

Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Department of Ethnic Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

University of Colorado, Boulder

November 2018

The Department of Ethnic Studies explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its Standards, Processes, and Procedures (SPP) document, and is consistent with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement entitled, “Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty.”

1. *Rules of the Regents:* Rules of the Regents, as given in the CU Faculty Handbook, define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

The University requires comprehensive review at the end of the last appointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials (see the Faculty Handbook) and can, if negative, result in the rejection of a faculty member for renewal of appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

According to the Faculty Handbook, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate “excellence” in either teaching or research and “meritorious” achievement in the other category, plus meritorious service. Promotion to the rank of full professor requires, according to the Faculty Handbook, that a candidate demonstrates “outstanding” achievement in both teaching and research. The purpose of the departmental evaluation is

to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the disciplines that are represented within the Department of Ethnic Studies.

2. *Allocation of Effort*: Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. This allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord with the Department's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.

3. *Evaluation of Teaching*: In the first year after being appointed to a tenure-track position, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain all written records pertaining to teaching. The portfolio will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching. The Department may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

a. *Undergraduate teaching*: Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching credentials. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:

1. Statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
2. Faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
3. Peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
4. Examples of course outline, syllabi, examinations, and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
5. Descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework;
6. Written statements that may have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters.

Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students, directing and/or serving on honors thesis committees, and research activities promoting faculty-student interaction.

b. Graduate Instruction: Graduate instruction is an important component of teaching evaluation. The Department of Ethnic Studies has its own graduate program, which offers both a graduate certificate and Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies. Core faculty members are expected to advise, mentor, and teach graduate students. Additionally, core faculty members are also expected to: (1) serve on committees of students being advised and mentored by other faculty members; (2) be actively involved in the annual graduate admissions process; (3) develop graduate level courses; and (4) regularly teach graduate level seminars. Faculty members should maintain, as part of the teaching portfolio, records on their graduate teaching and advising activities, including courses taught, dates of admission for individual students, dates of completion and placement of individual students, and other contributions to the growth and development of the graduate program. These records are considered integral parts of the evidence pertaining to demonstrable achievement in teaching.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

Evaluation of Research: Achievement in research is an important component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for appointment, promotion, or tenure. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research activity. The Department of Ethnic Studies (DES) is committed to helping all junior colleagues build a record that will lead to successful comprehensive review and promotion to associate professor with continuous tenure. Toward that end, each junior faculty will be asked by the chair to identify a senior

member of the faculty to serve as a mentor. The chair will maintain a record of the mentors selected by junior colleagues. The chair will offer advice about potential mentors and encourage junior colleagues and mentors to meet regularly with one another. Mentors will offer advice and assist in identifying additional resources that may be helpful in the career management of junior colleagues. Ultimately, however, career management is the responsibility of each faculty member, regardless of rank. The Chair will hold discussion at least once a year with each assistant professor.

Publication is an important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. Even though we are an interdisciplinary department, it is usually expected that faculty members have a completed single-authored monograph at the time of tenure review and show evidence of future research agendas that demonstrate a scholar's growth from the dissertation and their first single author book to make a case for excellence in research. If faculty seeking tenure do not want to focus on a single author monograph with a top tier press and published articles as their main criterion for research productivity, they can pursue single author and lead author articles in refereed journals, book chapters and refereed symposium proceedings. The quantity of published work for those seeking promotion with tenure without a single author book should be at least nine to twelve articles. All published work should show evidence of originality and importance.

In keeping with the College of Arts and Sciences guidelines on research productivity. Books and articles are generally considered "finished" when they are in print or "out of the hands" of the faculty meaning they are in the in print or in galley stage. Faculty members in the college are advised that editing or co-editing a volume is generally considered by the college personnel committee as a professional service and a reflection of stature in the subfield, and effort in this area prior to tenure should *not come* at the expense of the production of original scholarly work. Articles written as part of an edited volume are of course considered scholarship. An argument that editing activity is unusual and should be considered an original scholarly contribution must be made by the department.

To be judged excellent in research or creative work, faculty must have established a strong record of accomplishment as judged against the criteria of the primary unit and College. A record of research excellence must evidence the following: regular research activity, sustained productivity in a line or lines of research going beyond the dissertation, intellectual originality and independence, high quality as indicated by

publication in top tier presses, recognized refereed journals or similarly prestigious venues, and impact on relevant fields of scholarship. Additional indicators include external funding, invitations to publish or present, and awards. Funded community engagement that has scholarship as part of the engagement will also be considered as evidence of research productivity but not at the same weight as a book published by a top tier and refereed journals.

