



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Anthropology

Department of Anthropology

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the Department of Anthropology – October 27, 2025

Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences – November 20, 2025

Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs – November 24, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION	4
SECTION 2	FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS.....	5
2.1	Tenure Track Titles	5
2.2	Academic Professional Track Titles	6
2.3	Other Titles	6
SECTION 3	EXPECTATIONS FOR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY	6
3.1	Teaching.....	6
3.2	Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work	7
3.3	Service.....	7
3.4	Administration	7
SECTION 4	SCALE AND GUIDING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE	7
4.1	Rating Scale for Annual Reviews	8
4.2	Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility	8
SECTION 5	ANNUAL REVIEW	10
5.1	Purpose.....	10
5.2	Focus.....	11
5.3	Time Period of Review.....	12
5.4	Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance.....	12
5.5	Required Components.....	13
5.6	Promotion Progress Review	14
5.7	Assessment Outcomes that Require Action	15
5.8	Timeline	15
5.9	Complaint Procedure.....	16
SECTION 6	MID-TERM REVIEW FOR UNTENURED ASSISTANT PROFESSORS	16
6.1	Purpose.....	16
6.2	Process.....	16
6.3	College-Level Requirements for the Mid-Term Dossier	17
6.4	Feedback from Mid-Term Review	17
SECTION 7	PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	18
7.1	Purpose.....	18
7.2	Focus.....	18
7.3	Time Period of Review.....	18
7.4	Time Considerations.....	19
7.5	Other Special Considerations	20
7.6	College-Level Requirements for the Candidate’s Promotion Dossier.....	20
7.7	College-Level Requirements for the Department Level Review	21
SECTION 8	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	25
8.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty.....	25
8.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty	28
SECTION 9	POST-TENURE REVIEW	30
9.1	Purpose.....	31
9.2	Peer-review Committee	31
9.3	Process.....	31
9.4	Professional Development Review.....	32
9.5	Professional Development Plan	33
9.6	Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review and Professional Development Review)	33
9.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review.....	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

APPENDIX A	RUBRICS FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE	35
A1	Rubric for Evaluating Faculty Performance in Teaching.....	35
A2	Rubric for Evaluating Faculty Performance in Research	37
A1	Rubric for Evaluating Faculty Performance in Service	39
APPENDIX B	CRITERIA AND SAMPLE INDICATORS FOR DEMONSTRATING MERITORIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS.....	41
B1	Criteria and Sample Indicators Related to Teaching for all Promotions	41
B2	Criteria and Sample Indicators Related to Research for Promotion to Associate Professor	42
B3	Criteria and Sample Indicators Related to Research for Promotion to Professor	43
B4	Criteria and Sample Indicators Related to Service for Promotion to Associate Professor	44
B5	Criteria and Sample Indicators Related to Service for Promotion to Professor	45

1. INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Anthropology is to study what it means to be human in the broadest sense through an examination of culture and society, the biology and evolution of humans and our closest relatives, and the study of past human dispersals, communities, and material culture. As such, we are uniquely situated to provide our students with the means to understand, respect, and engage with the wide variety of human experiences that make up our globalized world, and to esteem and value the broad diversity of physical and cultural differences that comprise our unique species. The critical thinking skills that Anthropology students learn prepare them not only to critically evaluate scientific and non-scientific claims made in academia, in public, and on social media, but to actively participate in well-informed social discourse relating to their own society and its continually evolving stance on public policy and governance. As part of our mission to serve all of the people of the State of Texas, the Department of Anthropology is committed to fostering an inclusive and welcoming workplace and learning environment for all of our faculty, staff, and students, drawing in and supporting individuals who collectively reflect the diversity of our community, our state, and our nation.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Anthropology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the College of Arts and Sciences; such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators to help evaluate overall performance of faculty.

