

Section 3: Appointment; Reappointment and Promotion of Teaching Professors; Comprehensive Review, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review of Tenure-track Faculty

Libraries faculty follow the procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review established for University of Colorado faculty by the Office of Faculty Affairs and regental policy.

Criteria for post-tenure review appear in Section 1, Part 2 of the Libraries Faculty Handbook. Procedural information for candidates and post-tenure review committees appears in the Tenure Committee Procedures.

- See [Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion](#)¹ by the Office of Policy and Efficiency.
- See [Tenure and Promotion Appeals](#)² by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Part 1: Appointment and Reappointment

Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor

- See [Non Tenure-Track Faculty](#)³ by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- See [Reappointment of Instructor Rank Faculty](#)⁴

Assistant Teaching Professor: Assistant Teaching Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to the field and should be otherwise well-qualified to practice librarianship.

Associate Teaching Professor: The rank of Associate Teaching Professor is awarded to Assistant Teaching Professors who have demonstrated a high level of performance in the practice of librarianship, usually after a period of not less than seven years in rank as an Assistant Teaching Professor or equivalent professional experience.

Teaching Professor: The rank of Teaching Professor is awarded to Associate Teaching Professors who have been exemplary librarians and members of the university community, after a minimum of three years at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or equivalent professional experience.

¹ <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

² <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/relevant-policies-and-procedures/tenure>

³ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/faculty-career-milestones/recruitment-and-hiring/non-tenure-track-faculty>

⁴ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-instructor-rank-faculty>

Tenure Track Faculty: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

- See [Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty](#)⁵ by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- See Hire with Credit toward the Tenure Probationary Period, below.

Hire with Credit Toward the Tenure Probationary Period

- [Adjustments to the Tenure Clock](#)⁶ (see Shortening the Probationary Period)
- [Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion/APS 1022](#)⁷
- [Regent Laws, Article 5](#)⁸ (see 5.B.4.D.3, regarding the tenure probationary period)

Candidates employed previously in a tenure-track position are eligible to request consideration for hire with one, two, or three years of credit toward the tenure probationary period. See Adjustments to the Tenure Clock:

“Shortening the Probationary Period: At the time of initial appointment, the dean has authority to credit 1, 2, or 3 years towards a tenure decision to incoming faculty with previous tenure-track faculty experience of a comparable nature at another institution. Regent's Rules do not allow more than 3 years credit to be granted. Granting years of credit towards tenure must be defined in the letter of offer. Junior faculty should be conservative in requesting or accepting credit towards tenure, as the decision to shorten one’s probationary period becomes a binding decision on the part of both the University and the faculty member. In extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member who has already begun an appointment may, with the approval of the chair and/or dean, petition the provost to grant years towards tenure at a later date.”

The Senior Associate Dean will inform all tenure-track faculty search finalists that campus policy permits both hire with credit and early tenure applications, and that a candidate may request consideration for hire with one, two, or three years of credit, during their hiring negotiation.

Upon receiving a candidate’s request for hire with credit, the Senior Associate Dean will inform the candidate that they may elect to submit a revised version of their curriculum vitae. This allows the candidate to submit a curriculum vitae that documents their complete record and that will be used to consider their request for hire with credit. In deciding whether to grant years of credit and

⁵ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/faculty-career-milestones/recruitment-and-hiring/tenure-track-and-tenured-faculty>

⁶ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/adjustments-tenure-clock>

⁷ <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

⁸ <https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/5>

how many, the Senior Associate Dean will consult with the relevant department director, search committee chair, and make a recommendation to the Dean.

In case of hire with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the letter of offer must state the year(s) of credit awarded and indicate the timeline for the individual's mandatory, fourth-year comprehensive review, as stipulated by the campus [Adjustments to the Tenure Clock policy](#)⁹.

How to Request a Retention Offer

Any faculty members may negotiate a retention offer with the Dean of Libraries at any time. Retention requests may stem from receipt of an offer from another institution, or may be preemptive, which would not necessitate such an offer. Prior to making an offer to the candidate, the Dean may consult with the Merit Review Salary Committee. The Dean reviews supporting information and makes a recommendation to the Provost. Retention offers may require a commitment to remain at CU Boulder for some period of time. There is no guarantee of a retention offer if requested and there is no penalty for making a request.

For more information see the [Faculty Affairs documents on retention](#)¹⁰ and the MRSC Committee Procedures.

