DOSSIER SUBMISSION GUIDELINES – CLAS 2024-25
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Schools/Colleges/Library are responsible for compiling and organizing their candidates' dossiers in Interfolio. Please forward cases to Betsy Metzger in the Office of Faculty Affairs by **Wednesday, January 15, 2025**.

RTP Record Retention

University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus record retention policy requires that all faculty personnel records, including promotion and tenure documents, be maintained for 10 years after the employee's separation from the University. Schools/colleges/library should retain a full and complete electronic record.

Dossier Components

File Names

The following tables indicate the naming conventions for dossier components. Certain dossiers may not have all the items that are indicated, but the ordering of what is placed in the dossier should follow the guidelines.

Table 1. Tenure/Tenure and Promotion/Promotion to Professor/Comprehensive Review: Dossier Components (all in PDF)

Dossier Component	File Name
Dossier Checklist	01_LastNameFirstName_Checklist
UCD-7 Signature Form	02_LastNameFirstName_SignatureForm
Primary Unit Criteria Primary Unit Criteria Version Choice	03_LastNameFirstName_PrimaryUnitCriteria 03a_LastNameFirstName_PUCVersionChoice
Initial Offer Letter	04_LastNameFirstName_InitialOfferLetter
Previous RTP/Personnel Actions	05_LastNameFirstName_PreviousRTP_PersonnelActions
Pandemic Impact Statement	06_LastNameFirstName_PandemicImpactStatement
Curriculum Vitae	07_LastNameFirstName_CV
Overall Summary Statement	08_LastNameFirstName_SummaryStatement
Teaching (Librarianship) Statement	09_LastNameFirstName_TeachingStatement
FCQ Summaries	10_LastNameFirstName_FCQSummaries
Scholarly/Creative Work Statement	11_LastNameFirstName_ScholarlyCreativeStatement
Leadership/Service Statement	12_LastNameFirstName_ServiceStatement
Supporting Teaching (Librarianship) Materials	13_LastNameFirstName_SupportingTeachingMaterials
Supporting Scholarly/Creative Work Materials	14_LastNameFirstName_SupportingScholarlyMaterials
Supporting Leadership/Service Materials	15_LastNameFirstName_SupportingServiceMaterials
Primary Unit Evaluation Committee Report	16_LastNameFirstName_PrimaryUnitEvalCommitteeReport
Primary Unit Analysis of Teaching (Librarianship)	17_LastNameFirstName_PUAnalysisTeaching

Primary Unit Analysis of Scholarly/Creative Work	18_LastNameFirstName_PUAnalysisScholarlyCreativeWork
Primary Unit Analysis of Leadership/Service	19_LastNameFirstName_PUAnalysisService
Primary Unit Recommendation	20_LastNameFirstName_PrimaryUnitRecommendation
Dean's Advisory Committee Recommendation	21_LastNameFirstName_DeansAdvisoryRecommendation
Dean's Recommendation	22_LastNameFirstName_DeansRecommendation
External Review	23_LastNameFirstName_ExternalReview
Case Reconsideration Recommendation(s) **(*only for cases reconsidered by schools/colleges/library)**	24_LastNameFirstName_ReconsiderationRecommendations

Table 2. Hires with Tenure: Dossier Components (all in PDF)

Dossier Component	File Name
Dossier Checklist	01_LastNameFirstName_Checklist
UCD-7 Signature Form	02_LastNameFirstName_SignatureForm
CU Denver Primary Unit Criteria	03_LastNameFirstName_PrimaryUnitCriteria
Candidate's Current Institution Tenure/Promotion Criteria	04_LastNameFirstName_CurrentInstitutionCriteria
CU Denver Offer Letter	05_LastNameFirstName_OfferLetter
Curriculum Vitae	06_LastNameFirstName_CV
Teaching (Librarianship) Evidence	07_LastNameFirstName_TeachingEvidence
Scholarly/Creative Work Evidence	08_LastNameFirstName_ScholarlyCreativeEvidence
Leadership/Service Evidence	09_LastNameFirstName_ServiceEvidence
Primary Unit Recommendation	10_LastNameFirstName_PrimaryUnitRecommendation
First Level (Dean's Advisory Committee) Recommendation	11_LastNameFirstName_DeansAdvisoryRecommendation
Dean's Recommendation	12_LastNameFirstName_DeansRecommendation
Situational Letters (as appropriate for Situation A, B, C, or D)	13_LastNameFirstName_SituationalLetters
External Letters (if required)	14_LastNameFirstName_ExternalLetters

Adding Material

It is the responsibility of the school/college to ensure that any material added to a candidate's dossier after its initial submission is entered in their Interfolio case and the Office of Faculty Affairs is notified. Additional material should be scanned into **a single PDF file** using the following naming convention: *" LastNameFirstName_AdditionalMaterial_Date"*

Sample

JonesMary_AdditionalMaterial_2.2.25

Dossier Checklists

Certain dossiers may not have all the items that are indicated, but the ordering of what is placed in the dossier should follow the guidelines.

