

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON

PROMOTION,

TENURE AND CONTRACT

RENEWAL

March 1998

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON PROMOTION,  
TENURE AND CONTRACT RENEWAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	<u>Introduction</u>	. . . . .	2
II.	<u>Schedule</u>	. . . . .	2
III.	<u>Materials and Procedures</u>	. . . . .	3
IV.	<u>Criteria and Methods of Evaluation</u>	. .	7
V.	<u>Promotions and Tenure</u>	. .	9
	A. Promotion from Lecturer to Assistant Professor		9
	B. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor		9
	C. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor		10
	D. Review of Associate Professor for Purpose of Granting Tenure. . .		10
VI.	<u>Renewal of Contracts</u> . . . . .		10
	A. Lecturer		
	B. Assistant Professor		
VII.	Preparation of the Dossier . . . . .		11

## I. INTRODUCTION

This document outlines procedures, criteria of evaluation and materials required for promotion, awarding of tenure and renewal of contract in the Department of Anthropology.

The faculty of the Department are urged to familiarize themselves thoroughly with this policy statement, the University of Delaware's policy on promotion and tenure as reflected in the Faculty Handbook, and with appropriate statements circulated by College and University Promotion Committees prior to the consideration of a candidate.

## II. SCHEDULE

March 15	Candidate's written request for promotion submitted to Department Chair
March 21	Department Chair calls meeting to create Promotion Committee (PC)
March 26	External reviewers contacted
September 1	External review letters to Department Chair and Chair of Promotion Committee
September 1	Candidate delivers dossier to Department Chair and the Chair of the PC
September 7	Reports of PC Subcommittees due
September 15	Promotion Committee meeting to complete its evaluation of the candidate
September 17	Promotion Committee delivers written report of its conclusions to candidate
September 19-23	.Candidate appealing PC decision regarding promotion, tenure, and/or renewal must deliver appeal in writing to the PC chair
September 25	Promotion Committee must deliver to candidate written response to any appeal

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| October 1                 | Promotion Committee must deliver its final written evaluation, including any possible decisions in relation to an appeal, and the complete dossier that now includes all additional pertinent data (external peer reviewers' letters, and other written evaluation materials) to the Department Chair. |
| October 7                 | Chair sends her/his written evaluation to candidate and Promotion Committee  |
| October 9                 | Candidate appealing Department Chair's decision regarding promotion, tenure, and/or renewal must deliver appeal in writing to the Chair  |
| October 11                | Department Chair must deliver to candidate written response to any appeal  |
| October 15                | Department Chair sends her/his final written report, including any responses to an appeal and the complete dossier to Dean of Arts and Science Office  |
| October 16 to February 25 | Schedule during this period will follow that established by the University Promotion & Tenure Department   |

### III. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| March 15 | <p>Candidate's written request for promotion, and/or tenure must be accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) a complete curriculum vitae and selected publications (to be sent to external reviewers)</li> <li>(2) A list of potential external reviewers</li> <li>(3) A list of service and teaching commentators</li> </ul> |
|----------|---|

Names submitted by the candidate shall constitute only a part of the panels from which evaluations are to be sought.

March 21

- (1) The Promotion Committee will consist of all permanent full time resident faculty, with a simple majority made up of members at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. On occasions when the latter cannot be met, the resident faculty in consultation with the chair, shall meet to select replacement(s), (qualified extra-Departmental judges at the appropriate rank). Insofar as possible, intra-University panel members should be persons in closely allied fields able to judge professionally, fairly and comprehensively the candidate's scholarly and general academic qualifications. The candidate should retain the right, to object to outside of-department panel members, and the PC will make the final decision. University policy permitting, outside panel members may be selected from outside the University. The full promotion panel shall consult regularly with the Anthropology faculty. Department Chair should be excluded from PC.
- (2) Once the Promotion Committee is established, it will choose a Head and Secretary, and subcommittees for evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work, teaching and service. These subcommittees shall have their reports finished by the end of the first week of September.
- (3) The PC shall designate 5 external reviewers to evaluate the candidate's scholarly abilities. The referees must be closely familiar with the candidate's area of research and topical interests. In constituting this panel, at least two names must be taken from the Candidate's list. The candidate shall be informed in advance of potential solicited evaluations and shall have the opportunity to comment on potential referees' qualifications. The final selection of external reviewers will be the responsibility of the PC.

March 26

After consultation with the Promotion Committee, the Head of the PC will contact the outside scholars. A subsequent letter to them must ask for a substantive and broad evaluation of the candidate's published work and a clear assessment of the candidate's potential. Outside evaluators will be requested to complete and submit their evaluations by September 1.