This document articulates departmental guidelines for faculty annual review, mid-term review, promotion and tenure review, and post-tenure review. For additional details, faculty are encouraged to examine the following university documents which are referenced below:

TITLES AND LINKS TO DOCUMENTS REFERENCED HEREIN
College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Faculty Affairs Annual Evaluation and Mid-Term Review
Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure
Faculty Affairs Guidelines to Faculty Titles
System Policy 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty
System Policy 33.05.02 Required Employee Training
University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 Post Tenure Review
University Rule 12.99.99.M0.01 Procedures for Appeal of Faculty Complaints and Appeal of Dismissals and Sanctions for Misconduct or Serious Misconduct

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS

Definitions of faculty ranks and tracks can be found in University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion) and the University's Faculty Title Guidelines. Faculty tracks and ranks that are relevant to the Department of Anthropology are as follows.

2.1 Tenure-Track Titles

Tenured and tenure track faculty include the following titles: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments). Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for cause. The concept of tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is granted to a subset of faculty who have a strong record of research and/or creative work and who have demonstrated that they will continue to be productive in this area of responsibility, in addition to having strong records of teaching and service.

2.1.1 Assistant Professor

The position of Assistant Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Assistant professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Assistant professors are expected to come up for tenure at the end of a mandatory probationary period.

2.1.2 Associate Professor

The position of Associate Professor is typically a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. (In rare cases, a faculty member may be at the rank of associate professor without tenure.) Associate professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of research and/or creative work, teaching, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause.

2.1.3 Professor

The position of Professor is a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause. Promotion to the rank of professor is based on continuing accomplishment and national or international recognition for scholarship.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Titles

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty titles are used to describe non-tenure accruing appointment titles that are eligible for promotion. They include the following: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer. Faculty in appointments with the word Instructional in the title will be expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching and service. Lecturers are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching.

2.2.1 Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer

Faculty with the title of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer will normally hold a master's or terminal degree in the teaching field and will make significant contributions to teaching activity (usually at the undergraduate level). Lecturer faculty are expected to engage in professional development related to teaching within the discipline. Lecturer faculty are not expected to make any contributions related to research. Lecturers can be assigned service activities, and service comprises 10% of their duties, but they are not evaluated on their service contributions. Any activity outside of teaching should be a small percentage of their time and effort. In all reviews, Lecturer faculty will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.

2.2.2 Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor

Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach and are expected to make significant contributions to teaching activity at undergraduate or graduate level. All faculty in these titles will also make significant contributions in the area of service. Typically, most of an instructional faculty's time and effort will be in the area of teaching, with an expectation to engage in professional development within the discipline. Faculty in these titles will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity, plus contributions to the area of service.

2.3 Other Faculty Titles

On occasion, and as needed, faculty with Visiting in their title will be appointed in the department. Faculty with Visiting in their title will have short-term appointments lasting from one semester to up to three years.

3. EXPECTATIONS FOR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance in teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; and service. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments). The standard breakdown of workload effort for tenure track faculty is 30% teaching, 50% research, and 20% service; the standard course load for tenure track faculty is two courses per semester. The standard breakdown of workload effort for academic professional track faculty with 'instructional' in their title is 70% teaching and 30% service; the standard course load for academic professional track instructional faculty is three courses per semester. The standard breakdown of workload effort for academic professional track faculty with 'lecturer' in their title is 90% teaching and 10% service, though service is not evaluated; the standard course load for academic professional track lecturers is four courses per semester.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty with assigned teaching responsibilities. As such, all faculty members who teach are expected to:

- (1) use teaching practices known to motivate and actively engage students in the learning process,
- (2) contribute to meaningful instruction and acquisition of knowledge for all students,
- (3) aim to continuously improve their teaching practices,
- (4) foster a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for students,
- (5) promote and diversify the development of the college's instructional programs, and
- (6) be a positive role model, mentor, or advisor.

