

Department of Anthropology Criteria for Personnel Actions (submitted 3/2018)

Approved by the faculty of the UCCS Department of Anthropology, 3/23/2018

Approval by Provost's Office: 8/2/2018

The following are standards for personnel actions in the Department of Anthropology. Anthropology is an extremely diverse field, and academic production in the different subfields is often disparate because of the nature of the research required and the intended audience(s) for publication or other outreach. (*For details on publication patterns generally and then within the four subfields, please see the final section of this document.)

In the field as a whole, there is a growing trend toward applied research and related work that responds directly to community or public needs. In applied work, public outreach is considered equivalent to publication when it meets two conditions: it must be based on theoretically-informed research and involve application of research results, and those results should be presented in a public format or otherwise reach a public audience, particularly within the communities affected by the research. Dissemination and assessment of research may take the form of communication with local communities and government or private sector groups as well as publications aimed at other academic scholars.

Another important consideration in anthropology is the question of ethics, given that we often conduct our work within communities that are directly affected by research results. According to the code of ethics of the American Anthropological Association, our first responsibility is to the communities where we conduct our research (or descendant communities, in the case of archaeology). Thus anthropological research should not be published if publication would have the potential to negatively affect host, collaborating, or descendant communities. This further highlights the importance of considering public outreach work, policy reports, or technical reports as commensurate with other forms of publication.

Given the role of non-academic stakeholders in our work, and the applied nature of it, we recognize that faculty may choose to adopt individual Faculty Responsibility Statements, and that these will then be important factors in considering promotion and tenure decisions. The parameters of each FRS will affect which criteria are emphasized and which less emphasized in that particular case; some may even integrate new areas of practice.

The Department of Anthropology recognizes the risk that can be involved in the pursuit of creative and innovative teaching and research efforts, especially public and applied research. We will take into consideration the risk factor of the teaching and research efforts of the candidate in the evaluation of the "success" and quality of the work. The lists that follow of types of evidence that might be used to assess the progress of a candidate towards promotion is a list of suggestions only, and is neither all-inclusive nor a checklist of requirements.

*Again – please be sure to note specific publication patterns for each of the four subfields of anthropology at the end of this document.

I. Criteria for initial reappointment review

A. Teaching: The faculty member must be a competent teacher. Given that new faculty may be introducing and developing new classes while teaching some established classes for the first time, student evaluations may vary at this stage, and they may not have had time yet to complete other teaching assessments. (See measures of teaching effectiveness, below; please also see FCQ disclaimer in that section.)

B. Research and Scholarly Work: The faculty member should be able to demonstrate that he or she has an active research program that shows promise of making significant contributions. At this point in a career, evidence of this performance might include grant proposals and completed unpublished manuscripts, and/or preliminary community outreach work. The nature of anthropological research is that, for continuity reasons, some of this work may have been (but does not have to have been) initiated before the faculty member arrived at UCCS.

C. Service: At this stage, the faculty member is expected to have a minimal service component, and that at the department level.

II. Criteria for comprehensive review

A. Teaching: For a meritorious rating at this stage, the faculty member must demonstrate effective teaching and active contribution to departmental programs, including curriculum development in their area of expertise and student mentoring. Excellence in this area might include a demonstrated commitment to pedagogical development, creation of new courses or updates to existing courses to reflect disciplinary development, or incorporation of outside-of-the-classroom activities. Specifically, the department seeks to engage its undergraduate majors in appropriate research activities – either designing their own or in partnership with faculty. At this stage the candidate might facilitate such work by providing students with opportunities for internships, field work, campus student engagement, and community partnerships. (Please see FCQ disclaimer in measures of teaching effectiveness, below.)

B. Research and Scholarly Work: For a meritorious rating, the faculty member must be able to demonstrate scholarly accomplishment beyond that of his or her doctoral research. It is especially important to have established a program of scholarly research. In anthropology, preparation and fieldwork can fill two or three years without producing publishable results. Evidence of excellent progress at this stage might include grant writing, contracting, or establishment of cooperative agreements. Alternative evidence of excellence might be publications or public outreach with appreciable results.

