

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY.

(As approved by the faculty, 12/7/95)
(Re-approved by the faculty (at the Faculty Meeting) on 4/23/01)

Introduction

The University requires all departments to publish their criteria and procedures for implementing the Academic Handbook guidelines concerning promotion and tenure. This document describes criteria and procedures of review for candidates in the Department of Anthropology

Promotions, Reappointment and Tenure Committees

In the Department of Anthropology the Promotions, Reappointment and Tenure Committees are ad hoc committees, their membership consisting of all departmental faculty members in rank(s) senior to the candidate.¹ Accordingly, the Reappointment and Tenure Committee is composed of all tenured faculty, as is the Promotion Committee for an assistant professor. The Promotion Committee for an associate professor consists of all faculty at full rank. This document refers to all three committees as “the Committee.” The Committee is governed by the standards and procedures described below.

Nominations

Each spring semester, all faculty except full professors are reviewed by the Committee on the basis of their current annual report. The department chair communicates a summary of the discussion and any recommendations in writing to each individual reviewed.

Nomination for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion may be made by the Committee or by self-nomination to the Committee through the chair of the department.

Preparation of the dossier

For each nominee who wishes to go forward as a candidate for tenure or promotion, the department chair, in consultation with the candidate, names a subcommittee (“the advisory committee”) to assist the candidate in the preparation of the dossier and its formal presentation to the full Committee. The advisory committee ordinarily consists of three individuals, one for

¹ "Departmental faculty" is defined as all its voting members, that is, individuals appointed in academic ranks (full or part-time: lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, College Professor) whose regular teaching and service are in the Department of Anthropology. Associate instructors, adjuncts and visitors are not voting members of the departmental faculty made by the Committee or by self-nomination to the Committee through the chair of the department.

each of the three dossiers (research, teaching, and service). Ordinarily, the chair does not serve as a member of the advisory committee except in the role of service adviser.

The research adviser should be an individual whose field of research is sufficiently close to the candidate's that she or he can provide an independent assessment of the candidate's contributions to knowledge in that field, as well as advise the department chair on the external review process. Ordinarily, these requirements mean that the research adviser will be appointed from the candidate's subfield.

It is the research adviser's responsibility to advise the department chair on recognized experts outside the University who are qualified to review the candidate's particular field of scholarship. In compiling the list of external referees, the research adviser must consult with the candidate, as mandated by COAS procedures.

It is the chair's responsibility to solicit external reviews on the basis of advice by the research adviser. External reviewers should be asked to assess the candidate's contributions and productivity relative to peers at other major research institutions.

The teaching adviser is responsible for an independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching in relation to the department's curriculum and the candidate's anthropological specialty.

The service adviser has primary responsibility for an independent evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the department, college, university, and profession.

The candidate has primary responsibility for compiling the dossiers, including assembling the dossiers themselves, in consultation with the advisory committee.

The advisory committee is responsible for presenting the dossiers to the full committee. The advisory committee's formal presentation of a candidate's dossier to the committee must include both oral and written summary assessments of the candidate's achievements. The written summaries must be made available to members of the committee for review well in advance of the discussion and vote, ordinarily in early fall; they are also included in the dossier itself for submission to the College of Arts and Sciences.

A checklist is available to help candidates and their advisory committees anticipate the nature and scope of the full dossiers (See Academic Guide as revised 5/94.)

Committee review

As early as possible in the fall term, but not before the start of the term, the Committee meets to discuss the dossiers and vote their recommendation. A summary of the discussion and the vote are recorded by the chair of the Committee, normally the department chair; this report must be

included in the candidate's dossier.² The department chair does not vote with the committee, but must make his or her recommendation in a separate written statement in the dossier.

As indicated in the Academic Handbook, the review of the Committee must take research (and/or creative work), teaching, and service into account. The balloting by the Committee and the individual assessment of the chair must reflect both a rating for each area of activity and a vote. Ratings (in conformity with the college scale) may be outstanding, excellent, effective, or poor. Votes may be yes, no, or abstain. Members of the Committee are encouraged to submit letters explaining the basis of their rating and vote to the department chair, who is obliged to submit these to the College along with the dossiers.

Criteria of review

Research The assessment of research gives primary consideration to the quality of the candidate's published work, where "quality" implies a significant contribution to knowledge. Since the review is future-oriented, the candidate's productivity and trajectory of research is also taken fully into account.

The department does not set a fixed formula for assessing productivity; the norm varies by subfield, except insofar as the record of publication should give clear indication of a coherent program of scholarship. In archaeology, the normal benchmark for tenure and promotion consists of a major monograph and articles at each stage; some substantial set of these may be jointly authored. In bioanthropology, the normal standard involves several articles each year, a portion of which may be jointly authored. For candidates in social/cultural and linguistic anthropology, the normal benchmark consists of a book and articles at each stage; normally, these are single-authored, but jointly-authored works are becoming more common.

The research dossier consists of a comprehensive statement by the candidate describing the past and anticipated development of her or his research program, along with a summary statement of self-evaluation. The statement should be supported by copies of all publications, any manuscripts of work in progress and under review, peer reviews of manuscripts and proposals, published reviews of published work, grant and fellowship proposals along with available reviews. Letters by external reviewers must also be included in the dossier.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should have developed a significant program of research subsequent to the dissertation and appointment at Indiana University. Candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor should have developed a significant program of research and publication subsequent to tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. In either case; the candidate should provide evidence of the on-going development of her or his scholarship.

² In cases where the department chair does not hold a rank sufficient for membership on the Promotion Committee, she or he shall designate a Promotion Committee chair; for example, when there is candidate for promotion to full professor, and the department chair holds the rank of associate professor.

Teaching The teaching evaluation gives primary consideration to the candidate's ability to present a body of knowledge and anthropological approaches to knowledge to students at all levels and in a way that stimulates their ability and desire to learn.

The teaching dossier consists of a comprehensive statement by the candidate describing her or his pedagogical goals and approaches in each course comprising her or his regular teaching program, her or his approach to advising, as well as a short summary statement of self-evaluation.

The teaching record (courses taught, numbers of students in each course, BEST or any other statistical report of student evaluations) should be summarized in table form.

In addition to the course evaluations undertaken by the candidate in the regular course of teaching, the dossier must also include the teaching adviser's independent assessment of the candidate's teaching goals and performance, student evaluations, letters from students, appraisals from colleagues, and whatever other evidence may be available as indication of the candidate's performance as a teacher (e.g., syllabi, instructional guides or textbooks authored by the candidate, and so forth). Students' prizes, awards and placement may also be taken into account.

The teaching dossier must also include a list of the candidate's graduate advisees (and undergraduate advisees, if any) divided into the following categories, and indicating those students who have completed their degrees: PhD majors, inside minors, outside minors, MA majors; inside minors and outside minors; undergraduate advisees (e.g., honors advisees).

Service The evaluation of service gives primary consideration to the candidate's contributions to the department, college and university, and the profession. Community or other service activities may also be taken into account.

Candidates should list their activities on any department, college and/or university committees (noting any that have been especially demanding), as well as professional service (e.g., as a reviewer of manuscripts, or as participant at professional meetings and/or in professional organizations). Candidates for tenure are unlikely to have accumulated substantial service records, but nevertheless are expected to be able to provide evidence of contributions to the department and profession.

Procedures and criteria at subsequent stages of review

The department's vote and chair's recommendation conclude the first phase of the review for tenure and/or promotion. For descriptions of procedures and criteria at subsequent stages of the review, please see the relevant portions of the Faculty Handbook and Academic Guide.