

**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 as 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 Critical Media Practices

Annual Merit Evaluation

Point System and General Principles

Annual merit reviews are conducted by the Merit Committee. The committee's membership, certain rules governing its procedures, and the possibilities for appealing its decisions are described in the department's Bylaws. Campus policy states that a faculty member has the right to append a response to the rating if she or he so desires. A copy of the rating plus any response from the faculty member is placed in the faculty member's personnel file and is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act. The review evaluates teaching, research/creative work, and service for the previous three calendar years, using the following College-approved point system for each of the three categories:

Far Exceeds Expectations	4.6-5.0
Exceeds Normal Expectations	3.6-4.5
Meets Normal Expectations	2.6-3.5
Below Expectations	1.6-2.5
Unsatisfactory	0-1.5

The committee bases its decisions largely on the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) for the previous three years. Scores are pro-rated for any deviation from the standard workload of 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research/creative work, and 20 percent service. Any differential workloads must have been approved in advance by the Chair.

For evaluations of teaching the University requires multiple measures. In general, evidence of achievement could include favorable peer review of classroom performance; supervising theses, dissertations, and/or independent study; serving on graduate-student review committees; developing new course content and methods; preparing and teaching courses not previously taught in the department; contributing to curricular development; and advising and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students. The department considers co-teaching a valuable contribution to pedagogy and also values teaching outside the classroom in activities such as field trips, community engagements, curating student exhibitions, and publishing student work.

Achievement in research/creative work could include publishing with research presses or

in scholarly journals, delivering talks and papers at conferences or other universities, engaging in public scholarship, applying for or receiving grants or fellowships, or being nominated for or receiving awards. It can also include evidence of work in progress.

Creative work could include presentations, performances, exhibitions, screenings, readings of creative writing, or other sharing with peers or the public locally, regionally, nationally or internationally. As with research, applying for or receiving grants or fellowships or being nominated for or receiving awards counts as evidence of active engagement, as does evidence of substantial work in progress. A faculty member may choose to emphasize either scholarly or creative work or choose to engage in both and may also choose public engagement as a major emphasis in scholarship, or creativity, or both.

Achievement in service can include such things as serving on departmental or university committees recognized by faculty peers as significant; mentoring pre-tenure faculty; 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.

In evaluating the three categories 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. The lists above are not intended as exhaustive with regard to types of work. The department values the unconventional and the innovative as long as quality and significance can be demonstrated. In all cases faculty should provide as much detail as possible about quantity and significance on the FRPA or in a separate statement to the committee.