



The University of
Montana

**UM UNIT STANDARDS COMMITTEE
SIGNATURE FORM**



Unit Standards for: Department of Anthropology

Year: 2009

1) Department Chair:

John C. Daniels
Signature

9/28/09
Date

2) Dean:

Christopher Con
Signature

9-28-2009
Date

3) Chair, UM Unit Standards Committee:

Danell Still
Signature

3/10/10
Date

4) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Roger C. Engle
Signature

7/12/10
Date

Unit Standards for the Department of Anthropology

September 28, 2009

Following are the Department of Anthropology's Unit Standards. These standards are applied in conjunction with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University Faculty Association and the Montana University System that is currently in effect.

I. Introduction

A. *General Philosophy*

We begin with the understanding that a faculty member's performance results from a complex mix of competency, skills, and knowledge. Our standards are designed to objectively and consistently evaluate and reward performance while recognizing and encouraging faculty development in terms of individual strengths and accomplishments.

We encourage our faculty members to take risks and to be innovative. Our unit standards aim to guide and improve performance rather than to be used as a bullwhip or strict yardstick. The evaluation process established by these standards is designed to get the Department faculty members working together to identify and plan individual and program improvement.

Our Department principles of faculty performance pave the way for our unit standards. They are as follows:

1. effectively encourage positive performance by our peers by ensuring that colleagues have the information, authority, and resources required to do their jobs, and expect others to conduct their professional activities with a minimum of bureaucratic intrusion;
2. participate in the professional development of our colleagues, recognize their efforts and accomplishments, and react with positive understanding to constructive feedback, suggestions, and viewpoints of others;

3. strive to consider and exceed the expectations of colleagues, students, administrators, and potential employers of students as well as reach our professional goals; and
4. individually and collectively consider long-term programmatic goals in making decisions.

B. Unit Standards and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

1. The procedures outlined in this Unit Standard are intended to expand on the process outlined in the current CBA. In the event of inconsistencies between these documents, the terms of the CBA shall prevail.
2. Faculty members should consult the CBA for procedures relevant to the evaluation process beyond the level of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and for procedures for appeals.
3. Probationary faculty should pay particular attention to the CBA sections which cover rights of probationary appointees and other matters such as rank, appointment, reappointment, nonreappointment, and credit for probationary service.

II. The Faculty Evaluation Process

A. Faculty Responsibilities for Evaluation

1. Each faculty member to be evaluated shall consult with the Department Chair in proposing to the members of the Department an individualized FEC subcommittee for those who will be formally evaluated that year. See Section II.C for FEC structure and responsibilities.
2. Each faculty member who is to be evaluated is responsible for preparing and submitting required evidence of teaching effectiveness and an Individual Performance Record (IPR). The requirements for these documents are outlined in Section III.A-B. These documents must be presented to the Department's Administrative Officer in accordance to the CBA timeline: that is, teaching materials for the

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) by September 15 and the IPR by October 15.

3. Each Faculty member shall sign the recommendations of the SEC, FEC, and the Chair's review to signify that he/she has read them and to attest to the accuracy of the supporting documents. The signature does not signify the faculty member's endorsement of the recommendations.

B. In accordance with the CBA and before October 15, the tenure track faculty in the Department will vote on the FEC subcommittees proposed for each faculty member to be evaluated. If a majority vote is not obtained, the Department Chair will submit additional proposals until a majority vote for the FEC is obtained.

C. Each FEC subcommittee shall consist of the FEC subcommittee Chair, two other faculty members, and one non-voting student member appointed by the FEC subcommittee Chair and selected from the Student Evaluation Committee (SEC). The FEC subcommittee Chair and the two other faculty will be from within the Department for whom the University Faculty Association is the bargaining representative under the CBA, except as follows:

1. A faculty member shall not serve as a member of the FEC subcommittee for the consideration of his or her own evaluation.
2. Only tenured faculty and the student representative will serve on a FEC subcommittee when a decision concerning promotion or tenure is to be made.
3. Any tenurable faculty members may serve on a FEC subcommittee of a faculty member being evaluated for a normal or merit salary increment.
4. The FEC subcommittee chairs shall be tenured faculty members of the Department and shall be chosen by a majority vote of the FEC committee members.

- D.** The duties of the FEC subcommittee Chair shall be to call and conduct a meeting of the FEC subcommittee in accordance with this document and the CBA, and to oversee the written evaluation.
- E.** Upon request of any faculty member being evaluated, the FEC subcommittee shall afford the faculty member an opportunity to address the committee personally regarding the committee evaluation.
- F.** The FEC subcommittee will examine all collected evidence and then apply this Unit Standard to the request of the faculty member. The recommendation of the FEC subcommittee is determined by a majority of the voting members and is explicated in a statement that measures the request of the faculty member against this Unit Standard. The report will be forwarded by the FEC subcommittee Chair to the Department Chair.