Dossier Checklist: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CU Denver) 2024-25

Candidate's Name: _____

School/College/Library: _____

Current Rank/Title: _____

Action: [ ] Comprehensive Review for Reappointment [ ] Tenure [ ] Promotion

A candidate's dossier must include the following items:

[ ] Completed dossier checklist

[ ] UCD-7 signature form

[ ] Primary unit criteria

[ ] Statement re: version of primary unit criteria candidate agrees to be used in evaluating the case (previous or current if candidate was hired with previous criteria in place. For promotion to full professor, current primary unit criteria shall apply.)

[ ] Initial offer letter

[ ] Previous RTP and personnel actions, if any (including credit for prior service, tenure clock extension forms, reappointment letters and VCAC memos, tenure letters and VCAC memos)

[ ] Faculty Pandemic Impact Statement (optional)

[ ] Current curriculum vitae *(See **Strategies for Success** Appendices for suggested format.)*

[ ] Overall summary statement *(two-to-three-page summary overview)*

[ ] Teaching (librarianship) statement *(no more than three pages)*

[ ] FCQ one-page summary table *(see **Strategies for Success** Appendices)*

[ ] Scholarly/creative work statement *(no more than three pages)*

[ ] Leadership/service statement *(no more than three pages)*

[ ] Supporting teaching (librarianship) materials

[ ] FCQs *(Schools and colleges have discretion in terms of very large courses, but need to submit unbiased, representative samples of FCQs.)*

[ ] Other supporting teaching (librarianship) materials

[ ] Supporting scholarly/creative work materials

[ ] Supporting leadership/service materials

[ ] Primary Unit Evaluation Committee report

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of teaching (librarianship) (*subcommittee report, if relevant*)
(Documentation requires peer reviews of teaching/librarianship, other multiple methods of evaluation, and critical, relevant teaching/librarianship analyses.)

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of scholarly/creative work (*subcommittee report, if relevant*)

[ ] Primary Unit analysis of leadership/service (*subcommittee report, if relevant*)

[ ] Primary Unit recommendation and vote (*See **Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers** for acceptable wording for evaluation and vote count.**)

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views is required and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added

[ ] Dean's review/advisory committee recommendation and vote (*See **Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers** for acceptable wording for evaluation and vote count.**)
(an independent analysis at this level is required)

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added *(This is helpful, but not required.)*

[ ] Dean's recommendation (*See **Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers** for acceptable wording for evaluation.**)

[ ] External Review

[ ] Letters received from external reviewers

[ ] Copies of External Reviewers' biographical sketch or short vita

[ ] List of external reviewers contacted, indicating:

- **whether candidate or primary unit recommended the evaluator**
- **relationship, if any, of the evaluator to the candidate or to a member(s) of the primary unit**
- **who responded**
- **a numbered order** (for consistency if they are quoted in first-level and second-level recommendations)

[ ] Explanation of how reviewers were selected

[ ] Copy of the letter requesting external reviewer evaluation letters

[ ] Number of reviewers meets requirements [ ] explanation if requirement not met

[ ] Ratio meets requirements [ ] explanation if requirement not met

[ ] Reconsideration recommendations
(If the Dean's review/advisory committee or the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the dossier is returned to the Primary Unit for reconsideration, after which the Primary Unit returns its reconsidered judgment to the Dean for further consideration.)

[ ] Primary unit's reconsideration, if applicable

[ ] Additional reconsideration and vote of the Dean's advisory/review committee and/or Dean, if applicable

I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and affirm that it is complete and is consistent with University policy.

Dean's Signature _____ **Date** _____

* ***Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers*** dictates the acceptable wording for evaluation and vote counts of performance at each level. Reappointment/comprehensive review evaluation of teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service differ from promotion and tenure evaluations.