C. Service: For a meritorious evaluation, the faculty member should have some committee service above the department level, or equivalent community service. Excellence in this area might include more than one committee above the department level, service in professional organizations, any service at the college or University level, or more extensive community service in a professional capacity.

III. Tenure and promotion to associate professor

A. Teaching: Meritorious performance must include a consistent record of effective teaching, student mentoring, continuing curriculum development, and active contribution to departmental programs. Evidence of excellence in this area might also include any of the following: building new departmental programs, interdisciplinary collaborative work and the integration of students into hybrid teaching/research work (e.g. involving students directly in faculty research projects), a demonstrated commitment to pedagogical development, creation of new courses or substantial revisions or updates to existing courses to reflect disciplinary development, campus student engagement, or substantial incorporation of outside-of-the-classroom activities. (Please see FCQ disclaimer in measures of teaching effectiveness, below.)

B. Research and Scholarly Work: For a meritorious evaluation, a faculty member must be an established scholar with a record of academic (including applied – scholarship of practice) productivity and prospects for continued contributions. Evidence of excellence in such accomplishment might include successful grant-writing and other fundraising, public outreach with appreciable results (see publication patterns, below); publication of monographs, technical reports, or policy reports (often refereed); refereed publications (journal articles and book chapters and/or book(s)); or scholarship of pedagogy within the field. At least half of this work must have been accomplished during the candidate's time at UCCS.

C. Service: For meritorious performance, committee service above the department level is expected. Excellence in this area might include: more than two committees above the department level, service in professional organizations, any service at the University or CU system level, committee service on a professional board (not required, but can serve to demonstrate status as an established scholar). Extended community service on or off campus is likewise valued and rewarded, though not required.

IV. Promotion to full professor

A. Teaching: Since being promoted to associate professor, the faculty must have demonstrated a continued record of effective teaching, active contribution to departmental programs, and student experiences both inside and outside the classroom. Examples of excellence in this area might include willingness to innovate or incorporate innovative pedagogy in new or existing courses, involve students in community work in new ways, or provide novel and innovative field experiences for students. Anthropology is an undergraduate department, so evaluation is primarily in that arena. However, invitations to serve on graduate committees outside of the department are evidence of both excellent teaching/mentoring, and also external regional or national recognition of the candidate's expertise. (Please see FCQ disclaimer in measures of teaching effectiveness, below.)

B. Research and Scholarly Work: The faculty member must be able to demonstrate that since his or her promotion to tenure their scholarship has developed or continues to develop significant influence on the appropriate field. Excellence in this area might mean that this

significance is recognized at the national level, but given the nature of applied research, that influence may be regional or even local in scope. Evidence of impact should be clear from publications, broader recognition of expertise (e.g., invitations to plenary sessions, international conferences, or to be keynote speaker in national or international meetings, or invitations to work with various communities in an applied setting), and from comments of external reviewers.

C. Service: In addition to continued service for the department, the candidate must contribute in significant ways at the college level or above (e.g., chairing committees and serving on committees with heavy workloads). Significant community service, in a professional capacity, can stand in place of university service, as can committee service in professional organizations. Extensive experience as Department Chair will be strongly recognized as contributing to a record of excellence.

D. CU System requirements for promotion to full professor: According to Regential policy, full “professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other[*]; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas.” *The Department of Anthropology at UCCS is an undergraduate department only.

V. **Post-tenure Review**

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, continuing to be productive in research/publications, and continuing to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. While professional plans are important, we recognize that within anthropology, research directions can shift due to changing circumstances in our communities of research, and those changes should be taken into consideration during the review. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting these criteria, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

Measures of teaching effectiveness

The department recognizes research that demonstrates that FCQs are not an effective measure of student learning, but rather of student satisfaction. In addition, we recognize that gender, ethnicity, race, and other factors create bias in FCQ results. For this reason, the department

does not heavily weigh FCQs in evaluating the effectiveness of faculty teaching and student learning. Instead, we take a multi-factor approach.