3.2 Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities is central to the Department, and effectiveness in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work is required of all tenure stream faculty. All tenure stream faculty members are expected to contribute to scholarship or research and its publication. Effectiveness and excellence in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work is based on both quantitative and qualitative measures. Measures/sources of information may include: 1) publications in peer-reviewed journals; 2) books published by respected university or trade presses; 3) chapters in edited volumes; 3) chapters in conference proceedings; 4) research funding (e.g. grants, contracts); 5) presentations of research (invited lectures, conference presentations, etc.); 6) technical reports; 7) impact factors and journal rankings; and 8) contextual evidence of impact of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work. Criteria for demonstrating effectiveness and excellence in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work include:

- Coherent, continuous scholarly agenda
- Demonstrable scholarly productivity (underscored by the production of publications or creative work, and grant and other related scholarly activities)
- Influential research or creative work that is highly regarded in sub/specialized fields and disciplines

3.3 Service

Service to the institution, to students, colleagues, the Department, the College, the University, and the Discipline are integral to the operation of the Department, and service is required of all tenure track faculty, all instructional faculty, and all lecturers though lecturers are not evaluated for their service. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service is based on: 1) faculty service and leadership within the department; 2) faculty service to the college and university; 3) service and leadership within national and international disciplinary/professional organizations; 4) other service contributions to the discipline, including reviews of grants, manuscripts, and external promotion cases; and 5) contributions to the university's efforts to engage students, faculty, and staff in support of a diverse, welcoming, and inclusive community. Criteria for demonstrating effectiveness and excellence in service include:

- active participation in the operation of the department
- productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities
- contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities
- demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank
- demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities

3.4 Administration

This area of responsibility is limited to faculty who have defined leadership roles within the department, college, or university (i.e., department heads, associate/assistant deans, etc.). Appointment letters should clearly state the percentage of time and effort for the administrative appointment. The evaluation of administrative performance should be based on criteria and expectations specified in individual appointment letters.

4. SCALE AND GUIDING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

The Department of Anthropology recognizes that there are multiple indicators of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance; it does describe guiding criteria and accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations.

4.1 Rating Scale for Annual Reviews

The Department of Anthropology uses the following five-point scale for evaluating faculty performance:

- Outstanding
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

4.2 Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility

4.2.1 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Anthropology will use the following guiding criteria in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of teaching:

Quality of Teaching - Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member has an established record of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching encompasses a variety of skills and best practices including, but not limited to, (a) use of teaching techniques proven to motivate students and engage them in the learning process; (b) careful selection and preparation of course content (i.e., sequencing of topics, level of rigor, pacing of topics, etc.); (c) use of accurate, organized, neat, and up-to-date teaching materials; (d) appropriate methods to assess student work and progress in the course; (e) proper course management; (f) use of effective communication (i.e., clear explanations in class, timeliness of email responses, clarity of course or assignment expectations, etc.); and (g) maintaining a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for all students.

Professional Development – Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member engages in professional development activities that enhance and improve their instructional effectiveness. This could include, but is not limited to, programs offered by the professional organizations, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference.

Curricular Development - Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member creates, improves, or enhances the curriculum for a course or a set of courses, or a new course.

Impact Beyond the Classroom - Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that a faculty member's teaching has an impact that extends beyond the classroom. This would include (a) supervising high-impact learning experiences (e.g., internships, honors contracts, study abroad, fieldwork, undergraduate research, etc.); (b) mentoring and advising undergraduate and/or graduate students, (c) activities that contribute to the professional success of students (e.g., reviewing student's grant proposals or manuscripts, writing reference letters, etc.); and (d) disseminating teaching methods and course materials to other instructors.

4.2.1.1 Sources for Evaluating Teaching Performance

The evaluation of teaching is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement or the use of a single source of information (i.e., student evaluations of teaching). To better protect against potential bias and ensure a more holistic review of a faculty member's teaching performance, multiple sources of information must be considered.