Part 2: Criteria for Evaluating Libraries Faculty for Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure

- See [CU System APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion](#)¹¹
- See [Regent Policy 5.D: Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#)¹²

General criteria for evaluating Libraries faculty for reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review are (1) the practice of librarianship, which is considered the equivalent of teaching in other campus departments, (2) scholarly and creative work, and (3) service, which includes service to the Libraries, the campus, and the profession. The most critical factors in reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, and tenure cases are the quality and impact of a candidate's work. The Libraries faculty value excellence in the practice of librarianship informed by active scholarship. Given that a rating of 'excellent' in leadership and service is neither required nor sufficient for promotion or reappointment, tenure-track candidates are encouraged to focus on achieving a rating of 'excellent' in librarianship or in scholarly and creative work. Teaching

⁹ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/adjustments-tenure-clock>

¹⁰ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/a-z#O>

¹¹ <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

¹² [Regent Policy 5.D: Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#)

track libraries faculty are generally expected to achieve a rating of 'excellent' in librarianship for reappointment and promotion.

Criteria are reviewed and updated regularly, on a cycle tied to the seven-year Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) review. The Faculty Governance Committee will appoint a group of pre-tenured, tenure, and teaching professor rank faculty to conduct the review.

Practice of Librarianship

For tenure-track reviews and teaching track promotion reviews, we evaluate the practice of librarianship based on the following three criteria:

- Performance of Core Responsibilities
- Trajectory and Growth
- Impact

For Reappointment of teaching track faculty, we evaluate the practice of librarianship based on the following two criteria:

- Performance of Core Responsibilities
- Trajectory and Growth

Performance of Core Responsibilities

Library faculty dossiers must include all position descriptions and revisions during the time period under review. The position description documents the major duties and core responsibilities of the position, and it may be updated over time to reflect changes to core responsibilities.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of a high level of achievement in professional performance, defined as successfully carrying out the faculty member's responsibilities as specified in their position description(s) for the time under consideration.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement required for meritorious, with evidence of consistently outstanding performance in the area(s) of core responsibilities at a rigorous and challenging level; demonstrated, significant impact on the development, management, and/or implementation of high-quality collections or services.

Trajectory and Growth

At the time of review, candidates must demonstrate continued development and professional growth in their appointed position(s).

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of continued growth and the development of expertise in the knowledge and skills required for their position(s). The candidate must demonstrate that they will continue to develop in their appointed position.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement required for meritorious, with evidence that the faculty member is greatly accomplished in their area of expertise, has continued to develop their knowledge and skills, and/or has expanded their areas of expertise to other relevant domain areas.

Impact

The work of library faculty can have an impact in a wide range of areas depending on their job duties. The categories outlined below (in alphabetical order) provide potential areas in which candidates can demonstrate impact:

- [Collaboration](#)
- [Fostering Inclusion](#)
- [Impact on Research and Learning](#)
- [Influence on the Practice of Librarianship](#)
- [Innovation](#)
- [Leadership and Management](#)

Collaboration

Librarianship is a collaborative effort that requires building relationships, maintaining projects, and mutual support of colleagues both inside and outside of the University Libraries.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of success in building and maintaining essential relationships; demonstrated contributions toward projects, and in support of colleagues, through the candidate's collaborative work.
- **Excellent:** Evidence of success in building and maintaining especially productive collaborations, including key support roles in the success and/or longevity of existing projects or relationships, or those leading to new initiatives or projects.

Fostering Inclusion

Librarianship, as a profession, values intellectual freedom, equity, inclusion, and diversity. Library faculty affirm inclusive excellence and diversity¹³ to be vitally integral to the practice of librarianship, and actively support the values outlined in the [CU Libraries' Commitment to Diversity and Inclusive Excellence statement](#)¹⁴; by the [American Library Association](#)¹⁵; the [Association of College and Research Libraries](#)¹⁶; and [the University of Colorado Boulder](#)¹⁷.

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions to activities creating, supporting or promoting inclusion, equity, and intellectual freedom initiatives. Incorporates these values in their practice of librarianship.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions to activities creating, supporting or promoting inclusion, equity, and/or intellectual freedom; evidence of significant outcomes and impact in promoting an inclusive environment through incorporating these values in their practice of librarianship.

¹³ [As defined by the CU Boulder IDEA Plan, p. 5](#)

¹⁴ <https://www.colorado.edu/libraries/about/commitment-diversity-and-inclusive-excellence>

¹⁵ <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/diversity>

¹⁶ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/diversity>

¹⁷ <https://www.colorado.edu/odece/diversity-plan/campus-definition-inclusive-excellence>

Impact on Research and Learning

Library faculty can have a large impact on research and learning practices, often achieved by either partnering directly with researchers and teaching faculty or by developing collections or building and maintaining tools, systems, services, policies, or communities of practice.

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions to supporting, enhancing, or promoting research and learning.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions in this area. Beyond the level of achievement for meritorious, excellence may be demonstrated by broad influence on the research and learning practices of the CU community, significant impact on a more focused constituency, or special recognition for contributions promoting research and learning.