September 15 -

#### The PC Evaluation Meeting

1. The members of the Scholarship and teaching and Service Subcommittees shall present their reports and answer questions on their content.
2. A general discussion and question period will follow. Each member of the PC will then have the opportunity to make a succinct statement about the evidence for and/or against promotion.
3. Final deliberation and a confidential vote shall be taken. The Head shall give each PC member a ballot with one of three options to mark: approve, disapprove, abstain. The Head of the PC shall announce and record the ballots accordingly. A favorable vote of a simple majority of the members of the PC is required for nomination by the PC. A text of the PC's decision will be drafted at the same meeting by the Secretary. The statement will indicate the numerical vote, and explain the reasons for the decision.

September 17

The Head of the PC shall give the candidate written notification of the PC's numerical vote and explain the reasons for the decision. The Subcommittee reports signed by the members, and summaries of the PC's perspectives on scholarship, teaching-and service shall be made available to the candidate at this time.

September 19-23	The candidate has five working days to appeal decisions of the PC in writing and ask for a new meeting of the PC. At this meeting the candidate can express his/her points of view before further deliberations are held. The PC must give a definite response within two working days of receiving the appeal.
October 1	Upon a final decision of the PC a recommendation for or against promotion will become a part of the candidate's dossier, along with all the materials reviewed. These documents will then be forwarded to the Department Chair.
October 7	The Chair will make an independent evaluation and report his/her conclusions in writing to the candidate and the PC.
October 9-11	The candidate has two working days to appeal in writing a decision of the Chair against promotion, tenure, and/or contract renewal. The Chair must give a definitive response within two working days of receiving the appeal.
October 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If the PC and Chair agree in recommending promotion, or if either or both recommend against promotion but the candidate chooses not to withdraw, the application goes forward to the College Committee and the Dean, together with the Committee's and the Chair's recommendations, and if any exist, the candidate's written appeals and departmental response.</li> <li>2. If administration or committees need any further information about the candidate, they should contact the Chair and Head of the PC.</li> <li>3. After the dossier has left the Department no additional materials will be added to it without permission of the candidate. Copies of such materials must also be sent to the Department Chair and PC, who will make written acknowledgment and comments when appropriate.</li> </ol>

4. A candidate for promotion has the sole right to withdraw from the promotion process at any step.

IV. CRITERIA AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

The Department of Anthropology considers all evidence (teaching, research, publication, service) available. Each area of evaluation must first be examined and explored in its own right. The sum of the total contribution must then be assessed carefully.

A. Scholarship

An individual proposed for promotion will be evaluated by the faculty on scholarship subsequent to appointment or the last promotion after careful consideration of the following areas:

1. Written Works. These include published works, works in press, works accepted for publication, works submitted for publication, works in draft intended for future publication, papers presented at meetings, formal/technical research reports, and contributions to juried electronic journals. In the appraisal of materials, the amount of output and the place of publication are assets but secondary to the quality of the work, its originality, and demonstrated and possible impact.
2. Unsolicited invitations to contribute to symposia in her/his specialty; organization of scholarly symposia; requests to serve as an officer of a professional association or on the editorial board of a professional journal; requests to review manuscripts for publishers, grant proposals for granting agencies, and books for journals, and professional consultation.
3. The candidate's summary of research activities, statement of research plans, and any grant proposals since appointment or last review for promotion. The scope, quality and continuity of research should be considered as well as evidence of financial support of research, where appropriate.

Evidence of scholarship may be sought in letters of reference from outside evaluators and favorable reviews or comments on the individual's published work.

Emphasis will be placed on the candidate's having made substantive contributions to the field of Anthropology and/or to the areas(s) of specialization.

## B. Teaching

In evaluating a candidate's teaching, the PC should consider the material in the dossier which substantiates the teaching record. This may include:

1. course syllabi and outlines;
2. examinations, worksheets, study guides;
3. course assignments - term papers, problems, etc.
4. evidence of originality in the preparation and organization of courses;
5. productivity in organizing new courses;
6. Department supervised student evaluations, properly tabulated and summarized, with sample of student comments;
7. performance at public lectures and/or lectures given in other classes in the University;
8. self-evaluation;
9. long-term follow-up of students;
10. formal written evaluations from current and former students and advisees of the candidate solicited through the Head of the PC.
11. peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparations, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative capacity and the like.

## C. Service

In judging a person's service contribution, the quality and efficiency of service are of greater importance than the status of the committee or assignment. Demonstrated and documented failure to render service in an efficient and cooperative manner may be sufficient grounds to recommend against promotion.

The following are subjects for the evaluation of service:

1. Departmental, College, and University service assignments. This category includes committee memberships and chairpersonships; service as senators; faculty advisorships to student groups or clubs; etc. The Head of PC should solicit information on the candidate's record from the Department Chair, heads of relevant outside committees, and from faculty administrators and others who have knowledge of the candidate's contributions in these areas.