The following two sources are required for any review (annual, mid-term, promotion, or post tenure) of faculty performance in teaching:

- (1) Faculty descriptions of their teaching contributions. These descriptions include information on new and revised courses, high-impact learning experiences, mentoring of students, professional development related to teaching, grants received relating to pedagogy, awards received, etc.
- (2) Student feedback regarding their learning experience as judged by student's end of course evaluations.

For promotion reviews the College also requires:

- (3) Two peer-evaluations via observation of teaching. Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide documentation summarizing their review of the observation to the candidate and ideally discuss the observation with the candidate. For this purpose, departments may use either the sample classroom observation instrument provided by the College (listed as Appendix C in the College Guidelines), or the instruments available on the Center for Teaching Excellence website. The candidate should include two summaries of the observation in the teaching section of their promotion dossier. If a candidate has received more than two peer observations of teaching prior to promotion, the candidate may choose which two summaries of peer observations to include in their dossier. A candidate may choose to include information in their impact statement about how the peer feedback helped to improve or modify their teaching. More specifics about these peer-evaluations for promotion are in Section 7.6.3 of the College Guidelines.

4.2.2 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and/or Creative Work

The Department of Anthropology uses the guiding criteria described below in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of research and/or creative work. The first criterion is relevant for all four types of faculty performance evaluation (i.e., annual review, mid-term review, promotion review, and post-tenure review). The other three guiding criteria may be useful for all types of review, but are of particular relevance for promotion reviews.

Productivity – productivity encompasses a variety of activities including, but not limited to, time and effort spent conducting research; the delivery of research presentations; the submission of research proposals for funding; and, the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work. Any review of faculty performance (i.e., annual review, mid-term review, promotion review, or post-tenure review) will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member is a productive scholar with an active research and/or creative work agenda.

Independence and Intellectual Leadership – any review of faculty performance will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member has established an independent record of research and/or creative work that goes beyond early career mentors (particularly for early career scholars) and/or that the faculty member is regarded as an intellectual leader within a chosen area of specialty (particularly for senior scholars). To meet this guiding criterion, a faculty member's scholarly or creative work must be regarded as original, authentic, or innovative within the discipline and/or subspecialty. To achieve independence and intellectual leadership, a faculty member needs to have the skills and resources necessary to design and conduct a feasible study, for instance serving as the principal investigator on external grants, directing a field-based research program, coordinating a collaborative research team, etc.

Scholarly Impact – any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member's work is making an impact. The impact may be limited to impacts on the discipline, but may also include broader impacts to the local community, the state of Texas, the nation, or beyond. Broader impacts may also include practical applications of research, including but not limited to the production of patents.

Positive Trajectory – any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member is on a positive trajectory, with projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact on a 3-5 year timescale.

4.2.2.1 Sources for Evaluating Research and/or Creative Work

The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Multiple sources of information must be considered when reviewing records of research and/or creative work. Each type of review (i.e., annual review, mid-term review, promotion review, and post-tenure review) requires a different set of required sources (as indicated in more detail in sections 5-8 below).

4.2.3 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

The Department of Anthropology uses the following guiding criteria in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of service:

Institutional Engagement - Institutional engagement includes activities that benefit the department, college, and university. This includes serving on committees commensurate with one's academic rank and job title and making meaningful contributions to the governance of the institution.

Academic Leadership - Academic leadership exemplifies a commitment to the institution and the discipline. Leadership activities include, but are not limited to, chairing committees and task forces on campus, leadership roles within the department, and serving as a leader of scholarly organizations and entities that serve academia.

Professional Mentoring - Professional mentoring encompasses a variety of activities, including the informal and formal mentoring of colleagues, participating in and/or leading programs designed to provide professional development to others, serving as a faculty advisor to a student group, and writing letters of recommendation.

Commitment to the Discipline - There is a wide variety of review work that falls outside the scope of committee work (e.g., reviews for internal and external grant programs, scholarly journals, awards programs, promotion and tenure reviews, program reviews, etc.). This work is a normal component of service activities. Invitations to review work signifies stature in the discipline, or interdisciplinary field, while providing review work demonstrates a commitment to the discipline.