Influence on the Practice of Librarianship

Library faculty work within an international community of library and information professionals that shares and establishes best practices, standards, and guidelines. CU Boulder library faculty are often leaders in their field whose practice and accomplishments can have substantial influence on how libraries and librarians approach their work.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of consistent and sustained adoption, support, and advocacy for best practices, standards, guidelines and similar within their practice of librarianship.
- **Excellent:** Beyond the level of achievement for meritorious, excellence may be demonstrated by instrumental contributions in the development of standards or practices, such as those produced by recognized bodies at the national or international level; the creation of widely adopted, acclaimed, or influential best practices, standards, guidelines, instructional or procedural materials, and similar; or the creation or development of particularly impactful workflows, activities or documentation that materially changed the organizational culture and/or the practice of librarianship within the Libraries, campus, or more broadly.

Innovation

Innovation within the Libraries is experimenting with new ideas, pedagogy, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures, services, workflows, or physical environments.

- **Meritorious:** Demonstrated contributions in experimentation with and assessment of new ideas, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures; Ongoing support of practices considered innovative or new.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and widely significant contributions in experimentation with and assessment of new ideas, techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures; creating, designing, facilitating, or leading programs to encourage innovation and experimentation; introducing new best practices around communicating innovation and new ideas.

Leadership and Management

Library faculty may participate in high-level decision-making and strategic planning within or beyond their unit; influence the activities of individuals and groups and manage human, material, or financial resources to support, advance, or achieve the Libraries' or campus'

strategic mission and goals; and/or provide effective leadership and management for activities that support, advance, or achieve unit, departmental, or Libraries strategic initiatives.

- **Meritorious:** Evidence of active participation in high-level decision-making and strategic planning within or beyond their unit, and/or providing effective leadership or management for activities that support, advance, or achieve Libraries or campus strategic initiatives.
- **Excellent:** Demonstrated, sustained, and exemplary leadership or management of initiatives or activities that support, advance, or achieve Libraries or campus strategic initiatives, and/or especially significant or influential contributions to strategic planning initiatives.

Multiple Measures of Librarianship

Dossiers for all candidates for reappointment, comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion must include at least three “multiple measures” by which the practice of teaching/librarianship is evaluated, some of which are solicited by the Primary Unit and some of which are supplied by the candidate.

Multiple measures included in the dossier must contain at least one measure beyond the letters described below.

Terminology: Evaluator, Supervisor

The concept of a faculty member’s work being supervised by another is unfamiliar to most teaching faculty. Therefore, to the extent possible, those who prepare such evaluations are encouraged to refer to these letters as from “Internal evaluators.”

Letters solicited by the Primary Unit

- **Measure: Libraries’ evaluator letters:** For each candidate, two letters are solicited from internal Libraries’ evaluators. These letters should focus on the candidate’s practice of librarianship. However, evaluators may also choose to comment on the candidate’s scholarly/creative activity and leadership and service. These letters should be solicited from qualified individuals familiar with the candidate’s operational role and librarianship duties in the Libraries, and at least one should be from someone who is a current member of the Primary Unit that will review the candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Candidates for review may suggest the names of library employees who can serve as evaluators.¹⁸ The primary unit (PU) will determine which Libraries employees to ask to provide these two evaluations, considering the candidate’s specific organizational responsibilities and role in the libraries and the candidate’s suggestions of qualified evaluators. These evaluations are the equivalent of what teaching faculty might regard as a multi-year teaching evaluation.

¹⁸ Library employees refer to faculty and staff who are supervising faculty.

If the PU cannot find at least one internal evaluator who is at a rank above the candidate's, the PU may request an evaluative letter from an evaluator outside of the Libraries (from the campus, but not outside the university), who knows the work of the candidate and is qualified to judge the candidate, and who is above the candidate's rank. If no one at a higher rank can provide an evaluative letter, only in those rare cases may a candidate's dossier include two evaluative letters from evaluators who are at or below the rank of the candidate.

- **Measure: Libraries or Campus colleague letters:** Candidates for review may suggest the names of faculty colleagues within or outside the libraries who can provide an informed evaluation of some aspect of their work that may be otherwise insufficiently covered in the dossier. In general, no more than one such letter from libraries or campus colleagues is solicited for reappointment or comprehensive review dossiers, and no more than three are solicited for review for tenure or for promotion dossiers. Working from the names supplied, the Primary Unit solicits such evaluations as it believes will be useful for the review.

Evaluation of instructional activities gathered by the Primary Unit

Measure: **Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs):** All FCQs received during the period under review must be included in the candidate's dossier. Faculty who teach credit courses outside LIBR and DHUM must provide FCQs to the Faculty Support Project Manager.

- **Measure: Teaching Evaluations:** All pre-tenure faculty who teach (including credit-course teaching) as part of their core responsibilities are evaluated by the Tenure Committee Teaching Evaluation subcommittee. At least one evaluation should be conducted annually. The review dossier includes all evaluations received during the period under review.

Teaching professors and tenured faculty who teach (including credit-course teaching) are encouraged to request a teaching evaluation by contacting the subcommittee. The review dossier includes all evaluations received during the period under review.

