



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

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. Evaluation of Research

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some weighting is standard in academic circles. In general:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Evaluation of Creative Work

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Evaluation of Teaching

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

Measures to Assess Teaching. No single measure of effectiveness in teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be used by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services students, independent study or independent research projects and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seem appropriate for a particular individual.

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Evaluation of Service

The Department recognizes the importance of providing service in all fields and levels of expertise represented on the faculty. Evaluation of service can extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial and reviewing for professional journals or professional societies, or professional services to the nation, the state, the public, or internationally. Service is generally evaluated on the basis of its significance, quality, its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it. Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion, reappointment, or tenure.

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

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

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

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

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

I. INSTRUCTORS

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

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

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

Formal Review for Reappointment

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. SENIOR INSTRUCTORS

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

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

Formal Review for Reappointment

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

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

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

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

3. EVALUATION: Same as for instructors.

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