Dossier Checklist: Hire with Tenure (CU Denver) 2024-25

Candidate's Name: _____

School/College/Library: _____

Current Rank/Title: _____

Action: [ ] Tenure [ ] Promotion

A candidate's dossier must include the following items:

[ ] Completed dossier checklist

[ ] UCD-7 signature form

[ ] Primary unit criteria for CU Denver primary unit

[ ] Criteria for tenure/promotion at candidate's current institution

[ ] CU Denver official offer letter

[ ] Current curriculum vitae

[ ] Evidence of meritorious or excellent teaching *(e.g. peer reviews of teaching, student evaluations, syllabi, curriculum development, mentoring, awards)* including a narrative summary that describes their merit or excellence in teaching

[ ] Examples of meritorious or excellent scholarly/creative work *(three publications or other supporting documentation are sufficient)*

[ ] Evidence of meritorious or excellent leadership/service

[ ] Primary unit recommendation and vote including analysis of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service*

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views is required and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added

[ ] Dean's review/advisory committee recommendation and vote*

[ ] if vote is not unanimous, an explanation of dissenting views and a minority report by dissenting faculty may be added

[ ] Dean's recommendation* including the three required points enumerated in *Campus Administrative Policy 1021: Hire with Tenure* (July 1, 2020)

a) A statement of the specific merits of the candidate, including a summary of how the candidate meets or exceeds the Regental and school, college, or library standards for tenure, tenure and promotion, or tenure at the rank of professor.

b) A description of the long-range fiscal and academic program plans for the unit.

c) An explanation of how the personnel action fits into the unit's plan.

[ ] Situational Letters *(as appropriate to the situation)*

[ ] Situation A: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution

Candidate is currently a tenured associate professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure as an associate professor.

[ ] Situation B: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution

AND

three external letters of evaluation for promotion to the rank of professor OR letters of recommendation for hire

Candidate is currently a tenured associate professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure and promotion to professor.

[ ] Situation C: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate tenure at the current institution

AND

copy of the official letter granting the candidate the rank of professor at the current institution

Candidate is currently a tenured professor at a comparable institution, and requests tenure and the rank of professor.

[ ] Situation D: Copy of the official letter granting the candidate the current rank at the current institution

AND

three external letters of evaluation for the award of tenure

(a very unusual situation): Candidate is not currently tenured at another institution, but has a record that clearly meets the Campus' standards for tenure. This would most likely only occur if the candidate is at a program/institution that does not grant tenure.

[ ] External Letters if required *(if the letters of recommendation for hire are not used or if the candidate is not currently tenured at another institution)*

I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and affirm that it is complete and is consistent with University policy.

Dean's Signature _____ **Date** _____

*Note that ***Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers*** dictates the acceptable wording for evaluation and vote counts of performance in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service.

Letter Writing Requirements for Dossiers - CLAS

There are a number of **necessary requirements** in preparing letters in a case for the second-level and third-level reviews. These typically depend on type of case.

(A) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW FOR REAPPOINTMENT

(1) <u>For evaluations of the three areas</u>: Record vote counts (yes-no-recusal-absent) for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion. A recused committee member cannot be present during the discussion or vote. **Abstentions are not permitted**.

In the Primary Unit evaluations, the total in the vote table should equal the number of faculty eligible to vote. Faculty who are eligible to vote but cannot vote due to departmental bylaws restrictions (e.g., the chair), participation in upper levels of review (DAC, Dean, or VCAC), or a conflict of interest should be counted as recused.

CLAS is allowed to use this language in AY 2024-25:

The designations **approaching excellent**, **approaching meritorious**, or **not meritorious** (as described in primary unit criteria) may be used for evaluations of the three categories.
[CLAS has permission to use this language in AY 2024-25]

Examples:

- The primary unit voted 6-0-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **approaching excellent** in teaching with six committee members voting for approaching excellent.
- The primary unit voted 4-2-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **approaching meritorious** in scholarly/creative work with four committee members voting for approaching meritorious and two for approaching excellent.
- The primary unit voted 4-2-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **not meritorious** in leadership/service with four committee members voting for not meritorious and two for approaching meritorious.

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations:

Evaluation of Teaching (Librarianship), Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service (AE = approaching excellent, AM = approaching meritorious, NM = not meritorious)	Teaching (Librarianship)	Scholarly/ Creative Work	Leadership/ Service
Department/Primary Unit	6AE	4AM, 2AE	4NM, 2AM
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	5AE, 2AM	4AE, 3AM	5AM, 1AE, 1NM
Dean's Evaluation	AE	AE	AM

(2) <u>For the overall rating</u>: Use **only** the designations **on track for tenure; not on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections**; or **not on track for tenure** in reviews by the primary unit, the dean's review/advisory committee, and the dean in Comprehensive Review evaluations. Do not invent other terminology.

Overall Evaluation	On track for tenure	Not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections	Not on track for tenure
Department/Primary Unit	6	0	0
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	5	1	1
Dean's Evaluation	X		

(3) <u>For the overall recommendation and vote</u>: Record the overall vote for reappointment as yes-no-recusal-absent.