- **Portfolio**—All anthropology faculty will compile a portfolio that includes course syllabi, examples of exams, worksheets, etc. This portfolio will be made available to the department chair at times of annual review and formal personnel review.

In addition, all faculty must provide at least three other measures for consideration.

- **Peer evaluation** through in-class observation, team-teaching, or other formats
- **Changes in course syllabi and assignments** demonstrating use of student or peer feedback to modify courses in positive ways
- **Demonstrated updates to course materials and/or development of new courses** based on disciplinary developments
- **Demonstrated commitment to pedagogical development** through courses and workshops
- **Development of new programs** in response to disciplinary changes and/or evolving student needs
- **Unsolicited student comments and correspondence**
- **Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs)**

Publication patterns in Anthropology (ranked 1, 2, and 3 – no particular order within rank):

1

- Book, ethnographic monographs or technical reports on major excavation or regional survey projects that undergo peer review
- Peer-reviewed articles in journals with national and international circulation and impact (including appropriate online journals)
- Major works in public anthropology
- Major grant proposals submitted
- Articles in published conference symposia that serve to report research to affected communities, countries, or descendant groups
- Chapters in edited volumes that undergo peer review
- Major publications that serve as resources for affected communities
- Museum exhibits with national exposure
- Peer-reviewed edited volume (with faculty member as editor or co-editor)
- Major research-based creative works using disciplinary knowledge
- Textbook

- Published full-length articles in peer-reviewed conference proceedings

2

- Technical reports to applicable agencies (for example: small-scale excavation and survey reports; public health project reports; reports to community-based organizations)
- Minor works in public anthropology
- Minor grant proposals submitted
- Progress reports on ongoing applied/field research projects in any subfield
- Articles in journals with regional circulation and impact (including online journals)
- Edited volumes that undergo peer review only by editor(s)
- Chapters in edited volumes that undergo peer review only by the editor(s)
- Published conference abstracts that undergo peer review
- Peer-reviewed conference papers or posters
- Museum exhibits with local or regional exposure
- Peer-reviewed published encyclopedia entry
- Minor research-based creative works using disciplinary knowledge
- IRB/IBC proposals undergoing full review

3

- Book reviews
- Commentaries
- Blog posts (essays or articles)
- Published abstracts
- Small-scale works of public interpretation (e.g. pamphlets)
- Small internal grant proposals
- IRB/IBC proposals undergoing expedited review

Sociocultural and applied sociocultural anthropology:

Within sociocultural anthropology, a meritorious tenure file should have a mix of approximately three to five publications from the first two tiers of ranked publication types listed above (at least three from tier 1). Five or more tier 1 publications denotes excellence. Since books tend to

contain far more data and analysis than single articles, a full-length ethnographic or theoretical book could count as three to four first-tier publications of other types. Nonetheless, this does not imply that books are more highly valued than articles or other first-tier publications, simply that they quantitatively represent more information and work.

Within applied sociocultural anthropology, equal emphasis is given to single-author and co-authored articles and reports, particularly when co-authors are members of communities affected by the applied research. In applied anthropology, policy reports and resource publications may constitute the bulk of publications. Therefore, numbers of publications in a successful tenure file in applied anthropology will be similar to those for sociocultural anthropology, but types of publications may vary.

Assessment for pre-tenure reappointment should be based upon reasonable progress toward these criteria for tenure. Assessment for full professor should be based on progress toward establishing a national reputation in the field.

Successful generation of grants and contracts that will ultimately lead to publication within the first two tiers of ranked works may be substituted for such publications in reappointment and comprehensive reviews. Book chapters that go through peer review are counted equally with journal articles.

