

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 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.