

XV. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW OF TTF¹

All Departmental criteria and policies for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are governed by the procedures and standards set forth by the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado and are outlined in the University of Colorado's Administration Policy Statement (APS) #1022, which also identifies the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion (<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>).

1. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In accordance with Regent Policy, the Department requires that candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor “demonstrate meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. . . . In addition, candidates must demonstrate excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.” See Regent Policy 5D: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>.

Candidates are reminded that “the process leading to award of tenure is an evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation.” See Regent Policy 5C: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-5>.

1.A) Dossier Construction

The candidate, aided by the Department Chair, prepares a dossier containing relevant information on which the Evaluation Committee will base its decision. The guidelines for dossier construction for the Denver Campus are available online at https://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/center-for-faculty-development/resources/Documents/Dossier%20Checklist%20for%20Reappointment_Tenure%20and%20Promotion.pdf.

1.B) Department-Level Review

All resident members of the TTF participate in the fact-finding portions of the primary unit review. Three subcommittees of at least two people each will be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty to assess the research/creative work, teaching, leadership and service; these subcommittees will compose letters to the faculty detailing the record for their specific area of emphasis. Following consideration of the merits of the record, only those faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires may vote on the case. In cases involving interdisciplinary research or personnel shortages, the Department may invite equally qualified members of other departments within the University to serve as voting members of the review committee. The review will be conducted with the aid of external as well as internal expert referees, based on a dossier of achievements that the candidate assembles according to the format required by the Downtown campus.

¹ Primary Unit Criteria were updated in 2020 to reflect changes to tenure standards adopted by the Board of Regents effective July 1, 2020. The revision was approved by faculty on April 27, 2020, approved by the Dean on June 15, 2020, and approved by the Provost on December 3, 2020. Revised primary unit criteria are effective July 1, 2020.

The Department recognizes that individuals' achievements in research/creative work, teaching, and service will vary due to their unique abilities, responsibilities, opportunities, and areas of professional expertise. What follows is a list of general criteria that will be used to guide the Department's decision-making process for each of the three areas.

1.C) Criteria for Evaluating Research/Creative Work

For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality research. Per CU Denver policy, the following six criteria will be used by the Department to assess research:

1. The quantity and quality of research publications;
2. The significance and/or impact of the research on one's field;
3. The programmatic nature of the research;
4. The degree of creativity and originality of the research;
5. The degree to which the research demonstrates growth and/or evolution; and
6. How the candidate's research and productivity compares to others with similar training and experience in the discipline of communication and/or allied fields.

A successful research record may be judged as either (1) *meritorious* or (2) *excellent*. Although the Department recognizes Regent Law Article V, the Department takes a holistic approach to evaluating records.

1.C.1) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Meritorious*

For a research record to be judged *meritorious*, the candidate must publish at least:

- (a) four refereed journal articles and/or book chapters, at least three of which must be single- or first-authored peer-reviewed journal articles. All articles must be in print or accepted for publication (without the need for further refereeing) at the time of submission of the dossier. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of essays accepted for publication or in press.

OR

- (b) a single or first-authored scholarly (not edited) book. The book, along with all articles, must be in print or accepted for publication (without the need for further refereeing) at the time of submission of the dossier. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of essays accepted for publication or in press.

Quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as meritorious. All scholarly work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.) as well as quantity.

1.C.2) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Excellent*

For a research record to be judged excellent, the candidate must publish at least:

- (a) Seven single or first-authored refereed journal articles and/or book chapters. Five of these publications must single or first-author peer reviewed journal articles. All articles must be in print or accepted for publication (without the need for further refereeing) at the time of submission of the dossier. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of essays accepted for publication or in press.

OR

- (b) a single or first-authored scholarly book *and* at least three single or first-authored refereed journal articles and/or book chapters. At least two of these publications must be peer reviewed journal articles. The book, along with all articles, must be in print or accepted for publication (without the need for further refereeing) at the time of submission of the dossier. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of essays accepted for publication or in press.

Please note that quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as excellent. All scholarly work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.) as well as quantity.

Also note that substantial, externally funded grants or other equivalent scholarly activities may be substituted for one or more refereed publications.

1.D) Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality teaching. The following seven criteria will be used by the Department to assess teaching:

1. The clarity and rigor of the candidate's teaching materials;
2. Demonstrated expertise in and knowledge of both scholarly subject matter and teaching methods appropriate to the courses the candidate teaches;
3. Creativity and innovation in course development, design, and/or delivery;
4. The degree of responsiveness to teaching feedback and students' concerns;
5. The professionalism and sensitivity of the candidate in addressing diversity issues, broadly conceived, both inside and outside of the classroom;
6. An ability to engage students intellectually and supportively beyond the classroom; and
7. Ongoing participation in pedagogical development.

