aggrieved faculty will select one member. The committee will select the committee's chair.

If a faculty member has a grievance with the chair, s/he shall request that an ad hoc Grievance Committee meet with both the chair and the grievant(s) to attempt to resolve the issue(s).

If the ad hoc Grievance Committee fails to resolve the issue to the satisfaction of the faculty, the chair shall refer the issue to the dean who may seek advice from the Ombuds Office or the CMCI Grievance Committee.

SECTION 7: AMENDMENT TO THE BYLAWS

- 7.1 Departmental Policies and Bylaws are subject to change. Changes in Departmental Policies shall occur through a collegial and shared process and must be approved by the voting members of the department (majority vote). The process to modify or change the department's bylaws are subject to change at any time and in any manner provided the changes are the result of the following procedures: (1) suggested changes are submitted in writing in advance of a department meeting, (2) at the meeting a quorum is present acknowledged by a simple majority vote that the change merits consideration, and (3) a subsequent department meeting (preferably the next one) at which a quorum is present (absentee ballot is permitted) approves the changes by a majority vote.
- 7.2 **Implementation of these bylaws:** By a majority vote of the Media Studies faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on **January 23, 2017.**

Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
Department of Media Studies
College of Media, Communication, and Information
University of Colorado Boulder

The Department explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes and Procedures (SPP) document, and is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty."

1. **Laws of the Regents.** Laws of the Regents, as given in the C.U. Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

The University requires comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials noted in the Faculty Handbook and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

According to the Faculty Handbook, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate "excellence" in either teaching or research, and "meritorious" achievement in the other category, plus meritorious achievement in the area of service.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires, according to the resolution adopted at the February 17, 1994 Board of Regents meeting, that full professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent and (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a greater emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor that indicates substantial significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service. The Department of Media Studies, working within the framework of the Laws of the Regents, makes the following clarifications respecting how those rules apply to its faculty:

The purpose of the departmental evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the disciplines that are represented in the Department of Media Studies.

2. **Allocation of Effort.** Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department is 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. This allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord with the Department's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.
3. **Evaluation of Teaching.** In the first year after being appointed to a tenure-track position, faculty should create a file that will contain their written records pertaining to teaching. The file 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 file is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.
 - a. **Undergraduate teaching.** Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. No single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of

judgment by the Department. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
3. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
4. examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
5. descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
6. written statements from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters;
7. Evidence of subsequent student success and other outcomes pertinent to the case at hand.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising service to undergraduate Students, directing independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students and activities promoting faculty-student interaction, including directing Honors projects and Latin Honors theses. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seem appropriate for a particular individual.

The Department will develop and maintain a schedule and process for conducting regular peer evaluations of faculty at all ranks to be used in compiling dossiers for reappointment, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and promotion to full professor. Faculty members may also 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 those mechanisms of self-improvement, but are encouraged to do so.

- b. **Graduate instruction.** Graduate instruction is an important component of teaching evaluation. All faculty members are expected to advise MA and/or PhD students (as governed by Departmental policies on such service), serve on committees of students sponsored by other faculty members, participate in the screening of new students and assessment of ongoing students, and instruct graduate students through regular courses or seminars. Faculty members should document their involvement with graduate students as part of their teaching file.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Laws of Regents.

4. **Evaluation of Research.** Achievement in research is an important component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. For purposes of evaluation, the Department considers research as those activities of scholarship that contribute to the Department's and University's mission to produce knowledge. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research and scholarly activity.

Publication is an important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. Publication venues will be evaluated in light of traditional criteria, such as books in academic presses, articles in peer reviewed journals, and chapters in prestigious volumes, but will not be limited to these. Instead, the Department recognizes that academic scholarship evolves, and that the forms, venues, and reach of scholarly publication can be evaluated in light of this fact, keeping in mind the objectives—in such areas as academic reputation and public significance—that evaluation using traditional criteria were designed to meet. Published work, regardless of venue, should show evidence of originality and importance.

A second important criterion for evaluation of research is the candidate's national or international reputation for achievement in research and scholarship. The Department will gather evidence of reputation

from authoritative reviewers external to the University; these will include some individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation and some, individuals who are, selected independently by the departmental evaluation committee rather than by the candidate.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit, or the Department may consider, other evidence of achievement in research that seems appropriate to a particular individual's case for promotion, reappointment, or tenure.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

Creative Work. The Department further recognizes that excellence in research and scholarship can be achieved through unique efforts that combine scholarly exploration with creative work.

Evaluation of such "scholarships of practice" will generally follow the same general criteria for research, while at the same time seeking to evaluate the creative work for its own achievement of excellence. Its significance in various professional contexts, its quality, reputation, influence, and significance to the generation of knowledge, assessed through procedures of external review and evaluation, will constitute an important part of the Department's overall evaluation.

5. **Evaluation of Service.** A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college 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, reappointment, or tenure. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Laws of the Regents?

Approved by the Department of Media Studies December 13, 2017