FACULTY PRE-TENURE AGREEMENT -- DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

January 22, 1993

This document is intended to provide clear direction to untenured faculty regarding the requirements for a successful tenure recommendation by the Primary Unit (i.e. the Department of Anthropology). The University of Colorado Faculty Handbook sets forth the Regents' general criteria for the awarding of continuous tenure. The Regents require that "tenure may be awarded only to faculty with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research or creative work" (Faculty Handbook, 1988, III-15). In addition to these general criteria, each primary unit "shall also take into account other criteria that have a material bearing on ... tenure ... recommendations(s) of that unit" (Standards, Processes and Procedures of the University of Colorado, October 1990, Appendix A, Section B.1.a).

It should be understood by the candidate for tenure that the role of the primary unit is to offer opportunities to untenured faculty in the areas of research/creative work, teaching, and service. It is the responsibility of the untenured faculty member to set his/her course with respect to these criteria. Furthermore, it should be understood that the primary unit does not grant tenure. It can only recommend to the Regents, through appropriate administrative procedures, that tenure be awarded or denied. However, within the general framework set forth by the Regents, the primary unit has considerable latitude in establishing specific standards to be used in evaluating the candidate for tenure. It is the purpose of this agreement to clarify these standards and the evidence that will be used to determine whether they have been met by a particular candidate.

GENERAL CRITERIA

Faculty contributions in teaching, research/creative activity, and service are the general criteria for evaluation for tenure.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

To be considered for tenure, candidates must be judged to have "meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either research/creative work or teaching" (Faculty Handbook pp III-28-29). Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor must
have "considerable successful teaching experience and promising accomplishment in research" (Faculty Handbook III-29). Qualifications for tenure and promotion are evaluated by peers within the primary unit of the candidate.

A. Teaching. The following specific criteria will be used to evaluate teaching.

1. What is the extent of the candidate's knowledge of the subject matter of the courses taught?

2. Does the candidate keep courses up-to-date by incorporating new material?

3. Does the candidate have a demonstrated ability to develop new courses or to make substantial revisions in old ones when appropriate?

4. What is the candidate's teaching effectiveness as evaluated by students and colleagues?

5. Does the candidate spend adequate time with students outside the classroom?

Teaching will be considered meritorious when the evaluation process detailed below demonstrates that the candidate has made a positive and constructive impact on the intellectual development of students in the context of formal course work. Contributions will also be expected in curriculum development, student advising, and/or individual instruction. Finally, evidence that the candidate has a genuine commitment to teaching excellence, has respect for students, and is likely to continue such commitment and respect will be a requirement for the meritorious distinction.

To further clarify, meritorious performance within Anthropology shall be defined as having:

- completed instruction of the courses assigned the candidate,

- received student evaluations that show, at minimum, an average or median level of performance, as compared with College statistics,

- performed adequately in the department's peer teaching-evaluation exercise,

- supervised theses and sat on thesis committees at the request of students,

- contributed to both graduate and undergraduate student advising,

- been accessible to students,

- offered courses that are of acceptable rigor in terms of currency, reading loads, assignments and examinations,
-taught students whose performance in succeeding courses is acceptable.

The excellent distinction will be given to those candidates who demonstrate truly superior commitment and success in teaching. Such candidates are thought of as outstanding teachers who exceed the meritorious performance standards and who are recognized by both students and faculty as having a significant impact on teaching at CU-Denver.

To further clarify, excellent performance within Anthropology shall be judged as having exceeded the above standards for meritorious performance by the addition of one or more of the following accomplishments:

- received student evaluations that are well above average as compared with College statistics,
- have been evaluated as performing at a high level in a peer evaluation exercise,
- have been nominated for or received an award for teaching,
- have designed new courses or significantly revised existing courses,
- have successfully used innovative teaching techniques.

Unacceptable achievement in teaching will be considered as failing to meet the standards for meritorious performance.

B. Research. The following specific criteria will be used to evaluate research.

1. Does the candidate work on problems that are judged significant by experts in the candidate's field?
2. What is the candidate's research and publication record?
3. What is the candidate's scholarly reputation outside CU-Denver?
4. Does the candidate have the ability to develop new areas of research in the future and establish competence in them when necessary?
5. Does the candidate show promise of significant future scholarly output?