Other positive evidence of reputation in the field which may be considered for evaluation for promotion to full professor may consist of, for example:

- Requests to serve as co-investigators on projects and/or grants
- Requests to review manuscripts, textbooks, book chapters, or grants
- Published citations (which might include using author- or article- level citation metrics to quantify)
- Requests to serve as officers of professional or academic associations
- Invited commentaries
- Requests to give honorary lectures sponsored by other professional or academic institutions
- Requests for public presentations and collaborations both within and outside the discipline
- Requests to serve on the graduate committees for students at other universities
- Requests to serve as external program reviewers at other universities
- Requests to write promotion and tenure external review letters for faculty at other universities

Linguistic Anthropology:

Linguistic anthropology overlaps highly with cultural and applied anthropology in terms of its basic research and publication patterns. As an inherently interdisciplinary field, publication venues in linguistic anthropology are diverse. Articles in flagship journals, including *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *Language in Society*, and similar venues, are valued highly. Books are certainly viewed favorably in linguistic anthropology, but are often not as prioritized as other modes of dissemination. As in cultural anthropology, a book would count as three or four

articles of this type due to the greater data content and analysis required. Additional publications may include refereed chapters in books or edited anthologies, although this is not an exhaustive list. Applied linguistic anthropology materials might include bilingual materials, dictionaries, teaching materials for endangered languages, or language documentation materials and training resources for language communities.

Assessment for pre-tenure reappointment should be based upon reasonable progress toward these goals. Assessment for full professor should be based on progress toward establishing a national reputation in the field.

Successful generation of grants and contracts that will ultimately lead to publication within the first two tiers of ranked works may be substituted for such publications in reappointment and comprehensive reviews.

Evidence of significant ethnographic and linguistic data elicitation should be counted as progress toward these goals for reappointment and comprehensive reviews. Book chapters that go through peer review are counted equally with journal articles.

Other positive evidence of reputation in the field which may be considered for evaluation for promotion to full professor may consist of, for example:

- Requests to serve as co-investigators on projects and/or grants
- Requests to review manuscripts, textbooks, book chapters, or grants
- Published citations (which might include using author- or article- level citation metrics to quantify)
- Requests to serve as officers of professional or academic associations
- Invited commentaries
- Requests to give honorary lectures sponsored by other professional or academic institutions
- Requests for public presentations and collaborations both within and outside the discipline
- Requests to serve on the graduate committees for students at other universities
- Requests to serve as external program reviewers at other universities
- Requests to write promotion and tenure external review letters for faculty at other universities

Archaeology:

Within archaeology, co-authored works and work in interdisciplinary journals count as highly as those particular to anthropological archaeology. A meritorious tenure file should have a mix of approximately three to five publications from the first two tiers of ranked publication types listed above (at least three from tier 1). Five or more tier 1 publications denotes excellence. Since books tend to contain far more data and analysis than single articles, a full-length archaeological monograph or book on method or theory could count as three to four first-tier publications of other types. Nonetheless, this does not imply that books are more highly valued than articles or other first-tier publications, simply that they quantitatively represent more information and work.

Assessment for pre-tenure reappointment should be based upon reasonable progress towards this goal. Assessment for full professor should be based on progress towards establishing a national reputation in the field.

Successful generation of grants and contracts that will ultimately lead to publication within the first two tiers of ranked works may be substituted for such publications in reappointment and comprehensive reviews. Book chapters that go through peer review are counted equally with journal articles.

Co-authorship is the norm in archaeological anthropology. Co-authorship order is highly variable and can be based on numerous criteria including (but not limited to) alphabetical order, professional rank of individuals, principal investigator or main funder of the project, or other, agreed-upon decisions between the authors. Co-authorship in archaeological anthropology generally implies that each author has contributed significantly towards the manuscript. The importance of the contribution to the manuscript, which could be any combination of data, analysis, writing, and/or editing, will be addressed in the research statement.

Within applied or public archaeology, equal emphasis is given to single-author and co-authored articles and reports, particularly when co-authors are members of descendent communities affected by the applied research, or other non-Academic project stakeholders (e.g. Park Service or Cultural Resource Management professionals). In applied work, policy reports and resource publications and technical reports may constitute the bulk of publications.

In addition, with the department's increasing emphasis on applied anthropology, reports submitted to governmental agencies or other organizations become increasingly important as measures of research productivity. Many such reports are peer reviewed by Ph.D. or M.A. level agency personnel whose primary job it is to do so, and such works become key resources for other agency and cultural resource managers in private and public sectors. For these reasons technical reports count as significant contributions to scholarship and rank as tier 1 or 2 publications.

