

## **DEPARTMENT of ANTHROPOLOGY**

### ***Promotion and Tenure - Procedures and Guidelines***

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

Below are specific procedures for the Department of Anthropology

### **I. Compendium of Procedures**

#### **i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal**

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental promotion and tenure committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

#### **ii. Review Period**

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In all other cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by "stopping the tenure clock" for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the department head who may also consult with the dean and the provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

#### **iii. External Reviewers**

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a promotion and tenure committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. This committee will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the committee. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

#### **iv. Internal Reviewers**

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

#### **v. Candidate's Statement**

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

#### **vi. Dossier**

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate's dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, "forthcoming" or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications; "forthcoming" work may also be included (an unpublished work may be described on

the c.v. as “forthcoming” if it has been accepted and is in production; there must be written affirmation [may be email] from the editor of a press for a book, an editor of a journal for an article, and a book editor for a book chapter, as to the full acceptance of a contribution and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate’s statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

#### **vii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report**

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a promotion and tenure committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate’s case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate’s work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees’ assessment of the candidate’s work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In most departments, both associate and full professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full Professor.

#### **viii. Department Meeting and Vote**

In general, the department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the department head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

### **ix. Department Head's Review**

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The department head's statement, the promotion and tenure committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

### **x. Degree of Candidate Access to File**

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the dean's review after the meeting with the dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

### **xi. College and University Procedures**

1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the dean.
2. After the file leaves the DAC, the dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.
3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.
4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the provost's office. The provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or

before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

## **II. Guidelines**

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Anthropology. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

### **I. Overview.**

Promotion and tenure in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Oregon are contingent upon an established record of superior research and publication, excellence in teaching, and performance of service to the university and the public. The Anthropology Department's procedures and guidelines governing promotion to associate professor with tenure and promotion to full professor are stated here for two reasons: a) to make department policy on promotion and tenure review explicit, and b) to assist untenured faculty in achieving promotion and tenure with minimal anxiety and stress. Criteria for advancement and promotion are presented first; followed by procedures and details of the review process. This document complements relevant College and University procedures and policies for promotion and tenure; these can be found on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

### **Responsibility for Scheduling:**

The department Head is responsible for appraising faculty of dates for promotion, tenure and post-tenure reviews. The Head will periodically consult with associate professors regarding their eligibility for promotion to full professor.

### **II. Criteria for promotion and tenure.**

A candidate for promotion and tenure must demonstrate a high level of competence in four areas: a) teaching, b) research & scholarly activity, c) leadership in academic and administrative service, and d) activity and service to the larger community. An exceptional record in one or two areas does not compensate for deficiency in others. The Department recognizes that the granting of tenure indicates confidence that the candidate will continue to be a strong scholar and teacher throughout his or her academic career.

The third year review is conducted by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and constitutes an assessment of accomplishments and performance mid-way to the candidates review for promotion and tenure. This review is an important internal departmental process that should be conducted with care. It is designed to give a junior faculty member clear feedback on directions that are, and are not, appropriate in making a successful case for promotion and tenure. In the 6<sup>th</sup> year review, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will pay careful attention to recommendations the candidate received during the third year review.

#### **1) Research & Scholarship.**

Establishing an active program of research and publication is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure in the Department of Anthropology. Evidence of a successful program of research and scholarship includes a series of high quality publications judged to be significant by peers at the UO and by recognized experts in the field at other institutions. The candidate's publication record will vary by sub-discipline within anthropology, however, original

articles and books (in peer-reviewed national and international journals, edited collections, and monographs) are regarded as a hallmark criterion for promotion. While the quality and significance of publications are more important than quantity, and the department does not require any specific number of articles or number of books for promotion; an anthropologist actively engaged in scholarly research might consistently publish between one and three articles per year. The relative value of publication vehicles – journal articles, books, edited volumes, book chapters, research and excavation reports – will vary by sub-field, but visibility, appropriateness, and prestige of publication outlets will be considered. For example, publication of a book, or the equivalent in quality peer reviewed articles, is generally required in socio-cultural anthropology, while high quality journal articles are more commonly the criterion for promotion in biological anthropology and archaeology.