Public Outreach and Engagement - Public outreach and engagement consists of service and leadership activities that benefit the local community, the state, the nation, and the broader society. This includes but is not limited to speaking engagements for broader audiences, publication of editorial opinions, outreach activities to local schools, serving on the board of a community organization (relevant to one's area of scholarly expertise), and providing testimony based on one's area of expertise.

4.2.1.1 Sources for Evaluating Service

The evaluation of service is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the department, college, university, academic discipline, or the broader community relative to the faculty member's title and percentage of assigned responsibility. There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV, Interfolio F180, and impact statement (for mid-term and promotion reviews). Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance, including, but not limited to, support letters and emails that denote service contributions.

5. ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure track, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the Department Head is responsible.

5.1 Purpose

The purpose of annual reviews of faculty performance is to:

- (1) Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position,
- (2) Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced or improved,
- (3) Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion or tenure as relevant – refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion),

- (4) Allow for an ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases,
- (5) Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations, and
- (6) Ensure that faculty members are in compliance with all university compliance requirements – refer to System Regulation 33.05.02 (Required Employee Training).

In the Department of Anthropology, the annual review process is also an opportunity to provide feedback to faculty regarding their progress toward future promotion. For faculty with mandatory probationary periods, the promotion progress review is a required element of the annual review process. For all other faculty, the promotion progress review is optional.

5.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual faculty member's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For untenured assistant professors, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure. For academic professional track faculty, the annual review evaluates performance in their assigned areas of responsibility and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable. For more information see University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and/or administrative work shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

Faculty at the rank of **Assistant Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts (whether successful or not) are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as individual citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences are given lower priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given higher priority; graduate student mentoring and advising are given lower priority; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Assistant Professors are expected to have a service record primarily to the department; other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications are also considered favorably, though not required.

Faculty at the rank of **Associate Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts (whether successful or not) are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences are also given high priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, as are graduate student mentoring and advising; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Associate Professors are expected to have a service record at the level of the Department, the College, and the University, other service contributions to national or international academic organizations, and to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications.

Faculty at the rank of **Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences, including invited

lectures and keynote addresses, are also given high priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, as are graduate student mentoring and advising; inclusion of graduate students in academic products (e.g. co-authorship) is considered especially favorably; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Professors are expected to have a service record at the level of the department and the University, service contributions including leadership roles in national or international academic organizations, and service contributions to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications, editorial roles in peer-reviewed journals or academic presses, and review of external promotion cases.

Faculty at the rank of **Instructional Assistant Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in teaching and service. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation. Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to have a service record primarily to the department; other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline are considered favorably, though not required.

Faculty at the rank of **Instructional Associate Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in teaching and service. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses, as are the development of opportunities to engage undergraduate students in high-impact experiences, participation (and leadership) of campus activities that focus on pedagogical methods, scholarship relating to teaching and learning, and efforts to obtain competitive grants for teaching; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a service record to the department as well as other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline.

Faculty at the rank of **Instructional Professor** are reviewed based on their contributions in teaching and service. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, as are graduate student mentoring and advising; inclusion of graduate students in academic products (e.g. co-authorship) is considered especially favorably; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Instructional Professors are expected to have a service record at the level of the department and the University, service contributions including leadership roles in national or international academic organizations, and significant service contributions to the discipline.

Faculty at the rank of **Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer** are reviewed based on the contributions in teaching. Student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses; engagement in professional development related to teaching within the discipline is also considered. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation.

5.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window for the review period. The Department of Anthropology uses a three-year window for research and/or creative work, and a one-year window for both teaching and service.