For each of the aforementioned quality indicators, candidates may submit a wide range of evidence, including (but not limited to): course syllabi and assignments, peer or mentor evaluations, qualitative and quantitative FCQ data, commendation letters from current or former students, samples of graded assignments (with associated grading rubrics), teaching awards, publications directly related to pedagogy, a statement of teaching philosophy and an overview of curricular or pedagogical innovations, an account of service-learning projects, supervision of

independent studies and honor theses, and a record of successful student outcomes (e.g., scholarships/fellowships, admission to graduate programs, acceptance of scholarly work at professional conferences, and/or publication of scholarly work in academic journals).

A successful teaching record may be judged as either (1) meritorious or (2) excellent.

1.D.1) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Meritorious*

For a teaching record to be judged *meritorious*, the evidence submitted must clearly, consistently, and compellingly demonstrate that the candidate has met the seven quality indicators outlined above.

1.D.2) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Excellent*

According to Regent Policy 5.D.2(B), a recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching “shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”

Accordingly, for a teaching record to be deemed “excellent,” it must achieve the criteria for the evaluation of meritorious and fulfill at least two of the following seven conditions.

At least one of these conditions must meet the requirements of Regent Policy 5.D.2(B). For instance, a teaching award from a regional or national/international communication association would demonstrate achievement at the “local, national, or international level,” as would the publication of a peer-reviewed publication in a tier 1-2 journal concerning teaching and learning, which furthers the practice and scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.

In most situations, a case for the designation of excellence in teaching will be made using one or more of (a), (b), or (c) below *plus* one or more of the other criteria.

- a) Receive one or more regional, national, or international (e.g., WSCA, NCA, ICA, etc.) teaching award
- b) Present an invited or competitively selected workshop, short course, or refereed presentation on pedagogy at a professional conference or peer institution
- c) Publish one or more single- or first-authored refereed journal articles focusing on pedagogy. The publication of an innovative textbook (i.e. one that does not merely duplicate existing content of leading mass market textbooks) may also fulfill this requirement.
- d) Facilitate student-directed research projects that have been accepted for publication or presentation at an appropriate professional venue or that resulted in significant community-engagement projects.
- e) Engage in substantial advising and mentoring of graduate students above and beyond the normally expected duties of advising and serving on exam committees of at least several graduate students a year.

- f) Demonstrate wide applications of high-impact practices including but not limited to incorporating service-learning projects, employing best practices in teaching diversity and inclusion, and utilizing writing-intensive assignments.
- g) Complete more than 40 hours of additional pedagogical training as part of a formally recognized teaching and learning professional development program.

Please note that quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as excellent. All pedagogical work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.) as well as quantity.

1.E) Criteria for the Evaluation of Service and Leadership

For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of high-quality service and leadership. The following two criteria will be used by the Department to assess service:

1. The quantity and breadth of service and leadership
2. The overall competence of the candidate's service and leadership efforts (e.g., capability, commitment, contribution, collegiality, ability to complete assigned tasks, duties, and responsibilities in a timely and effective manner).

A successful service record may be judged as either (1) *meritorious* or (2) *excellent*.

1.E.1) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Meritorious*

For a service and leadership record to be judged *meritorious*, the evidence submitted must demonstrate:

- (a) Consistent and competent participation on committees at the Departmental level.
- (b) Regular attendance at formal Departmental events.
- (c) Service or leadership on a College, University, or institutional committee.
- (d) Disciplinary service or leadership, which may include but is not limited to reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals or serving as an officer for an interest group.

1.E.2) Minimum Criteria for an Evaluation of *Excellent*

For a leadership and service record to be judged *excellent*, the candidate must meet all of the criteria required for an evaluation of meritorious and fulfill at least two of the following conditions:

- (a) Receive one or more service or leadership awards.
- (b) Hold significant positions of leadership (e.g., committee chairships, program directorships, managerial positions, journal editorships) within the Department, College, University, and/or discipline.