Written evaluations of research quality and the impact of publications will be solicited from members of the department, as well as from outside reviewers. The number and source of grants, fellowships, and awards in support of research will be considered as evidence of quality, but scholarly research will be judged on its own intellectual merits, rather than on the level of funding it generates. Further evidence of research impact may include invitations to lecture, to serve on editorial boards, to join research groups, and to review journal articles and research grant proposals. The department recognizes that standardized criteria will not apply equally to all candidates across all sub-fields of anthropology. Promotion and tenure committees will make every effort to judge each record of research independently, giving special consideration to the various factors that are unique to each individual case.

## **2) Teaching Quality.**

The transmission of knowledge and teaching students to pursue research are among the main missions of the university. The Department of Anthropology values excellence in teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Dedication to quality teaching is an absolute criterion for promotion and tenure in anthropology; unsatisfactory teachers will not be recommended for tenure, even if coupled with an outstanding research record. The department recognizes that there are many styles of teaching and multiple indicators of high quality teaching.

Indications of excellence in teaching will include attention of the following items:

- maintaining student-faculty contact: appropriate contact hours in lectures & seminars; scheduling of office hours, availability for 'drop-in' student consultation,
- keeping course content current: lectures, labs, and assigned readings keep pace with advancements in the field,
- encouraging active learning and co-operation among students,
- communicating high expectations and providing prompt feedback,
- mentoring of graduate students.

The Anthropology Department assesses teaching quality in several ways: a) self-assessment of teaching performance, b) student course evaluations, c) peer evaluation of classroom teaching, d) involvement in independent learning and research activities, e) contribution to the teaching needs of the department.

*Self-assessment of teaching performance.* The candidate will prepare a narrative statement of teaching goals, accomplishments, and pedagogical philosophy. This narrative will include: - a list of

courses taught; - how courses taught fit departmental and university needs and requirements; - a self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses; - summary of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness; - summary of plans for future teaching (new courses under development; revision of existing courses, etc).

*Peer evaluation of classroom teaching.* The department conducts peer evaluation of classroom teaching as described in the departmental Process for Systematizing and Completing Peer Reviews of Teaching (posted on the departmental Blackboard site). The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee member will prepare a statement evaluating the candidate's teaching performance and may solicit additional supporting letters from faculty colleagues who have either team-taught with the candidate or attended their lectures. The committee considers the clarity and fairness of class requirements and evidence that course materials and content reflect current scholarship relevant to the subject. The committee may evaluate the fairness of examinations, and the quality of a professor's grading.

*Student evaluation.* Multiple sources of student assessment of teaching effectiveness are considered. These include: a) summary statistics from computer scored course evaluations; b) signed 'free-from' written statements evaluating course content and instructor; c) letters solicited from former students (identified by the candidate or by the Promotions and Tenure Review Committee).

*Supervised research, reading and independent study (mentoring).* Participation in independent reading & conference type teaching, and in supervising research and independent study comprise an important aspect of university teaching. Regular activity in this type of teaching of graduate and undergraduate students is expected and is one component of the annual report of service. Evaluations of successful performance of mentoring will be solicited from former students, whose names may appear in the teaching narrative statement (above). Evidence of graduate teaching and mentoring is considered, including the number of master's theses and dissertation committees and comprehensive exam committees on which the candidate has served, as well as their general mentorship of graduate students.

*Teaching record and departmental needs.* To what extent does the candidate balance departmental teaching needs (introductory and major requirement fulfilling courses) with course that are narrowly focused on special issues? Does the candidate generate creative teaching initiatives and participate in team-taught courses? Does the candidate go beyond expectations and provide extra teaching service to the department?