III. Documentation Required for Evaluation

- A.** An evaluation form approved by the Department Chair for at least one class for each semester under review is required. Ideally, the reviews presented should be representative of the range of courses (lower and upper division, small and large, graduate and undergraduate) that is taught by the faculty member. This form shall have at a minimum, one question evaluating the course and one question evaluating the instructor on a ranked scale; for example, on the Instructional Assessment System evaluation (IAS) forms from the University of Washington, this is question 1 and 3 respectively.

B. Each faculty member shall document his or her performance in an IPR as defined in the CBA.

- 1.** Such documentation shall be made to a degree sufficient to allow the FEC subcommittee to make a competent judgment of the faculty member's performance. A self-assessing summary, typically less than a page, should be included. Faculty members are encouraged to effectively summarize their performance and to exclude inconsequential or redundant documentation.
- 2.** Lists of appropriate evidence that can be used to document teaching, service and research are found in Section IV. C. 1, 2, and 3.

- C.** The FEC subcommittee may receive or seek evidence from any source relevant to the evaluation of any faculty member in the academic unit so long as the evidence is relevant to these standards and the faculty member to whom the evidence pertains is afforded full opportunity to review and respond to the evidence.
- 1.** Should the FEC subcommittee require additional documentation the FEC subcommittee Chair shall so inform the faculty member in writing by November 1. The exact nature of the additional documentation must be specified.
 - 2.** If the faculty member desires to submit the requested additional documentation, she or he must do so within five working days of receipt of the request.

IV. General Criteria for Evaluation

- A.** Faculty responsibilities in the areas of teaching, service, and research are outlined in the CBA. The following are intended as an elaboration of these sections.
- B.** Central to the Department's evaluation process is the concept of a Normal Faculty Workload and the procedures for modifying it, defined in Section VII.F, and the concept of professional growth, defined in Section VII.E. Those sections are fundamental to applying the criteria listed in this section to faculty performance.
- C.** The lists below of activities and documentation are to be used only as a general guide, as the Department does not wish to constrain creative endeavors which would further the objectives of the University.
- 1.** Evidence of teaching effectiveness:
 - a.** For classroom teaching, the following evidence can be used:

summarized quantitative scores from teaching evaluations, including but not limited to the questions required in Section IV.A;

written student opinion, gathered by open-ended questions as part of the regular teaching evaluations;

peer evaluation by a colleague or colleagues;

course syllabi and other instructional materials;

letters expressing thanks from students;

innovations in teaching or advising;

new course and curriculum development;

use by other scholars of instructional materials prepared by a faculty member;

participation in professional development activities aimed at improving teaching; and,

nomination for, and, particularly, receipt of, a University teaching award.

- b.** Participation in undergraduate General Education, normally by teaching courses that satisfy General Education Requirements.
- c.** Success at mentoring of M.A. and /or Ph.D. students in the program, including evidence of conference presentations, publications, awards, and employment by those students. While all mentoring roles of graduate students are recognized and should be rewarded as critical for the successful of the Department, the role of committee chair for completed students is viewed as an important benchmark because of the commitment that it requires.
- d.** Active and productive participation in undergraduate student advising. **It** is recognized that advising efforts are difficult to measure, and that the number of

advisees is not controlled by faculty members. Faculty members wishing to document above-normal efforts in advising may point to above average advising loads, above average accessibility, above-average awards and research activities of their advisees, and the successes of advisees after graduation.

- 2.** Evidence of University, community, or professional service:
 - a.** Participation in fulfilling Departmental needs, including occupying a Departmental leadership and service office;
 - b.** participation in professional organization(s) including, but not limited to such matters as chairing discussant sessions at meetings, refereeing papers for presentation or publication, reviewing grant and contract proposals, and serving as an officer or a committee member of a professional organization;
 - c.** participation in faculty governance at The University of Montana, generally through membership in the relevant committees and/or the Faculty Senate;
 - d.** active and productive participation in other campus committees;
 - e.** conducting professional training, including workshops and seminars, for professionals in business or government;
 - f.** rendering professional service as a member of private or public boards or committees;
 - g.** consulting, compensated or uncompensated, that meets one or more of these criteria: (1) contributes to professional growth; (2) contributes to the professional growth of students; (3) creates positive publicity for the discipline and/or the University; or (4) brings new resources to the University;

ranked along a single dimension. However, evidence of the originality and impact of scholarship includes:

citations of a faculty member's scholarly contributions by other authors in their refereed journal articles or books;

favorable book reviews;

evidence of book and monograph circulation, including sales numbers, reprinting, and the number of research libraries holding the volume;

letters and reports from granting agencies evaluating the quality of the work;

solicited letters by peers and leaders in the field evaluating the scholarly impact of a faculty member;

the impact on student support and training at the University, as measured by student participation, employment, and publication;

the amount of money generated by external grants and contracts.