- **Measure: Solicited Student Letters:** Some candidates may serve as academic advisors, mentors, supervisors or classroom instructors. Candidates may suggest the names of students from whom to solicit letters. Working from the names supplied, the Primary Unit solicits such evaluations as it believes will be useful for the review process. Unless the list of names is extensive, the Committee usually solicits letters from all those named. Solicited student letters are confidential, and the names of students who provided letters may not be shared with the candidate.

Evidence of librarianship activities supplied by the candidate

- **Measure: Candidate-Solicited Letters:** Candidates may solicit letters and e-mails from students, colleagues, patrons, etc. These letters and e-mails should be addressed to the candidate, who is responsible for holding them on file pending a review, and forwarding them for the dossier at the appropriate time.

- **Measure: Librarianship Portfolio:** Candidates may submit a portfolio comprised of documentation to support their librarianship statement, illustrating their accomplishments and responsibilities. Candidates are advised to be highly-selective and concise, including only documentation and/or examples demonstrating the impact or context of librarianship activities, including but not limited to:
 - Accomplishments resulting from participation or leadership in task forces or other groups at the unit/department, Libraries, or campus level.
 - Advocacy toward, or the development of, collections, programs, and services that are inclusive of the needs of all persons in the community, and promoting open access to information for all users.
 - Awards and honors, including university, college, or professional society awards, prizes, selection for memberships in honorary societies, or honorary titles.
 - Contributions toward creating and maintaining a workplace climate that demonstrates commitment to inclusion, including but not limited to the development of instructional methods, resources or partnerships that are reflective of the broad diversity of the community.
 - The design and/or implementation of user research methods, user experience design methods and/or activities.
 - The development of improvements, new ideas, innovative techniques, alternative approaches to, or iterative assessment of, library procedures, organizational methods, and materials.
 - Serving as a thesis or dissertation advisor, or as a member of a thesis committee.
 - Work on standards adopted by national or international bodies.
 - Evidence of using professional experience, research, and creativity to solve problems, improve services, and innovate.
 - Examples of new partnerships created and maintained; policies, procedures, workflows, or systems implemented or improved; outreach, events, or exhibits organized; teaching or instructional materials created (e.g., syllabi, lesson plans, classroom activities, or guides).
 - Quantitative and/or qualitative measurements demonstrating excellence and impact of librarianship activities, including but not limited to:
 - Published reviews or descriptions of programs, projects, presentations, services rendered, etc. “Published” in this sense means written and distributed in a public venue, including in newspapers, newsletters, journals, websites, electronic discussion lists, etc.
 - Statistical data demonstrating impact of librarianship activities.
 - User research and/or feedback demonstrating impact of librarianship activities.
 - Other evidence of engagement with activities supporting research, teaching, and learning (e.g. research consultations).
 - Widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials.

Optional Multiple Measures for Teaching Track Reappointment

Teaching track professors undergoing reappointment may additionally use the following measures to satisfy the requirement for three multiple measures.

- **Measure: Annual Evaluations:** Teaching Track professors undergoing reappointment can request that their annual evaluations from their current contract years be included in their dossier as a measure.
- **Measure: Professional Plans:** Associate or Full Teaching Professors can include their prior professional plan (if applicable) and professional plan for their upcoming contract in their dossier as a measure. The professional plan should outline the candidate's planned work and goals over the course of their upcoming contract in librarianship, service, and research. It can include plans for a teaching professor differentiated workload project if applicable. It should be 500–1000 words in length.

Scholarly and Creative Work

As researcher-practitioners, the nature and subject of candidates' scholarly and creative work frequently aligns with and/or complements their practice of librarianship. Scholarly output, in all its forms, is assessed based on its quality and impact. Creativity and originality are also highly regarded. As an applied field, impact may be demonstrated by attention metrics (e.g., citation counts, download counts). Influential and selective publication or presentation venues are valued. As a highly collaborative field, candidates' records often include only co-authored works, and there is no requirement for solo-authored works to appear in a meritorious or excellent record. Individually authored and co-authored works are both valued by the field. Candidates should articulate their contributions to co-authored works, and the significance of these contributions may factor in evaluations of the scope and strength of the candidate's record of scholarly and creative work. Standards and other works by committee may be peer reviewed.

The Libraries Faculty endorsed the [University of Colorado Boulder Open Access Policy](#)¹⁹ in April 2015. Further, the Association of College & Research Libraries [Policy Statement on Open Access to Scholarship by Academic Librarians](#)²⁰:

“recommends as standard practice that academic librarians publish in open access venues, deposit in open repositories, and make openly accessible all products across the lifecycle of their scholarly and research activity, including articles, research data, monographs, presentations, digital scholarship, grant documentation, and grey literature. Authors should retain rights to these products of scholarship and make them available for reuse under an appropriate license.”