Examples:

- The dean's advisory committee voted 6-1-0-1 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for reappointment.

Add a table like the one following to record votes for reappointment:

Votes	Yes	No	Recusal	Absent
Department/Primary Unit	10	0	0	0
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	6	1	0	1
Dean's Recommendation	X		NA	NA

If the vote is not unanimous, the letter should explain the dissenting views or include a minority report submitted by the dissenting faculty, if they choose to do so. If no dissenting views were expressed, the letter should explicitly state that.

==========

(B) TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

(1) <u>For evaluations of the three areas</u>: Record vote counts (yes-no-recusal-absent) for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion. A recused committee member cannot be present during the discussion or vote. **Abstentions are not permitted**.

In the Primary Unit evaluations, the total in the vote table should equal the number of faculty eligible to vote. Faculty who are eligible to vote but cannot vote due to departmental bylaws restrictions (e.g., the chair), participation in upper levels of review (DAC, Dean, or VCAC), or a conflict of interest should be counted as recused.

Use the designations **excellent**, **meritorious**, or **not meritorious** in Tenure and Promotion evaluations by the primary unit, the dean's review/advisory committee, and the dean.

Examples:

- The primary unit voted 6-1-0-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **meritorious** in teaching with six committee members voting for meritorious and one for excellent.

- The primary unit voted 7-0-0-0 for **excellent** in scholarly/creative work with seven committee members voting for excellent.

- The dean's advisory committee voted 4-3-0-0 for **not meritorious** in leadership/service with four committee members voting for not meritorious, two for meritorious, and one for excellent.

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations:

Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service (E = excellent, M = meritorious, NM = not meritorious)	Teaching (Librarianship)	Scholarly/ Creative Work	Leadership/ Service
Department/Primary Unit	6M, 1E	7E	4E, 3M
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	4E, 3M	6E, 1M	4NM, 2M, 1E
Dean's Evaluation	E	E	M

(2) <u>For the overall recommendation and vote</u>: Record the overall vote for promotion and tenure as yes-no-recusal-absent.

Example:

- The dean's advisory committee voted 6-1-1-0 (yes-no-recusal-absent) in favor of tenure and promotion; one member was recused.

Add a table like the one following to record votes:

Votes	Yes	No	Recusal	Absent
Department/Primary Unit	7	0	0	1
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	6	1	1	0
Dean's Recommendation	X		NA	NA

If the vote is not unanimous, the letter should explain the dissenting views or include a minority report submitted by the dissenting faculty, if they choose to do so. If no dissenting views were expressed, the letter should explicitly state that.

==========

(C) PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR REVIEW

(1) <u>For evaluations of the three areas</u>: Record vote counts (yes-no-recusal-absent) for teaching (librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service as part of an overall recommendation. Recusals from discussion and voting should apply if there is a conflict of interest or a bias regarding a candidate, meaning that a committee member is unable to render a fair and unbiased opinion. A recused committee member cannot be present during the discussion or vote. **Abstentions are not permitted.**

In the Primary Unit evaluations, the total in the vote table should equal the number of faculty eligible to vote. Faculty who are eligible to vote but cannot vote due to departmental bylaws restrictions (e.g., the chair), participation in upper levels of review (DAC, Dean, or VCAC), or a conflict of interest should be counted as recused.

Use the designations **excellent**, **meritorious**, or **not meritorious** in Promotion to Professor evaluations by the primary unit, the dean's review/advisory committee, and the dean.

Examples:

- The primary unit voted 4-0-0-1 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **excellent** in librarianship with four committee members voting for excellent; one member was absent.

- The primary unit voted 3-1-0-1 (yes-no-recusal-absent) for **meritorious** in scholarly/creative work with three committee members voting for meritorious and one for excellent; one member was absent.

- The primary unit voted 3-1-0-1 for **not meritorious** in leadership/service with one committee member voting for meritorious and three voting for not meritorious; one member was absent.

Add a table like the one following to record evaluations:

Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Leadership/Service (E = excellent, M = meritorious, NM = not meritorious)	Teaching (Librarianship)	Scholarly/ Creative Work	Leadership/ Service
Department/Primary Unit	4E	3M, 1E	3NM, 1M
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	4M, 3E	5E, 2M	5E, 2M
Dean's Evaluation	E	E	M

(2) <u>For the overall recommendation and vote</u>: Add a table like the one following to record votes:

Votes for Promotion	Yes	No	Recusal	Absent
Department/Primary Unit	4	0	0	1
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	5	2	1	0
Dean's Recommendation	X		NA	NA

(3) <u>For the overall evaluation</u>: Add a table like the one following to record the overall evaluation for Promotion to Full Professor.