Demonstrated excellence in research or creative work, in addition to satisfying the primary unit's criteria for meritorious accomplishment, requires demonstrated research or creative works accomplishment that can be considered equivalent to that of other faculty in the discipline at a similar stage of career, here and in comparable departments or programs at other institutions. The PUEC report and external review letters play an important role in this judgment.

Another criterion for evaluation of research is extramural support. Although quantities of research support are not specifically required for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, extramural support is taken as an important external validation of research.

Another important criterion for evaluation of research is the candidate's national or international reputation for achievement in research. The Department will gather evidence of reputation from authoritative reviewers external to the University; these will include some individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation and some individuals who are selected independently by the departmental evaluation committee rather than by the candidate.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit, or the Department may consider, other evidence of achievement in research that seems appropriate to a particular individual's case for promotion, reappointment, or tenure.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents

Evaluation of Service: A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is an important criterion for the evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies.. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial and reviewing for professional journals or professional societies, or professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it. Also, DES values the importance of community engagement and recognizes the unique roles that faculty can play in working with communities outside of the university. Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and its duration and significance. Candidates for promotion, reappointment, or tenure should compile this information on a continuous basis. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

If the Faculty Handbook gives no explicit expectation for service, no separate evaluation of service is necessary; achievement in service will be considered as contributory to achievement in teaching and research.

Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.¹

Individuals who are hired as beginning assistant professors will have at least one evaluation for reappointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. The last reappointment prior to tenure decision must be based upon comprehensive evaluation. A standard pattern would be for an assistant professor to receive a three- or four-year appointment initially and, upon positive comprehensive review at the end of this first

¹ Information in this section is common to all departments and is not subject to departmental modification.

appointment, to receive a second appointment that would extend to the mandatory tenure decision.

Tenure is required by the end of the seventh year. Faculty members are typically evaluated for tenure in the seventh year; the seven-year probationary period will include any years of credit toward tenure that are specified in writing at the time of hiring. In cases where faculty were hired as advanced assistant professors and have developed a compelling record of research excellence, and are meritorious or excellent in their teaching and meritorious efforts can request that their application for promotion and tenure can be before the 7th year. If a faculty seeks early tenure at the time of their mid-career comprehensive review, the PUEC and the tenured faculty will first review the applicant's material and vote on their mid-career review and then review, and vote on the bid for promotion and tenure.

Typically, promotion to associate professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure, although formally the two are separate decisions. Under unusual circumstances, individuals may be hired as associate professors without tenure (mainly because the University is reluctant to hire individuals without a probationary period prior to tenure), and in this case the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of promotion to associate professor.

There is no mandatory point of decision for promotion to full professor. A customary waiting interval is approximately equal to the interval between the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, because significant incremental achievement is expected between ranks. In unusual cases, an individual can be considered for promotion to full professor after only a few years in rank as an associate professor, but this is not advisable on a routine basis because review committees can be expected to apply criteria strictly and not in such cases consider shorter time in rank. Individuals who have doubts about the timing of promotion should seek advice from their Chair, who may appoint an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the situation.

Any individual can ask to be considered for promotion or tenure at any time, and the Department will consider the request unless it is contrary to the rules of the University. Individuals who believe that they are promotable or tenurable should not hesitate to ask their Chair for an evaluation.

Departmental Review Process: Departmental judgments that involve the application of standards are based on peer review. The recommendation of the Department is ultimately determined by a vote of the tenured faculty following discussion of the evidence that was collected for the review. The process of personnel review begins for the Department with the Chair's appointment of a personnel committee, which performs two functions. First, if there is some doubt as to the likelihood of a favorable outcome, the personnel committee may advise the candidate to withhold the case until more time has elapsed, except in the case of mandatory tenure decision or mandatory comprehensive review. The committee may give this advice either initially, or after accumulating information indicating that the case needs to be stronger in order to be successful. The candidate is not bound to the advice of the personnel committee, however, and can proceed against it.