### **3) Leadership in academic and administrative service.**

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide> and lists institutional service as a criterion for promotion and tenure. Faculty must provide academic and administrative service to their department, college, university, and profession. At Oregon faculty play a key role in policy development and University governance. The promotion and tenure committee must evaluate the quality of a candidate's contributions to departmental, college, university or professional committees, and to other administrative functions that are normally performed by faculty. To this end, the committee should solicit letters from individuals around the campus who are in a position to comment on the candidate's role and performance in such work.

The Anthropology Department supports a policy of protecting untenured faculty from excessive service on College or University committees, however, an appropriate level of involvement in departmental service is expected. This policy recognizes that the candidate's first responsibilities are toward excellence in research and superior quality in teaching. An exemplary record of service is no substitute for mediocre scholarship or ineffective teaching and will not constitute a basis for promotion and tenure.

#### **4) Service and activity on behalf of the larger public & professional communities.**

As members of society, academics may play a variety of roles in the wider community. In promotion and tenure, attention is given to those services and activities a faculty member provides to the community that are based on professional expertise. Such activities may be at the local, state, national or international levels and may be as diverse as the field of anthropology, including (for example):

- giving talks to service organizations (Lion's & Rotary Clubs), community & neighborhood groups, retirement groups,
- developing news releases regarding research discoveries or special interest teaching topics for local and regional newspapers,
- giving expert testimony or professional service to government agencies,
- developing outreach or enrichment programs,
- monitoring elections in foreign countries,
- visits to local schools to present information on careers in anthropology, or talks on cultural diversity or human evolution and variation.

Professional academic or administrative service at the regional, national, and international levels also constitutes service to the larger community, and will be considered in promotion and tenure cases. This type of service may include:

- serving on the editorial board of professional journals and newsletters,
- peer reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals,
- chairing academic sessions and symposia at professional conferences,
- organizing panels or plenary sessions,
- serving as an invited discussant at symposia.

The role of service in the promotion and tenure process is supplemental. Service to the professional community and to the public at large is ancillary to scholarly and research activities and to performance of teaching. High levels of active involvement in service do not substitute for excellence in teaching and research and cannot constitute the primary basis for recommending promotion or tenure.

### **III. Procedures and Timetable for Promotion and Tenure.**

**1) Initial Meeting with the Anthropology Head.** During the first term of a new faculty member's appointment in a tenure-track position in Anthropology, the Department Head will schedule a meeting for the purpose of reviewing promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures at the departmental, college, and university levels. The Department Head will discuss with the new hire: the relative merit of various professional activities, the structure and content of annual reports of service, and the value of maintaining a detailed record of professional accomplishments. Attention will be given to the promotion and tenure timetable and the standard sequence of events:



formation of committee membership, preparation of the candidate's dossier, and roles played by the department and the college in the review process. A copy of the Department's ***Promotion and Tenure - Procedures and Guidelines*** document will be provided to each new hire at this meeting.

**2) Annual review of untenured faculty.** Each tenure-track faculty appointment will be reviewed annually by the Anthropology Department Head. This review will be based on a brief narrative statement of the candidate's professional accomplishments and future aspirations and will be accompanied by a list of significant academic achievements and professional service. The new hire is encouraged to consult prior Annual Reports of Service on file in the Anthropology Department Office for style and content. The individual will be given a written copy of the annual review by the Department Head, and a meeting may be scheduled (at the request of the Head or of the individual under review) to discuss the written evaluation and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the individual's professional activities. The written review will be signed by the Department Head and by the individual under review. The third year review is an especially important one, the outcome of which has an impact upon renewal of the employment contract.

### **3) Preparation of the Tenure File.**

Typically promotion & tenure cases are scheduled to occur during the 6<sup>th</sup> year of a candidate's appointment. During Winter term, in the year prior to which a promotion & tenure case is considered, the Head will appoint a three member promotion and tenure committee. Depending on the situation, the promotion and tenure committee may serve for all candidates, or may be tailored to the candidate under review by nomination of an additional member. During spring and summer the committee prepares the candidate's dossier. The candidate must provide the committee with the following items:

#### ***a) personal narrative statement, including:***

- a perspective or context for the record of research & scholarship,
- an amplification of teaching methods and philosophy,
- documentation of service activities (professional & community).