Use the designations **the record taken as a whole is excellent** or **the record taken as a whole is not excellent** in Promotion to Full Professor evaluations by the primary unit, the dean's review/advisory committee, and the dean.

Votes			
Department/Primary Unit	RECORD TAKEN	AS A WHOLE	IS EXCELLENT*
Dean's Review/Advisory Committee	RECORD TAKEN	AS A WHOLE	IS EXCELLENT*
Dean's Recommendation	RECORD TAKEN	AS A WHOLE	IS EXCELLENT*

If the vote is not unanimous, the letter should explain the dissenting views or include a minority report submitted by the dissenting faculty, if they choose to do so. If no dissenting views were expressed, the letter should explicitly state that.

*Note that there are three criteria for promotion to Full Professor. These are found in the system Administrative Policy Statement 1022.V.K.: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022.

==========

(D) OTHER SITUATIONS

In other evaluation situations, please subscribe to the examples given above as closely as possible.

University of Colorado Denver – Office of the Provost
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Signature Form (UCD-7)

[ ] Mr. [ ] Ms. [ ] Dr. _____
Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) Rank/Title

_____ [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Yes [ ] No
School / College / Library Department Tenure Track Tenured

_____ _____ _____
Highest Degree Awarded Year Awarded Institution

Years at the University of Colorado on the Tenure Track: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

Years at the University of Colorado NOT on the Tenure Track: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

Elsewhere (List only if approved for PRIOR SERVICE CREDIT):

Institution: _____ Years of Credit: _____ Title/Rank: _____

Institution: _____ Years of Credit: _____ Title/Rank: _____

A. Recommendation for REAPPOINTMENT (Tenure-Track)
(Subject to final approval by the Chancellor)

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____ years (TT only) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____ years (TT only) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

PROVOST'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____ years (TT only) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

B. Recommendation for PROMOTION
(Promotions subject to final approval by the Chancellor)

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____(Title/Rank) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____(Title/Rank) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

PROVOST'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ for _____(Title/Rank) Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

C. Recommendation for CONTINUOUS TENURE
(All continuous tenure recommendations subject to final approval by the Regents)

PRIMARY UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

PROVOST'S RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended _____ Effective date _____

Not recommended _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Sample Summary Table of Courses Taught and FCQs

Course Number:	**Title of Course:**	**Under-Graduate: (UG)** **Grad: (G)**	**New Prep: (NP)** **Prev. Taught # of times: (PT-X)**	**Co-taught: (CT)** **Single:(S)**	**Course Format:**	**Number of Students:** **Census: (a)** **Finals Week: (b)**	**FCQs Course Rating:** **(6 pt scale)**	**FCQs Instructor Rating:** **(6 pt scale)**
FALL 20XX								
FINE 1100	Drawing Foundations	UG	PT-1	S	SA	15a/13b	5.3	5.6
FINE 3000	Intermediate Drawing	UG	NP	S	SA	13a/12b	5.7	5.7
FINE 4800	Senior Art Seminar	UG	NP	CT	S	15a/15b	4.7	5.7
SPRING 20XX								
FINE 4000	Advanced Drawing	UG	NP	S	SA	13a/13b	5.7	5.7
FINE 4800	Senior Art Seminar	UG	PT-1	S	S	18a/18b	5.1	5.5
FALL 20XX								
FINE 2000	Life Drawing	UG	NP	S	SA	16a/15b	5.7	5.7
FINE 4210	Advanced II Painting	UG	NP	S	SA	14a/14b	5.0	5.3
FINE 4800	Senior Art Seminar	UG	PT-2	S	S	19/19	5.2	5.4
FINE 4840	Independent Study	UG	PT-1	S	IS	1a/1b	5.8	5.9
SPRING 20XX								
FINE 2200	2-D Design	UG	NP	S	SA	15a/15b	5.0	5.2
FINE 2200	Painting I	UG	NP	S	SA	18a/17b	5.3	5.4
						Overall Average FCQ Ratings:	**5.31**	**5.55**

KEY: Course Type

L (Lecture) **LL** (Lecture/Lab) **ML** (Main Lab) **S** (Seminar) **SA** (Studio: Art) **SM** (Studio: Music)

PI (Private Instruction) **FI** (Field Instruction) **P** (Practicum) **CE** (Cooperative Education) **TS** (Travel Study)

MT (Master's Thesis) **DD** (Doctoral Dissertation) **R** (Research) **IS** (Independent Study)

HY (Hybrid) **OL** (Online)

Note: Starting in the Fall of 2018 scores use a 5-point scale rather than a 6-point scale