Research will be considered meritorious when the evaluation process demonstrates that the candidate has met the general research expectations of the primary unit. This means that the candidate has a coherent and program of research, that such a program is making a significant impact on the candidate's research field, that the candidate is committed to an ongoing research career, and quality scholarly productivity resulting in the dissemination of research work in reputable venues is occurring. Accomplishments and promise in
research work are judged by peers, both within the primary unit and in the larger area of the discipline.

To further clarify, meritorious performance within Anthropology shall be defined as having:

- the possession of a coherent and integrated theoretical perspective and research plan that underlies and ties together tangible accomplishments,
- publications in peer-reviewed journals,
- recognition by peers and scholars within and outside the university as making a contribution to knowledge in his/her chosen area of specialization,
- conduct of sponsored or unsponsored research after coming to the University,
- demonstrated capacity for future research and scholarly achievement.

The excellent distinction will be given to those candidates who demonstrate superior work as evidenced by major publications, grants or contracts, or other recognition of superior performance.

To further clarify, excellent performance within Anthropology shall be judged as having exceeded the above standards for meritorious performance by the addition of one or more of the following accomplishments:

- publication of papers, books or articles in top-ranked, peer-reviewed journals and/or high-quality presses,
- recognition by peers and scholars within and outside the university as having made significant, original contributions to Anthropology or its subdisciplines,
- conduct of extramurally-sponsored research or contract work,
- having attained a national or international professional reputation in his/her area of research specialization.

Unacceptable achievement in research will be considered as failing to meet the standards for meritorious performance.

3. Service. The following specific criteria will be used to evaluate service.

1. What is the candidate's level of participation in department, college, campus, and/or university activities intended to improve the quality of programs including facilitating the functioning of the university, campus, college or department?
2. Does the candidate participate in professional activities intended to promote the development of the candidate's field?

3. Does the candidate participate in the community to strengthen university/community relationships when appropriate?

Service will be considered _meritorious_ if the candidate has, at a minimum, contributed to the mission of the primary unit through cooperative participation on necessary departmental committees and activities and has, in addition, found an active participatory role in the university, the community or the profession.

To further clarify, _meritorious_ performance within Anthropology shall be defined as having:

- service on Departmental, College and University committees,
- completion of assigned or elected administrative tasks,
- service to the profession and discipline through participation in organizational committees, governing boards, international organizations, or public service groups,
- acting as a referee for journals or funding agencies.

**EVIDENCE**

A. Teaching. The following evidence will be used to evaluate teaching performance:

1. Evaluation of teaching materials (syllabi, examinations, handouts, etc).
2. Student opinions as expressed in quantitative SCQ ratings and narrative comments.
3. Evaluation of teaching by colleagues who have visited the candidate's classes.
4. Evaluation of the quantity and quality of individual instruction performed by the candidate including research supervision if appropriate.
5. Quality and quantity of student advising if appropriate.
6. Quality and quantity of course or curriculum development when appropriate.

To further clarify, within Anthropology, the following items will be considered:

- The candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as stated in their Performance and Tenure Plan, and the relationship of that philosophy to actual achievements.
Specific criteria: What is the candidate's teaching philosophy? Is it appropriate to the role and mission of the CU-Denver campus? Is it consistent with the role and mission of the Anthropology Department, as laid out in the Department's Strategic Plan?

-Student evaluations of teaching, both the quantitative figures and the written evaluations provided by the Faculty Course Questionnaire each semester.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's average performance for classes taught at different levels -- introductory, core courses, major courses, graduate courses? How do these compare with College values for similar courses? What is the general tenor of written comments?

-The evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance by a subcommittee of colleagues.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's teaching or lecturing style? Is it appropriate to the level of class? Is the material organized and presented in a way that facilitates understanding? Does the candidate involve students in discussion? What is the overall impression of the committee as to the adequacy of the candidate's classroom performance?

-Teaching awards and other recognized accomplishments in instruction.