It is of the utmost importance that a faculty member seeking promotion and tenure work closely with the PUEC chair for feedback on their required statements, submission of names for external reviewers, submission for materials for the dossier sent to the external reviewers, and submission of materials for the dossier for the comprehensive dossier that is used for PUEC review and tenured faculty discussion and vote. For the PUEC committee along with the Department leadership to submit an applicant's dossier of materials and statements and provide sufficient time for external reviewers to read and evaluate the dossier of materials and statements, the suggested time-line is that the faculty should plan on providing a list of seven external reviewers NO Later than February 1 of the spring semester before the tenure year. Faculty should plan to have their dossier of materials ready to be sent to external reviewers no later than April 1 of the spring semester prior to the fall semester when the dossier is submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences with the all the required materials, the PUEC report, the Chairs letter and vote counts. The second purpose of the personnel committee is to solicit external letters of reference and to collect other confidential information that the candidate cannot collect independently. External reviewers will be asked to submit their external reviews no later than Aug 1 prior to beginning of the Fall semester so that the letters can be made available to the PUEC committee and then the tenured faculty at the earliest convenience possible.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the bulk of the personnel file, but can seek the help or advice of the personnel committee as appropriate. The Administrative Assistant of the Department will receive the file and will review it for completeness. The file should meet the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the Campus as outlined on specification sheets that are available from the Dean's office. It is the responsibility of the personnel committee to obtain any additional information that it may require to make a complete presentation to the Department.

Following the assembly of all materials, the personnel committee will have a final meeting in which it decides by vote its opinion on the case. The committee also will assign to its member's responsibilities for presentation of the case to the Department. The committee will make the entire file available on a confidential basis to the tenured faculty prior to the Department's discussion of the case.

The Department Chair announces discussion of personnel cases by the Department in advance. There will be a separate meeting scheduled by the Chair of the Department in consultation with the PUEC Chair to discuss the dossier. Only tenured faculty in the Department of Ethnic Studies will be allowed to discuss and vote on candidate's case for tenure or mid-career review. The personnel committee will be asked to make a presentation to the tenured faculty and the Chair. This will be followed by detailed discussion of the case by all faculty. When the Chair is satisfied, that discussion is complete, there will be a vote by closed or secret ballot in the different categories of evaluation. In cases of mid-career review and promotion and tenure will be voted on by only tenured faculty regardless of tenured rank. Faculty that are seeking promotion to full professors, only full professors would vote on the case of an associate professor being considered for promotion to full professor. If there are not enough full professors rostered in the Department of Ethnic Studies, the Chair will work with the PUEC chair and in consultation with the faculty to request a full professor from another unit whose research expertise can assist in the assessment of the faculty.

The Department Chair acts as an independent judge of the case. The Chair does not vote on the personnel decision except in the case of a tie, but does provide a critical evaluation of the case that may or may not support the faculty's vote. In a letter addressed to the Dean, the Chair reports the Department's vote, the vote and report

summary highlights of the PUEC, and summarizes faculty discussion, and gives the Chair's opinion of the case.

Review above the Level of the Department: Following the departmental vote, the candidate's file is sent from the Department to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences by the stated deadline. The Dean refers the case to a standing College committee (Dean's Personnel Committee), which discusses the case and votes on it. The Dean then writes a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter gives the Dean's personal evaluation of the case and a recommendation for action, as well as reporting the vote and, if appropriate, the opinions of the Dean's Personnel Committee. The Dean is not bound to agree with the Dean's Personnel Committee, with the Department, or with the Chair.

Beyond the Dean's office, the personnel file passes to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor's office receives files on all personnel decisions from all colleges on the Campus. The Vice Chancellor relies heavily on the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC), which considers all cases for comprehensive reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The VCAC discusses each case in detail and votes on the disposition of the case. The vote is considered a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The Vice Chancellor's decision is relayed to the Chancellor.

Beyond the Vice Chancellor's level, review occurs by the Chancellor, the President, and the Regents. A negative decision by any level of review can be overruled by a positive decision at a higher level. For example, a negative decision by the Department could be overruled by the Dean or by the Vice Chancellor. Similarly, a positive decision at any level can be overruled by a negative decision at a higher level. When any decision is overruled, the case is sent back to the lower level with advice from the upper level and a request for clarification, reconsideration, or additional information. The case is then reconsidered by the lower level and forwarded again to the upper level for final review. The rights of appeal for rejected candidates are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Return of cases from an upper level to a lower level cannot always be taken as a sign of weakness in the case. Sometimes, review committees find critical pieces of

information missing from the file and ask for additional information, even though they fully expect to approve the case. Individuals under review should not be unduly concerned by a request for additional information, unless the request is accompanied by a negative vote from a review committee.

The candidate is directly advised through the Chair by the Dean's office of all review committee decisions. In addition, the candidate will receive a copy of the letter that passes from the Dean to the Vice Chancellor and will be notified of the reasons for any negative action or concern on the part of the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee about degree of documentation.

Personnel cases are prepared in the fall semester of the year before they take effect. The order of preparation is typically by increasing rank: comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor. Under the current scheduling system, the comprehensive reappointment cases will leave the Department in October, cases for tenure and promotion arrive at the Deans office no later than November 1, and the full professor cases may leave the Department as late as January in the year of the proposed personnel action.