Individuals whose names have been supplied by the candidate may be asked for written comments when thought appropriate.

2. Special lecturing activities within the University-e.g., participation in University or College forum, lectures to University clubs or other University groups, etc.
3. Special lecturing activities and consultantships outside the University-e.g., lectures to community groups: talks to high school or elementary school classes: active involvement with community to achieve educational goals.

## Part V. PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

### A. Promotion from Lecturer to Assistant Professor

Lecturers receive a one-year contract, usually contingent on completion of all requirements for the Ph.D. within the first year. For a Lecturer who acquires the Ph.D. during the contingency period, appointment as Assistant Professor may be routine. If the contingency is not satisfied during the first year and a second one-year contract as lecturer is granted, the Ph.D. must be completed during the second year for any further contract to be granted. A Lecturer who is granted a second year must prepare a dossier and proceed through the regular promotion process. Major criteria for evaluation will be viewed in light of the candidate's limited experience in teaching and service and the practical limitations imposed by completion of the dissertation on the candidate's research and publication; thus a close examination of the quality of the dissertation will be an important element in the evaluation.

### B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must take place within the time guidelines established by the University. Whereas teaching, service, and ongoing research activities are all significant, particularly important is the record of publication of juried essays, book chapters and books. Work submitted and accepted for publication deserves special attention. Clear evidence is necessary about continuity, effort, potential, and quality in research and commitment to publication. At a minimum, the individual should show excellent achievement in scholarship or teaching and high quality performance in all areas.

C. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Unlike other steps in the promotional process, that from Associate Professor to Professor is not bound within a fixed number of years after assumption of the previous rank. While it is intended and expected that faculty should seek a level of research and publication sufficient to warrant promotion to Professor, it is the excellence of the work that must determine Departmental recommendations. While the criterion of excellence is difficult to objectify, it should generally be applied to quality and continuity of research and publication (rather than simply to quantity) as well as to the candidate's reputation-nationally and/or internationally-in the profession. A sufficient quantity of published and accepted works extending over several years is, however, one proof of continued commitment to research and of success in publication, particularly if no books and/or no monographs are available.

D. Review of Associate Professor for Purpose of Granting Contract Without Term

An Associate Professor hired on a two-year contract must be reviewed by the spring of the first year of the contract. The procedures shall be the same as those used for promotion of resident Assistant Professors to the rank required. Outside referees may be brought in at the request of the Head of the PC, of the candidate, or when a majority vote of the PC requires it.

PART VI: RENEWAL OF CONTRACTS

- A. Lecturer See Part V, Section A.
- B. Assistant Professor- The review for contract renewal shall take place in the Spring semester of the first year. The criteria and method of review shall be the same as outlined for promotion with the following exception: no letters from outside referees will be included unless specifically requested by the candidate.

## PART VII: PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER

The following is a suggested format to be used by the candidate as a guideline in constituting the dossier. The contents of the dossier comprise:

- 1) a table of contents; 2) the Department of Anthropology's Statement of Policy on Promotion and Contract Renewal; 3) the Curriculum Vitae and annexes to it.

### The Contents of the Curriculum Vitae and Annexes

1. Standard biographical information (advanced degrees, Ph.D. dissertation title, employment record, etc.)
2. Areas of specialization.
3. Research activities:
  - a. Fieldwork - funded, non-funded, duration, place, topic.
  - b. Special awards, honors, etc.
4. Writings -
  - a. Publications: differentiating between books, articles, and reviews.
  - b. Works accepted and in press.
  - c. Works accepted but not in press.
  - d. Works submitted but not yet accepted for publication.
  - e. Manuscripts.
  - f. Typed papers presented at scholarly meetings.
  - g. Statement including references to reviews of published work or references to actual usages by others of published work.
  - h. A summary of scholarly activity and research subsequent to attainment of current rank; and a statement covering immediate and long-range research plans.
  - i. An annex with materials arranged in chronological order and by category.
5. Teaching
  - a. A summary of teaching activity including a statement covering immediate and long-range plans.
  - b. A list of courses taught, by year.
  - c. Sample syllabi, reading lists, exam questions and other course materials. These will be synthesized by the Teaching and Service Subcommittee for the course portfolio evaluation.

- d. Sample of Department supervised student evaluations.
  - e. Other evaluative materials.
6. Service
- a. Statement for Service
  - b. Department Committees and Assignments  
College Committees and Assignments  
University Committees and Assignments  
Public Performance or Lectures  
Service to Professional Organizations  
Service to Government  
Service to Educational Institutions