V. Specific Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Other Evaluations

- A.** Promotion. Promotion requires attainment of the academic qualification and an academic record appropriate to that rank. Promotion is not, in other words, merely a matter of years in rank. In addition to the criteria listed in the CBA the following will apply:

1. Assistant to Associate Professor

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching, research, and service as described in Sections VII.B-D. Furthermore, the character of the service in rank as Assistant Professor shall demonstrate professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University.

For promotion to Associate Professor, scholarship must be evidenced by a set of publications or other works related to the candidate's field of expertise as defined in Section IV.C.3.a-d. Normally, these works will vary considerably in length, purpose, audience, and venue, but collectively they must demonstrate an effective research agenda with an impact on the field at the national or greater level. This impact must be evident in the works themselves, but documentation of scholarly impact, as defined in Section IV.C.3.e, should be included in the IPR where applicable.

2. Associate to Full Professor

All candidates for promotion to Full Professor must present evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching, research, and service as described in Sections VII.B-D. Furthermore, the character of the service in rank as Associate Professor shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of a significant impact to at least one area of Department needs, University governance, the profession, or to the larger community.

For promotion to Full Professor, satisfactory scholarship shall be broadly defined to accommodate the unique set of skills possessed by the individual faculty and the current needs of the Department of Anthropology. Scholarship must be evidenced by a set of publications or other works related to the candidate's field of expertise as defined in Section IV.C.3.a-d. Normally, these works will vary considerably in length, purpose, audience, and venue, but collectively they must demonstrate an effective research agenda with an impact on the field at the national or greater level. This impact must be evident in the works themselves, but other documentation of scholarly impact, as defined in Section IV.C.3.e, should be included in the IPR where applicable. Further, professional growth in a

faculty member's research agenda will be shown by one or more of the following: productive new projects, new external funding sources, greater involvement of students in the research agenda, or a higher level of scholarly impact of ongoing research.

B. Tenure

Granting of tenure reflects not only past performance, but also potential for significant future growth to the standard expected for promotion to Full Professor. The attention of those faculty members nearing tenure is directed to the CBA regarding "Eligibility for Tenure Application," "Limitations on Tenure Awards," "Rights of Tenured Appointees," as well as the sections in the CBA and this document which cover criteria, documentation and procedure. Particular note should be taken of the statement in the CBA which reads in part, "It shall be the responsibility of the eligible faculty member to initiate the application for tenure..." (CBA 9.320).

C. Merit Recognition

Merit recognition is covered in the CBA. To be eligible for merit a faculty member must demonstrate outstanding performance in one or above normal performance in two of the three areas-teaching, scholarship, and service-and at least nonnal performance in the remaining areas. Receipt of a merit award does not provide sufficient evidence that the requirements of protnotion and tenure have been met.

D. Normal

The Department expects that the majority of evaluations that most faculty members will request over their career will be for a "normal increment." They will be expected to grow in value to the institution, through continued satisfactory teaching, scholarship or service, and will be rewarded with a normal increment to their salary.

E. Less-Than-Nonnal

1. Less-than-normal increment is explained in the CBA and is reserved for either the absence of any performance or serious deficiencies in

performing one or more assigned departmental duty in teaching, scholarly activity, or service.

2. Serious deficiencies in performing reasonably assigned departmental duties or engaging in scholarly activity or service include:
 - a. not carrying out duties at all, for reasons other than illness;
 - b. performing duties in a clearly incompetent manner;
 - c. teaching that is clearly not effective;
 - d. ceasing to engage in scholarly activity.
3. A less-than-normal increment cannot be based on a requirement that has been reduced or eliminated as part of a workload adjustment, as discussed in Section VII.F.2. Such alterations might reflect substantial new professional responsibilities, working a less than 1.0 FTE, a sabbatical, or another reassignment of duties.

F. Retention

The CBA provides that the FEC shall make a recommendation concerning retention of probationary faculty. The following statements in this section are intended as amplifications of the Contract language.

The documentation and evidence submitted by the faculty member in conformance with the CBA and this document will also be used by the FEC in consideration of retention.

The procedure used for making a recommendation concerning retention and nonreappointment will be the same as that provided in the CBA and this document for making recommendations concerning tenure, salary and promotion. That is, normal performance in the area of teaching, service and scholarship is required.