Specific criteria: Has the candidate received or been nominated for teaching awards? Have they been recognized in any other way for innovative instructional methods?

-Quality and number of student theses submitted for completion of advanced degree or honors requirements.

Specific criteria: How many master's and honor's students has the candidate supervised since joining the Department? How does this compare with other faculty in the department? Do students seek out this individual for thesis advising and committee membership? What is the quality of master's and honor's theses supervised by the candidate as compared with other faculty in the Department?

-Extent of student advising.

Specific criteria: How many students has the candidate advised? Do students seek the candidate out for advising? Is the candidate considered accessible and approachable?

-Teaching innovations, including new courses, or significant revision of existing courses.

Specific criteria: What new courses has the candidate designed and offered? What teaching innovations has the candidate employed? Has the candidate received grants for teaching enhancement, or novel teaching ideas?

-Preparation of course materials.
Specific criteria: Are course syllabi well-constructed? Do they identify the main goals of the class and how these goals are to be met? Are assignments and examinations appropriate for the level of course? Is the course material current?

B. Research. The following kinds of evidence will be employed to evaluate research performance:

1. Quality and quantity of publication in refereed journals or other refereed publication venues.

2. Quality and quantity of presentations at professional meetings.

3. Evidence of involvement in direct collection of data/information which may include grant writing, unsponsored laboratory or field research, archival research, or other appropriate activity.

4. Quality and quantity of nonrefereed publications.

5. Evidence of a good professional reputation outside CU-Denver as shown by evaluations from qualified professionals in the candidate's field.

To further clarify, within Anthropology, the following items will be considered:

-The statement of theoretical orientation and research agenda as written in the candidate's Performance and Tenure Plan, and the relationship of this plan to actual accomplishments.

Specific criteria: Is the research program well-thought out? Does it fit within the overall scientific context of the discipline or subdiscipline? Does the statement as written support the candidate's actual achievements; i.e. is the theoretical basis of the research as proposed consistent with actual accomplishments?

-Peer-reviewed published papers, books and monographs.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's record of publication in peer-reviewed formats? What is the stature of the journals and presses in which the candidate has published? Given the candidate's research, are the journals and presses chosen appropriate?

-Papers which have not been peer-reviewed.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's publication record in venues that have not been peer-reviewed? What are the main contributions of these publications to the discipline and subdiscipline? For example, are these book chapters that acquaint non-specialist audiences with a particular area of specialization? Do these publications enhance the candidate's professional reputation? Are they research reports of limited circulation?
-Unpublished papers and/or manuscripts in preparation.

Specific criteria: Do the unpublished papers and/or manuscripts in preparation suggest promising future achievements, future contributions or new avenues for research? Are they likely to be published?

-Grants and contracts which have been funded.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's record of grant-writing? Have grants been funded? Have grants been submitted to prestigious organizations that subject proposals to rigorous peer review? Are the research questions and methods spelled out in these proposals consistent with the candidate's research agenda? Do the research questions promise future substantive contribution to the discipline or subdiscipline?

-Unsponsored research/data collection activities.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's record of unsponsored research? Have the results of this research contributed to the discipline or subdiscipline, the candidate's publication record, or professional reputation? Does the research hold promise for future accomplishment?

-Recognition of research and scholarly work outside the university.

Specific criteria: How is the work of the candidate received outside the university? Is it judged to be a significant contribution to the discipline or subdiscipline? Is the work of the candidate widely known on national or international levels?

-Promise for future productivity.

Specific criteria: Based on all of the above, is there evidence (e.g. research and writing in progress, past accomplishments) that suggests that the candidate will be productive in the future?

C. Service. The following kinds of evidence will be used to evaluate service.

1. Participation in activities serving the Department, College, Campus, or University.

2. Participation in activities serving the discipline/profession of the candidate.

3. Participation in activities serving the community, if appropriate.

To further clarify, within Anthropology, the following items will be considered:

-Activities in Department, College, Campus, or University committees and administrative posts.

Specific criteria: What is the candidate's record of service at these levels? Is this record comparable with that of other faculty