Excellence is often differentiated by exceptional impact, demonstrated by attention metrics, or distinguished through widely influential and selective publication or presentation venues. Excellence may also be evidenced by a strong scholarly reputation at the national or international

¹⁹ <https://www.colorado.edu/libraries/research-assistance/open-access/open-access-resolutions>

²⁰ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/openaccess>

level, demonstrated by formal acknowledgements or awards recognizing excellence in research, or invited publications or presentations.

- **Meritorious for tenure-track faculty:** a meritorious record of scholarly activity will generally include 3-5 substantive scholarly outputs including refereed book chapters, articles in refereed journals, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact (e.g., digital projects, data sets, code). This is in addition to other scholarly work including non-refereed articles, presentations, grants and other research material. The record should demonstrate sustained activity.
- **Meritorious for teaching professor faculty:** a meritorious scholarly record will show evidence of activity, which may include presentations, book reviews, non-refereed publications, grants or other scholarly outputs.
- **Excellent for tenure-track faculty:** an excellent record in scholarly and creative work is demonstrated by sustained growth and exceptional impact. It will generally include 7-10 substantive scholarly outputs such as refereed book chapters, articles in refereed journals, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact (e.g., digital projects, data sets, code). This is in addition to other scholarly work including non-refereed articles, presentations, grants and other research material .
- **Excellent for teaching professor faculty:** an excellent record in scholarly and creative work will demonstrate sustained activity and include regularly appearing substantive outputs such as refereed articles, chapters or conference proceedings; non-refereed publications; significant presentations; book reviews; grants; or other scholarly work.

Research outputs encompassed by the term “Scholarly and Creative Work” may include, but are not limited to:

- Books and monographs, single or co-authored
- Books of a scholarly nature, edited or co-edited
- Refereed scholarly outputs such as articles in refereed journals, refereed chapters in books, refereed conference proceedings, or other modes of equivalent impact
- Standards, essays in encyclopedias, other scholarly papers, technical reports, non-refereed chapters in books, high-impact blog posts, non-refereed articles or other publications
- Competitively selected or invited presentations or posters
- Reviews and abstracts such as book reviews, electronic resource reviews, or reviews of creative activities
- Grant proposals (even if not funded), contract funds for research, research awards, fellowships and scholarships
- Presentations, panels, or moderation of panels or roundtables
- Digital scholarship and other emerging forms of digital research outputs which may include, but are not limited to, digital projects, digital exhibits, datasets, databases, applications and software, programming packages
- Creative work produced in relation to the discipline or specialty

- Exhibitions, exhibition catalogs

Leadership and Service

Leadership and service encompasses a library faculty member’s work on committees, task forces or other elected/appointed bodies that are charged by the Libraries faculty, or for the CU System, CU Boulder and professional organizations. The role of professional organizations in directing and guiding the practice of librarianship results in increased impact and importance of service to the profession by librarians.

- **Meritorious:** A meritorious record of service and leadership is demonstrated by a definite and continuing commitment to service, marked by sustained growth and accomplishment.
- **Excellent:** An excellent record of service and leadership is demonstrated by a definite continuing commitment to service above the level of achievement of meritorious. Excellence is marked by a high level of responsibility and significant impact, and is often differentiated by elected positions; distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community; sustained significant accomplishments in service, resulting in a reputation for expertise; or, awards recognizing excellence in service.

Activities encompassed by the term “Service” may include, but are not limited to:

- Elected or appointed positions related to faculty governance within the University of Colorado
- Committees or elected/appointed bodies within the campus, the CU System and professional organizations
- Participation in professional associations and consortia
- Planning, organizing or conducting professional seminars, workshops, conferences, or programs
- Editing journals or newsletters, reviewing manuscripts, etc.
- Reviewing for grants, fellowships, or other awards
- Community engagement and volunteer work in relation to the discipline or specialty
- Mentoring activities (students, colleagues, etc.)

Approval of Tenure Criteria

- Feb 01, 2024 – Approved by Libraries Faculty
- Feb 06, 2024 – Approved by Dean of the Libraries, Robert McDonald
- Feb 06, 2024 – Approved by Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, Michele Moses

Part 3: Comprehensive Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Stream Faculty

See [Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Rank Faculty](#)²¹ by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Process

The tenure process is subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents, and to other university policies and procedures as applicable.