G. Tenure Review

Following the procedure outlined in the CBA, tenure review is initiated

only when less-than-normal reviews occur over three consecutive years. The chair will recommend and the Faculty will approve a FEC subcommittee who will then decide to either recommend continuation or discontinuation of the faculty member's tenure. This vote, accompanied by a statement on the reasons for the decision, will be voted on by the Department Faculty. Both decisions, with the relevant documents, will then be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

VI. Requirements for Non-Tenurable Faculty

A. The Anthropology Department recognizes four types of non-tenurable Faculty, also known as adjunct appointees: lecturers, adjunct faculty of any rank, research faculty of any rank, and visiting faculty of any rank.

B. Full-time non-tenurable faculty

- 1.** These faculty members are encouraged to participate in unit governance in the same capacity as probationary faculty, except as provided in Section II.C and those activities prohibited in the CBA.
- 2.** Workload shall be distributed between teaching, scholarly or creative activities, and service in ways to best meet the needs of the Department, as discussed in Section VII.F.
- 3.** Lecturers are expected to remain current in the areas that they teach, but are not expected to engage in a research program. Any lecturer who wishes to undertake research activities, however, will be supported by the Department to the extent possible. Otherwise, the standards for the performance of full-time non-tenurable faculty shall be the same as for regular faculty.

C. For less-than-full-time non-tenurable faculty only standards specific to the duties for which the person was engaged shall be applied.

VII. Definitions

The following are intended as an elaboration of the CBA.

A. Terminal Degree

A terminal degree for the Department is defined as an earned research doctorate from an accredited university in an area appropriate to the Department.

B. Satisfactory Teaching

Requests for promotion, tenure, normal increment, and retention require evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching. Courses should be designed so that they are rigorous, challenging and conducive to learning. Satisfactory performance in teaching will normally be evidenced by consistency of scores on student ratings of 3.0 or better on a six point scale (0=very poor to 5=excellent) on a form approved by the Department Chair. In the event that a change in evaluation forms alters this scale, the required score will be adjusted to be comparable. Two questions rating the course and the instructor shall be used to determine the student rating. The student evaluation scores should be interpreted in conjunction with the average GPA for students in the class, class size, course level and whether the class is required or optional. These adjustments should not be used to demean the efforts of faculty members who skillfully teach small, specialized courses.

Teaching can be determined satisfactory when accompanied by effective advising at the undergraduate and graduate level. Effective advising requires faculty members to be available to their advisees, to provide information that allows students to effectively navigate essential departmental and general University requirements, to point students toward appropriate University resources needed to answer complex questions, and to help advisees to plan their careers.

C. Satisfactory Scholarship

The definition of Satisfactory Scholarship varies with the requested action by the faculty member as outlined in Section V. The quantity and/or quality of scholarship is expected to grow as the faculty member

progresses through professional ranks.

D. Satisfactory Service

The definition of Satisfactory Service varies with the requested action by the faculty member as outlined in Section V. The quantity and quality of service rendered by a faculty member is expected to grow as the faculty member moves through the professional ranks.

E. The Concept of Professional Growth

The concept of professional growth, as stated in the CBA, shall be based on a thorough assessment of the applicant's performance while at The University of Montana. The overall guiding criteria in evaluating professional growth for a faculty member shall be his or her demonstrated ability to carry out the academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as stated in the CBA. The FEC is responsible for assessing the performance of the faculty member based on the criteria in the CBA, the elaboration of the criteria in this document and any other information put before the FEC by the individual being considered.

F. Normal Faculty Workload

1. The base expected workload for a 1.0 FTE tenure-track Anthropology faculty is:
 - a. two (2) courses each autumn semester and two (2) courses each spring semester;
 - b. a productive research program;
 - c. significant contribution to undergraduate advising and significant contribution to graduate mentoring;
 - d. significant contribution of appropriate service to the

Department, the University, the community, and/or the discipline;

- e.** functioning in a cooperative manner within the Department by carrying a fair share of such routine activities as student and faculty recruiting, class scheduling, coordinating course materials with other faculty, curriculum work, participating in faculty meetings and retreats.

- 2.** As part of a normal workload, a faculty member may be required to fulfill reasonable assignments that the faculty member agreed to and was hired to perform, unless their workload is altered under the procedures below.

- 3.** The areas addressed above serve as criteria for adjusting work load in a way that maintains an equitable status for each member of the faculty. Faculty members may have specific areas of teaching, research, or service expanded or limited in consultation and approval of his or her supervisory administrator. Such adjustments will be made in a reasonable and equitable way, and in accordance with any guidelines developed and approved by the Department Faculty. Such adjustments include but are not limited to a faculty member:
 - a.** teaching more courses in exchange for a reduced research expectation or reduced contribution to graduate mentoring;
 - b.** negotiating a reduced teaching load in exchange for one of the more demanding departmental service and leadership offices, such as chair;
 - c.** adjusting requirements for service, teaching, and research for tenurable faculty members working less than 1.0 FTE.