- (c) Make substantial contributions to a community-based project committed to civic engagement or social justice.
- (d) Complete significant media appearances in relation to research, teaching, or service.
- (e) Serve as expert witness, consultant, or media source regarding areas related to research, teaching, or service

Please note that quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as excellent. All service will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.) as well as quantity.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Full professors play a crucial role in determining the intellectual quality and vitality of the university. Thus, the rank of professor should be reserved for those faculty members who—through sustained excellence in research—have achieved high levels of prestige in their respective fields of study. Awarding such a promotion should be undertaken only when a faculty member’s research program is regarded by other full professors of high standing to be significant in the field. Appointment to associate professor does not imply eventual promotion to full professor, nor does length of service. Only persons who have demonstrated continuous intellectual development and leadership since promotion to associate professor will be considered for promotion to the rank of full professor.

Regential Law requires that faculty who seek promotion to full professor meet the following requirements: “Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a 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.” See Regent Policy 5D: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-5>.

Consistent with Regential Law, the Department of Communication requires that candidates for full professor have, at a minimum, (1) made sustained and significant intellectual contributions to scholarship in a well-defined area beyond those that were required for promotion to associate professor; (2) established a national or international reputation as a leading expert in their area of specialty; (3) contributed significantly to the intellectual development and growth of undergraduate and graduate students through teaching, advising, and mentorship; and (4) developed a significant record of service to the field of the candidate’s area of expertise as indicated by election or appointment to leadership positions in the profession.

3. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

When a tenured faculty member undergoes consideration for post-tenure review, the Department follows all CU Denver policies, which may be accessed using the links provided below:

1. System APS 1022, Standards and Processes for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>
2. CU Denver Campus Administrative Policy 1050, Post-Tenure Review https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider284/default-document-library/1050.pdf?sfvrsn=8f1bfb9_0
3. CU Denver Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements (PIA) and Development Plans, Exhibit A https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider284/default-document-library/1050.pdf?sfvrsn=8f1bfb9_0

Consistent with those Policies, the Department Chair writes a cover letter for each PTR dossier, but the formal evaluation of the candidate is completed by the CLAS PTR Committee.

While the CLAS PTR Committee and the Department Chair appraise each PTR dossier in part on the basis of the Department's annual evaluation process, the Department also recognizes that the PTR process provides a long-term overview of any given five-year period, meaning that the PTR Committee's evaluation may differ from the preceding five years of annual evaluation.

XVI. GRIEVANCES

All students, faculty, and staff with grievances of any matter should refer to and utilize the procedures described in the CLAS Bylaws.

XVII. AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS

Amending the Bylaws occurs in a multistep process. Proposal of Bylaw amendments must take place at a formal faculty meeting announced two weeks in advance. Voting may be done electronically after that meeting. To pass, the amendment must receive at least two-thirds positive vote from the faculty who vote; eligible faculty are defined in the governing document. Once the Department has voted to amend the Bylaws, the document is then submitted to the Dean of CLAS, who approves the amendments or returns the Bylaws to the Department for further consideration. The Bylaws are not considered formally amended until approved by the Department, Dean, and Provost.

XVIII. HISTORY

The Department's Bylaws were approved in November, 1998, and revised in September, 2000; May, 2001; and November, 2005. Beginning in September, 2008, and running through March, 2010, the Bylaws underwent major revisions that were approved on 15 March 2010. In the summer of 2010, the Dean of CLAS asked for a series of revisions that were incorporated into the October 2010 version of the Bylaws. The draft of October 2011 reflected additions requested by the Provost and Dean, and was unanimously approved by the faculty on October 17, 2011.

The draft of November 2012 includes further edits as suggested by the faculty and Dean, and includes new policies regarding Clinical Teaching Track, Instructors, and student grievances; this draft was approved by the Department on February 12, 2013. The draft of September 2013 was approved unanimously by all TTF present at the faculty meeting of September 3, 2013. Following faculty wishes and the suggestions of the external reviewers who performed a Program Review in the fall of 2014, the Bylaws underwent another major revision over the course of the fall of 2014, all of 2015, and the spring of 2016; the May 13, 2016, version of the Bylaws was approved by the Department on May 20, 2016, by a vote of 6-1-0-0 (yes, no, absent, recusal), and was thereupon submitted to the Dean. In the summer of 2016, the Provost's Office sent the Bylaws back the Department with minor revisions, which the faculty undertook in Fall 2016. The Bylaws were then resubmitted to CLAS and the Provost for approval on December 5, 2016, following a vote of 9-0-0-0. The primary unit criteria were revised to address updated Regent requirements for excellence in teaching and bylaws were revised to remove primary unit annual merit criteria per administrative instruction and were resubmitted on August 26, 2020, following a unanimous vote of 9-0-0-0. The provost reviewed the criteria and requested revisions from the department. Revisions were accepted by the department on August 29, 2020 and criteria were formally **approved by Provost Nairn on December 3, 2020.**