- Primary Unit (Tenure Committee) meets with candidates for review and explains the process.
- Candidate submits documentation (statements of librarianship, research, and service; current curriculum vitae; names of libraries and campus colleagues; librarianship portfolios (optional); FCQs from courses taught in other departments; three representative works; and names of potential external reviewers).
- Tenure Committee selects and contacts external reviewers, selected from a combined list of suggestions from the candidate and the members of the Tenure Committee.
- Tenure Committee determines which appropriate multiple measures to include.
- Tenure Committee forms Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and informs the candidate. The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee.
- PUEC arranges for multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews dossier, prepares report. Tenure Committee (i.e. "Primary Unit") reads and takes into consideration the report of the PUEC, discusses case, votes, and prepares report. Members take into account the content of the dossier. If a member of the PUEC or Primary Unit feels that relevant information is missing from the dossier they may write a letter to request inclusion of that information. The Candidate will receive a copy of all letters added to the dossier, except those from students and external evaluators.
- PUEC and Primary Unit reports must explicitly address all points contained in dossier or raised in discussion, both positive and negative. The Primary Unit report includes a vote tally.
- Dossier is forwarded to the Dean's Review Committee, which reviews the dossier, and prepares recommendation.
- Dean receives dossier, prepares recommendation, and forwards completed dossier to the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs (VP-AVCFA). Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor refers dossier to the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) for consideration.
- Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor informs Dean of disposition of cases. Cases go through the Provost, the Chancellor, and in cases of tenure, to the University President and finally the Board of Regents before becoming official.
- Tenure in the University Libraries takes effect July 1.

²¹ <https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion>

Special Circumstances

If there is a difference in recommendation between stages of the review process, the case will return to the prior stage of review for reconsideration and revote one time. For example, if the recommendation of the Dean's Review Committee is in conflict with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the case would return to the Primary Unit for reconsideration and revote, after which a letter detailing the reconsideration and revote would be added to the dossier prior to the dossier moving forward. If after reconsideration and revote the recommendations are still in conflict, the case moves forward with the recommendations as such. Candidates are free to include written responses to any of the recommendations made at any point in the review process.

Additions to the File

Candidates may submit additional information, updates, or responses at any point, which are considered from that point forward. Any review bodies may solicit additional information, and substantive information may be added by anyone involved in the review process. Candidates must be given the opportunity to respond to such additions.

Candidates are informed of recommendations made at each step of the review process, and may add a written response to the dossier to respond at any stage.

Appeals

Appeals of final negative tenure decisions are made to the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

Comprehensive Review

The comprehensive review, when for reappointment, is conducted in the fourth year at the rank of assistant professor, barring any hires with credit toward the tenure probationary period. A successful comprehensive review leads to reappointment for a period of three years, leading to tenure review. A negative comprehensive review leads to a one-year terminal contract.

In cases where a faculty member is hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the timing (in relation to the employee's date of hire) and nature (evaluative feedback only) of the comprehensive review are determined by the number of years of credit. In the case where the faculty member is hired with three years of credit, they will have one four-year appointment, and will not need to be reappointed, prior to tenure. They still must undergo a Feedback Only Comprehensive Review for advice and the Tenure Committee must vote on the action simply to assert that the review has been completed and advice provided to the faculty member.

Comprehensive review is based primarily on internal documentation. It considers performance in librarianship, scholarly and creative work, and service, and answers the question: does performance so far suggest that the candidate will compile a record that will justify promotion and

tenure at tenure review? By policy, in making such a judgment the benefit of doubt is given to the candidate. A record that indicates non- or barely meritorious performance in any of the evaluated areas, or that strongly suggests that the candidate will not meet the standards for tenure by the time tenure review takes place, may result in a recommendation against reappointment.

Tenure Review

Tenure review normally begins in the seventh year after appointment as assistant professor; some documentation is collected at the end of the sixth year. A successful tenure review leads to promotion to the rank of associate professor and granting of continuous tenure. A negative tenure review leads to a one-year terminal contract.

In cases where a faculty member is hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, the timing of the tenure review (in relation to the employee's date of hire) is determined by the number of years of credit awarded.

A candidate (including a candidate hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period) may stand for tenure simultaneously at the time of comprehensive review, or any time thereafter, before their mandatory tenure review (in the case of a candidate hired with credit toward the tenure probationary period, their mandatory tenure review is defined by the number of years of credit awarded at hire). The Tenure Committee must vote on both comprehensive review and tenure and promotion if they coincide. Tenure reviews undertaken at a time before the end of the probationary period are not mandatory and therefore candidates may withdraw from the review at any point and unsuccessful cases do not result in the one-year terminal contract; these candidates must return for tenure review at the mandatory time. The [Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion/APS 1022](#)²² (see especially VII. Evaluation) provides specific guidance on early tenure.

Tenure review involves consideration of both internal and external documentation, and answers the question "does performance so far provide convincing evidence that the candidate has made significant contributions in all three facets of performance, and that s/he will continue to do so?" At tenure review, the benefit of doubt is accorded the institution.

The [Boulder Campus Policy on Hires with Tenure](#)²³ states that an individual being hired with tenure does not need to be subjected to the identical review procedures as a candidate for tenure. Tenure review procedures for individuals who have received tenure at another institution and whose appointment does not include promotion to a higher rank are outlined in the [Tenure Committee Procedures](#).