The narrative statement should not simply repeat accomplishments and achievements, but should place those items, findings, or conclusions in an intellectual context. This personal narrative should be comprehensible to the non-specialist and limited to approximately five single spaced pages.

#### ***b) research & scholarship***

- all published and forthcoming materials;
- letters of acceptance for forthcoming materials;
- works in progress that the candidate wishes to have considered.

#### ***c) teaching activity***

- list of all courses taught, with course syllabi, and other relevant course materials;
- list of all graduate advisees, with special attention to: master's students advised, service on doctoral committees, and comprehensive exam committees, as member or chairperson, and service on graduate committees outside the department;
- an account of non-classroom supervised teaching: tutorials, independent study, supervised field & lab study.

**d) service to the discipline, institution, & general public**

- list services provided by type (academic, administrative, consultancy, etc).

**e) additional documentation.**

- a list of four - six potential external reviewers (by mid April)
- a signed letter stating candidate's intentions regarding access to the review file and referee's letters, waiving or not waiving right of access.

Supporting documentation for each of the three main areas of professional activity should be organized and submitted to the promotion and tenure committee by the candidate by the end of Spring term in the year preceding review.

Reviewers will include professional peers (4 - 6 external), university colleagues (3 - 4 internal), and former students. A list of potential reviewers will be prepared independently by the promotion and tenure committee and by the candidate. Early in spring term (by mid April) the promotion and tenure committee shall develop a list of leading scholars in the candidate's area of research specialization to provide an evaluation of the significance and impact of the candidate's record of publication on the field of anthropology. These reviewers will usually be external and will assess the caliber of the candidate's research record. Internal referees will be asked to evaluate the candidate's university service, in administrative activity and in inter-departmental programs and co-operative teaching enterprises. Former students, identified by the candidate and by the promotion and tenure committee will provide assessments of the candidate's performance in teaching and mentoring.

Using the University's required format and language, the service of potential reviewers will be solicited. A record must be kept of all invitations to participate in the review process and of acceptances and refusals. The College and University require evidence of reviewer's competence and qualifications, consequently all reviewer's will be asked to provide a brief vita with their letter of evaluation. The candidate has the right to suggest names of both external and internal reviewers (including graduate students; by early April), who are in a position to provide objective and competent commentary. In each case, the candidate should indicate any personal relationship (past mentor, friend, collaborator etc.) with individuals nominated. The external reviewers are selected by the Department Head and, by requirement of the university, include a clear majority of the reviewers from the Department's recommended list of reviewers. Candidates may also indicate potentially objectionable reviewers. Solicitation of external reviews will be conducted in Spring term (by mid-May) preceding the year in which a review is scheduled.

In Fall, the promotion and tenure committee will complete the candidate's dossier by adding:

- referees letters of evaluation and curriculum vitae (due by mid September),
- quantitative data from course evaluations,
- signed student comments,
- graduate student letters, and
- documentation of classroom visits by peers.

The promotion and tenure committee will make a final check for organization and completeness of the dossier. The department Head will assist by monitoring the committee's progress and by meeting with it if necessary. The committee will review the completed file and prepare a written

report to the department evaluating the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service (early October). The committee will vote (yes, no, abstain) by name. The committee report will be forwarded to the department Head who will distribute it to tenured faculty in anthropology in sufficient time to ensure that all members have the opportunity to conduct a fair review. The complete dossier will be available to all tenured faculty members in anthropology.

The department Head will call a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the promotion case and to consider the committee report. The Head will be responsible for noting opinions expressed regarding the candidates file, and for conducting a vote of eligible tenured faculty (voting will be private, ballots will be signed, and stored in a secure place). Any member of the department qualified to vote, that cannot attend this meeting may express an opinion on the case in writing to the Head. In cases of promotion to associate professor with tenure, eligible voters are regular faculty with associate to full professor rank (tenured faculty). When the decision on promotion to full professor is made, only full professors with 0.5 FTE or higher may vote. Emeriti, adjunct, and courtesy faculty do not vote.

