

I. Procedures

Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty.

Procedures specific to the Department of Anthropology are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

Department-Specific Policies and Procedures

Annual reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the Anthropology Department Head. This review will be based on a brief narrative statement of the candidate's professional accomplishments and future aspirations, together with a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date. The candidate 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.

Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

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 candidate's 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 6th year review, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will pay careful attention to recommendations the candidate received during the third year review.

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by members of the tenured members of the Department. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. 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.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

External Reviewers

Late in the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head 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. Independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. 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. 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.

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.

Promotion and Tenure Committee/Report

Prior to the deadline by which the tenure or promotion case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of faculty at the rank being sought by the candidate or higher to review the candidate. 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 must be completed sufficiently in advance of the deadline for submission of the dossier to the College for the department head and faculty of appropriate rank to have time to review the dossier prior to the Department meeting. It is generally made available in the Department office for review. In our Department, Associate and Full Professors vote on tenure cases, but only Full Professors and vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case. Following these discussions, 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 are tallied, usually by the department head, and the department is 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.

Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement describing the process and 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 concludes with the department head's opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote.

II. Guidelines

Preamble

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 following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40%, 40% and 20%, respectively. The 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. This document complements relevant College and University procedures and policies for promotion and tenure; these can be found on the Academic Affairs website: <https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure>.

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.

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 and 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 their academic career.

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 hallmark criteria 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, and 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 criteria 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 and other forms of scholarly impact (see list below). In some cases this may include citation counts, when appropriate to the scholar's area of research, rank, and point in their career. It is not required. If citation indexes are used as a criteria of evaluation they must be contextualized. 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.

These requirements above may be supplemented by evidence of additional high quality activity including but not limited to¹:

1.3 Research-related Speaking Engagements and Presentations

1.4 Preprints

1.5 Online Datasets and Databases

1.6 Films, Documentaries and Performances

1.7 Museum Exhibits

1.8 Products of Applied Research

1.9 Books, Poetry, Short Stories, Creative Non-Fiction

1) 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

¹ See Appendix A for detailed descriptions of points 1.3-1.10

- 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 when administered during the review window, and student experience surveys, c) peer evaluation of classroom teaching, d) involvement in independent learning and research activities, and 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 course evaluations when administered during the review window, and summaries of student experience surveys; 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 and 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?

2) Leadership in academic and administrative service.

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website <https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure> 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.

3) 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 activities listed under scholarly impact described in Appendix A and (for example):

- giving talks to service organizations (Lion's and Rotary Clubs), community and 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. Post-Tenure Review

1) Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: April 19, 2017

Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost: Feb. 3, 2020

the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed by the head or a head-designated representative. If reviewed by a head-designated representative, that person will provide a written report to the department head. The head will then write a letter. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

2) Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Anthropology expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/VO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

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 recommendation of the full professors.

Forming the Review Committee. If the full professors support the candidate's request to be considered for promotion, or if the candidate requests even in the event the full professors do not support the request, 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. 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 completed 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. The candidate should also include a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. 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.

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: April 19, 2017

Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost: Feb. 3, 2020

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 no later than November 1st.

APPENDIX 1

1.3 Research-related Speaking Engagements and Presentations

Presenting research is considered an important part of anthropologists' professional activity. In evaluating the quality of the speaking engagements and presentations we consider impact within two categories: A) impact within the larger fields we operate and B) impact within those specific regions or communities with which we engage. Examples of speaking engagements and presentations in Category A include presentations at national or international society meetings (e.g. American Anthropological Association, American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Society of American Archaeology) or participation at other national or international organization meetings (e.g. United Nations, Wenner Gren, UNESCO Heritage Meetings).

Examples of speaking engagements in Category B include invited talks, lectures or readings at colleges and universities as well as non-promotional television, online and radio appearances. These speaking engagements contribute to disseminating anthropologists' work both inside and outside academia, build connections with the communities with whom we work, attract new students, and consolidate scholarly networks across subfields. In this context, it is appropriate that audiences remain small and/or local. Category B is particularly significant for minority, international, and scholars of color who present their work to marginalized audiences or research about underrepresented areas/topics. Category B also encompasses presentations in cutting-edge innovative areas and topics which are only recently emerging in mainstream academia and are not yet part of larger (and more traditional) society meetings. The speaking engagements under Category B are key in anthropology because most faculty conduct research outside the United States and/or work in languages other than English. A good number of faculty collaborate with international scholars and local communities and maintain close research ties with academic institutions around the globe.

1.4 Preprints

Use of online preprint servers (e.g. <https://www.biorxiv.org>) are becoming increasingly important in the biological sciences. Posting preprints allows authors to make their work and research findings immediately available to the scientific community and to receive feedback from peers before they are submitted for publication. The impact of preprints can be measured through number of reads, downloads, shares and/or likes on social media or citations.

1.5 Online Datasets and Databases

Creation of significant online data, with its own inherent impact (i.e., value is greater than its use in the faculty's individual publications) is a valuable contribution that amplifies the impact of our research. The impact of datasets can be measured in their use. Examples of datasets generated by our faculty include: sequencing, assembling and annotating complete genomes and transcriptomes and making these resources publicly available; and contributing raw data on databases like NCBI (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) or Dryad (<https://www.datadryad.org>).

1.6 Films, Documentaries and Performances

For some anthropologists, scholarship may also be measured by performance such as in drama, music, dance, material culture. We recognize that these are important platforms for producing and sharing knowledge. Scholarly productions in forms other than print (for example, projects in film, video, or multimedia platforms) can be evaluated according to prevailing standards in relevant research areas, and the impact can be measured through attendance at performances, number of views online, and shares or likes on social media.

1.7 Museum Exhibits

Many anthropologists contribute to curating research collection and exhibitions at museums, both in Oregon (e.g., MHCH) and abroad (e.g., National Museum of Korea) as part of their research. The impact of these contributions can be measured in the use of the collections and by exhibit attendance/attention.

1.8 Products of Applied Research

For many anthropologists it is important that we not only publish our research but translate this research in to something more applied. The impact of such applied research can be measured in the legislation or policy it shapes or the service it provides to other researchers or the public. These types of scholarly products can include: developing and implementing of primate conservation action plans; translations of published materials; developing methods and providing online or in person tutorials for how to implement them; providing court testimony; contributing to policies on cultural heritage or conservation; and assisting in the development of national or international policies. This can also include Op-eds, and Blog posts.

1.9 Books, Poetry, Short Stories, Creative Non-Fiction,

For some anthropologists, scholarship may also be measured by literature forms not captured above (e.g., poetry, prose, creative non-fiction, blog posts, etc.). We recognize that these are important platforms for producing and sharing knowledge. The impact of these types of scholarly output can be measured using more traditional metrics when possible (e.g. quality of press), as well as by the number of reads, downloads, shares and/or likes on social media, attendance at readings or citations.