Other positive evidence of reputation in the field which may be considered for evaluation for promotion to full professor may consist of, for example:

- Requests to serve as co-investigators on projects and/or grants
- Requests to review manuscripts, textbooks, book chapters, or grants
- Published citations (which might include using author- or article- level citation metrics to quantify)
- Requests to serve as officers of professional or academic associations
- Invited commentaries
- Requests to give honorary lectures sponsored by other professional or academic institutions
- Requests for public presentations and collaborations both within and outside the discipline
- Requests to serve on the graduate committees for students at other universities
- Requests to serve as external program reviewers at other universities
- Requests to write promotion and tenure external review letters for faculty at other universities

Biological anthropology:

Biological anthropology is an extremely diverse subdiscipline, covering many different areas, typically using a biocultural and/or evolutionary framework. As a consequence, publication patterns vary considerably across different areas of research. Someone working in human biology might publish primarily in biology journals, while someone working in human behavior might publish primarily in psychology journals.

A meritorious tenure file should have five publications from tier 1 of ranked publication types listed above, and three additional publications from other tiers. Six or more tier 1 publications denote excellence.

Most primary research is reported in journal articles, which are considered to be the primary vehicles for establishing reputations in the field and for the dissemination of results and interpretations. Biological anthropologists may publish in the major journals of general anthropology, such as *American Anthropology* or *Current Anthropology*. There are several highly rated biological anthropology journals including *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *American Journal of Human Biology*, *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *Physiological Anthropology*, and *Human Nature*. Biological anthropologists often publish in major interdisciplinary science journals such as *Nature*, *Science*, *PNAS*, *BBS*, or *Proc B*.

Books are certainly viewed favorably in biological anthropology, but are often not as prioritized as other modes of dissemination (journal articles, book chapters, conference presentations, etc.). Presenting at conferences and meetings is also highly important for biological anthropologists, and posters and presented papers often include co-authors. Biological anthropology conferences typically include a peer review, and in the case of published conference abstracts, include multiple levels of review. Conference activity at the national and international levels, and at the discipline and interdisciplinary levels, are highly favorable and important modes of dissemination of data. Conference activity typically also provides a means for biological anthropologists to create and establish collaborative teams.

Co-authorship is the norm in biological anthropology. A random sample of ten issues of the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, the premier journal in biological anthropology, revealed that 21% of the articles were by single authors, 38% has two authors, and 41% had more than two authors. Co-authorship order is highly variable and can be based on numerous criteria including (but not limited to) alphabetical order, professional rank of individuals, principal investigator or main funder of the project, or other, agreed-upon decisions between the authors. Co-authorship in biological anthropology often also implies that each author has contributed significantly, often equally, towards the manuscript.

Articles published in biological anthropology tend to be shorter than in other subdisciplines. For example, it is rare to find an article longer than 20 pages in AJPA; most fall around ten pages, and many are shorter. Articles in specialty journals vary in typical length; in medical journals they tend to be short, in primate ethology journals they tend to be longer. Many articles published in bioanthropology rely heavily on quantitative methods, which condense the prose.

In addition, with the department's increasing emphasis on applied anthropology, reports submitted to governmental agencies or other organizations become increasingly important as measures of research productivity, especially in forensic anthropology and in some areas of medical anthropology and epidemiology.

Other positive evidence of reputation in the field which may be considered for evaluation for promotion to full professor may consist of, for example:

- Requests to serve as co-investigators on projects and/or grants
- Requests to review manuscripts, textbooks, book chapters, or grants
- Published citations (which might include using author- or article- level citation metrics to quantify)
- Requests to serve as officers of professional or academic associations
- Invited commentaries
- Requests to give honorary lectures sponsored by other professional or academic institutions
- Requests for public presentations and collaborations both within and outside the discipline
- Requests to serve on the graduate committees for students at other universities
- Requests to serve as external program reviewers at other universities
- Requests to write promotion and tenure external review letters for faculty at other universities