The Head will write a letter summarizing opinions (pro and con as relevant) expressed at the meeting, and in addition, will include a personal recommendation on promotion to the College as Department Head. This letter will accompany the file to the Dean's office, usually no later than early November.

#### **IV. Guidelines & Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor.**

##### **1) Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.**

As with earlier promotions, the critical scholarly criterion is quality rather than quantity. Further, the amount of research should not be qualified by time in rank; the issue is whether the candidate has for the past several years been producing high quality, important scholarly work.

To be considered eligible for promotion, an associate professor must have:

- an accomplished record of outstanding teaching, both in the classroom and in other aspects of teaching;
- an outstanding record of scholarly research (including significant work beyond that on which tenure and promotion to associate professor was based). This would include at least one additional monograph or edited volume, or the equivalent in high quality peer-reviewed publications, and
- a substantial record of effective service, typically both inside and outside the department.

Exceptions to these criteria are appropriate only when achievements in one area are truly extraordinary, in which case achievements should normally reflect sustained contributions over a long period. For example, a superb teacher, with modest accomplishments in other areas, may merit promotion. Similarly, a superb scholar (reflected by path-breaking contributions to the field) with modest accomplishments in other areas, may also merit promotion. Although typically subordinate to teaching and research, extraordinarily effective service (reflected by creative and sustained contributions to important functions of the University) is also an important consideration. In all cases, the expectation of significant effort and quality performance remain in each area.

## **2) Procedure & Timeline for Promotion to Full Professor.**

In timing, committee formation, and file preparation, procedures for promotion to full professor follow the more general guidelines for promotion and tenure cases specified above. Procedures specific to promotion to full professor are described below:

*Request for Consideration.* Candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to full professor must make a written request stating their desire to the Head no later than early March of the academic year preceding the year in which the case will be considered.

*Departmental Action on Request for Consideration.* After the request has been received by the Head, the full-time faculty (0.5 FTE or higher) at full professor rank will meet to discuss the request. A decision on the request for promotion to full professor will be made no later than mid March. The department Head will immediately provide a written response to the prospective candidate for promotion stating the decision reached by the full professors.

*Forming the Review Committee.* If the full professors support the candidate's request to be considered for promotion, a promotion and tenure committee will be formed by no later than early April of the academic year prior to that in which the case will be put forward.

*List of Potential Reviewers.* If full professors support the candidate's request to be considered for promotion, they will schedule a follow-up meeting where the candidate can propose a list of potential external reviewers who are in a position to provide objective and competent commentary. In each case, the candidate should indicate any personal relationship (past mentor, friend, collaborator etc.) with individuals nominated. The external reviewers are selected by the Department Head and, by requirement of the university, include a clear majority of the reviewers from the Department's recommended list of reviewers. The list of potential external reviewers (8 - 10) for the case must be compiled by mid April of the academic year prior to that in which the case will be put forward. A target date of mid September will be proposed to outside reviewers for receipt of their letters.

*Compiling the File.* Narrative statement, CV, all publications, record of teaching quality, and documentation of service will be prepared by the candidate and compiled and organized by the chair of the promotion and tenure committee during spring and summer. Once all the outside letters have been received and the file completed, the promotion and tenure committee will prepare a draft report of their evaluation of the dossier and make this document available for review by full professors.

*Meeting and Vote.* The department Head will convene the voting body of full professors of anthropology to discuss the file and to hear and discuss the promotion and tenure committee's report. The promotion and tenure committee will submit a final draft of their report which becomes part of the candidate's file. The Head will prepare a written report that includes a summary of the sense of the discussion of the full professors regarding the case. This report becomes part of the candidate's file as is the vote of the full professors.

*Final Deadline.* All documents, including reports and recommendations of the promotion and tenure committee and the Head of the Anthropology Department, and the complete file must be

ready in final form for transmission to the College of Arts and Sciences by late November.