²² <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>

²³ <https://www.colorado.edu/today/node/25030/attachment>

Promotion to Full Professor

Upon request of a tenured associate professor, a review may be undertaken to consider promotion to the rank of full professor. A successful review leads to promotion. A negative review leads to continuation at the rank of associate professor with tenure. There is no minimum or maximum time that must pass between promotion to associate professor and consideration for promotion to full professor. Candidates may not be held to a higher standard due to the passage of time. Because this is not a mandatory review, a candidate for full professor may withdraw their candidacy at any time.

Review for promotion to full professor involves consideration of both internal and external documentation. CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022 indicates that candidates for promotion to full professor will have “1. a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; 2. a record of significant contribution to 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 3. a record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.”

In the case of promotion to full professor, excellence overall does not indicate a requirement for excellence in each individual category. Rather, the overall record, in all three areas combined and taken as a whole, needs to be reflective of excellence. The focus of the full professor review is primarily on the record post-tenure. In the case of a candidate for full professor who received tenure at another institution and was hired into the University Libraries with tenure, the record is assessed since their completion of tenure at their previous institution, rather than their moment of hire. Post-tenure, pre-CU work counts equally with post-tenure work completed at CU. The expectations for promotion to full professor should be considered to roughly repeat the expectations for tenure and promotion. The candidate’s statement on librarianship should include, among other things, a discussion of challenges faced in teaching and/or mentoring and attempts to overcome them. The candidate’s statement on scholarly/creative activity should explain research focus changes over time, which are normal and encouraged. Generally, the record of scholarly/creative activity will include 3-5 substantive articles in refereed journals or venues of equivalent impact, in addition to presentations and other research material, completed since the candidate’s tenure. The record of service (university, professional, and public) is emphasized in an application for full professor and should have contributed to the overall mission and strategic priorities of the university. It is in the best interest of the Libraries and the University to have a robust number of full professors. Thus, the unit is encouraged to identify, mentor, and encourage potential candidates to apply. Associate professors are encouraged to stand for review when they are ready.

Part 4: Reappointment and Promotion for Teaching Professor Rank Faculty

See [Titles, Roles, Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Teaching and Librarian Positions](#)²⁴

Reappointment

Teaching track faculty are usually reviewed for reappointment during the summer, one year before the end of the appointment period. A typical annual merit formula for teaching track faculty in the libraries is 70% librarianship, 10% scholarly and creative work, and 20% service. Teaching track faculty with typical annual merit formulas are generally expected to demonstrate excellence in librarianship, under the criteria of “Performance of Core Responsibilities” and “Trajectory and Growth”, and meritorious performance in scholarly and creative work and leadership and service.

Upon successful review, Teaching track faculty are eligible for reappointment. However, when a reappointment process results in recommendation of a one-year probationary period to correct problems in performance, a one-year reappointment period 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.

Appeals

Candidates have the right to appeal a non-reappointment. Procedures for conducting this appeal are in the faculty by-laws “Section5: Evaluations, Appeals and Grievances,” and are made to the Libraries’ Appeals committee.

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Libraries faculty with the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor are eligible for promotion to a non-tenure track appointment carrying the rank of Associate Teaching Professor after a period of six years of continuous appointment at greater than 50% time. Up to three years credit toward promotion, based on previous academic service, may be awarded at the time of initial appointment. Promotion after six years is not mandatory, nor is it a right. The Dean considers the nomination and, if they approve it, they make the appointment.

Teaching track faculty with a typical (70-01-20) annual merit formula are generally expected to demonstrate excellence in librarianship, under all three criteria (performance of core responsibilities, trajectory and growth, impact), and meritorious performance in scholarly and creative work and leadership and service for promotion to associate rank.

²⁴ <https://www.colorado.edu/academicaffairs/titles-roles-appointment-evaluation-and-promotion-non-tenure-track-faculty-teaching-and-librarian>

Promotion to Teaching Professor

After a minimum of three years at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, individuals who have been exemplary librarians and members of the university community may elect to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor. There is no expectation that the granting of this rank will occur at a particular point in the individual's career after three years in rank as Associate Teaching Professor, nor is there an expectation that each Associate Teaching Professor should seek this rank. Although Associate Teaching Professors may, as a matter of convenience, seek promotion to Teaching Professor at the point of regular reappointment and contract renewal, an individual may seek promotion at any time after three years in rank. If promotion is not approved, that decision has no implications for the individual's status as an Associate Teaching Professor; that individual could elect consideration for promotion to Teaching Professor again. When an Associate Teaching Professor wishes to apply for promotion to Teaching Professor, the review undergoes additional campus level reviews.

For promotion to Teaching Professor, faculty are expected to demonstrate an overall "record of distinction" for promotion to full teaching professor. A record of distinction includes major positive impact in the Libraries, considerable impact on the campus generally, and participation in national or international discussions related to the individual's librarianship focus.

Primary Unit for Teaching Track Reappointment and Promotion

The Primary Unit is composed of the faculty members of the Libraries authorized to vote on matters of reappointment and promotion.

- Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for the reappointment of Assistant Teaching Professor cases.
- Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, Associate Professors, and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for the reappointment and promotion to Associate Teaching Professor cases.
- Teaching Professors and Full Professors form the Primary Unit for the reappointment and promotion to Teaching Professor cases.

The Primary Unit for teaching track reappointment and promotion is chaired by the Faculty Chair. If the Faculty Chair has a conflict of interest or is not a member of the Primary Unit, the Faculty Chair may appoint an eligible previous Faculty Chair. When there is no available previous chair, the Faculty Chair may appoint an eligible faculty member to serve as chair of the Primary Unit.

The Primary Unit is charged to evaluate the record as contained in the dossier and make a recommendation to the Dean. The vote of the Primary Unit and any accompanying summary, including the PUEC report and the report of the primary unit chair, becomes part of the dossier.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC)

For reappointment and promotion, the Primary Unit Chair appoints a PUEC consisting of primary unit members. To the extent possible, these PUECs should consist of Teaching Professors with the appropriate rank. The candidate has the option to comment on the membership of the committee. A single PUEC can be formed to conduct up to three reviews for candidates undergoing reappointment. For each rank (assistant, associate, full), PUECs are formed to review of up to three reappointment cases each. In cases when it is possible that ranks be combined for review by a single PUEC, this is allowed as long as all PUEC members are primary unit members for both ranks.

Teaching Track Professor Reappointment Process

- Candidates submit documentation:
 - A current CV.
 - Three statements: librarianship (approximately 1000 words), leadership and service (approximately 500 words), and scholarly and creative work (approximately 300 words).
 - Candidate-submitted multiple measures (see “Multiple Measures of Librarianship” above) which may include:
 - Candidate solicited letters; solicited student letters.
 - A librarianship portfolio.
 - Associate and Full Teaching Professor candidates submit a professional plan (500–1000 words) as well as their most recent prior professional plan (if applicable).
 - FCQs from courses taught in other departments.
- Primary Unit gathers multiple measures (see “Multiple Measures of Librarianship” above) which may include:
 - Evaluative and colleague letters based on candidate recommendations.
 - Annual reviews if requested by the candidate.
 - FCQs from LIBR and DHUM courses.
 - Teaching evaluations from the period under review.
- PUEC arranges for additional multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews the dossier, prepares a report and presents its recommendation to the Primary Unit at a meeting of the Primary Unit.
- The Primary Unit reads and takes into consideration the report of the PUEC and the candidate dossier, discusses the case, votes, and prepares a letter. If a member of the PUEC or Primary Unit feels that relevant information is missing from the dossier, they may write a letter to request inclusion of that information. The candidate will receive a copy of all letters added to the dossier.
- The Primary Unit writes a letter summarizing the discussion of the meeting and with a recommendation to the Dean, which is added to the dossier.

- PUEC and Primary Unit letters must explicitly address all points contained in the dossier or raised in discussion, both positive and negative. The Primary Unit letter includes a vote tally.

Expedited Reviews for Associate Teaching Professors and Full Teaching Professors

After the first appointment term, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors can opt into a formal, expedited review. The Dean will review the Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor's file. If the individual has been meeting or exceeding expectations, as indicated by appropriate measures of librarianship for example, then a contract may be issued. If the Dean sees the need for a full review, that review will be conducted. If the Associate or Teaching Professor continues to be employed by the University, reviews may alternate between expedited and full reviews.

Teaching Track Professor Promotion Process

- Candidates submit documentation:
 - An updated CV;
 - Three statements: librarianship (1500 words), service (750 words), and scholarly and creative work (500 words).
 - Candidate-submitted multiple measures (see "Multiple Measures of Librarianship" above) which may include:
 - Candidate solicited letters; solicited student letters.
 - A librarianship portfolio.
 - FCQs from courses taught in other departments.
 - When eligible for promotion, candidates are encouraged to combine reappointment and promotion materials into a single dossier.
- Primary Unit gathers multiple measures (see "Multiple Measures of Librarianship" above) which may include:
 - Evaluative and colleague letters based on candidate recommendations.
 - FCQs from LIBR and DHUM courses.
 - Teaching evaluations from the period under review.
- PUEC arranges for additional multiple measures as needed.
- PUEC reviews the dossier, prepares a report and presents its recommendation to the Primary Unit at a meeting of the Primary Unit.
- The Primary Unit reads and takes into consideration the report of the PUEC, discusses the case, votes, and prepares the report. Members take into account the content of the dossier. If a member of the PUEC or Primary Unit feels that relevant information is missing from the dossier, they may write a letter to request inclusion of that information. The candidate will receive a copy of all letters added to the dossier.
- The Primary Unit writes a report summarizing the discussion of the meeting and makes a recommendation to the Dean, which is added to the dossier.

- PUEC and Primary Unit reports must explicitly address all points contained in the dossier or raised in discussion, both positive and negative. The Primary Unit report includes a vote tally.