5.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual review, performance in each of the areas of responsibility and overall annual performance rating will be rated using the five-point rating scale outlined below. For the purpose of determining merit increases to salary, the Department of Anthropology refines some of these ratings by using high, medium, or low designations as outlined in Appendix A. The five-tier rating scale includes:

Outstanding – Performance that is exceptional and surpasses the norms and expectations of *Exceeds Expectations*. For example, this rating might be used for a faculty member in a year in which a faculty member receives a highly prestigious external award or a highly competitive external grant or fellowship, etc. Sources of information contain exceptionally strong evidence that a faculty member significantly exceeds guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Exceeds Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

Exceeds Expectations – Performance that satisfies and surpasses the norms and expectations of *Meets Expectations*. Sources of information contain strong evidence that a faculty member exceeds guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

Meets Expectations – Performance that meets the general norms and expectations. Sources of information contain sufficient evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

Needs Improvement – Performance that falls below norms and expectations of *Meets Expectations*. Sources of information contain minimal evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

Unsatisfactory – Performance that falls below norms and expectations of *Needs Improvement*. Sources of information are absent of evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility, as adjusted for job track and stage of career.

Scoring rubrics for each of the categories of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service are provided in **Appendix A**.

5.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the components below in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

5.5.1 Annual Report of Faculty Member's Activities

Each year, every faculty member must submit an annual report in Interfolio Faculty 180 outlining activities within each of their assigned areas of responsibility. In the report, faculty members should address the status of long-term projects, set the context in which annual activities have occurred, and state short-term and long-term goals.

5.5.2 Evaluations from Department Heads or Supervisors

The Department Head (or primary supervisor in the case of significant administrative appointments) will write an evaluation for the calendar year in a memorandum transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member should indicate receipt of the evaluation memorandum by signing a copy of the document. Faculty members are allowed to provide written comments about the memorandum for their department personnel file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgement of the evaluation document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, as well as the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, the memorandum shall also include a statement of expectations for the next year in teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service. Heads should also provide promotion-eligible faculty with an assessment of their progress towards promotion.

5.5.3 Compliance Review

Per system regulation, no faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating (i.e., rating of Meets Expectations or above) if they have not complied with all required Texas A&M University System and Texas A&M University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 – Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on TrainTraq trainings and submit their TrainTraq transcripts with their annual review materials.

Annual review of faculty performance for teaching must also consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member complies with all policies, rules, and deadlines associated with teaching. The annual evaluation rating will accurately reflect situations where a faculty member is out of compliance with the policies listed below for teaching:

- Course Syllabi and CV must be posted no later than seven days after the first class day as stated in Texas Education Code 51.974
- All required mid-term grades and final grades, including the grades for graduating seniors, must be submitted on time
- All attendance certifications (e.g., First Day of Attendance Certification) must be submitted accurately and on time

5.5.4 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member

The Department Head will provide an annual opportunity for a personal meeting to discuss the annual written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the Department Head or faculty member. The Head (or an appropriate delegate, such as the Associate Head or Promotion and Tenure committee chair) meet with all untenured tenure track faculty on an annual basis to discuss their progress towards tenure.

5.6 Promotion Progress Review

5.6.1 Feedback on Progress towards Tenure for Untenured Tenure Track Professors

Members of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must participate in an annual review of untenured assistant professors (and untenured associate professors, as applicable). Using annual review materials, this review must provide a candid assessment of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure (relative to their year on the tenure clock), and to provide constructive feedback on ways to strengthen their overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The feedback is reported to the Department Head. The Department Head will independently review all annual evaluation materials and provide a written memo to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process).

5.6.2 Optional Feedback on Progress towards Promotion for Promotion-Eligible Faculty

Promotion eligible faculty should understand that having a series of positive annual reviews is not a reliable indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion. In other words, a faculty member can be doing very good work and meet or exceed expectations during annual reviews, but not yet have a record that merits promotion. For that reason, tenured associate professors and academic professional track faculty who are not at the highest rank have the *option* of requesting *informal* feedback on their progress towards promotion as part of the annual review process. The purpose of this optional review is (a) to provide a candid assessment of how the faculty member's record of performance aligns with departmental and college criteria for promotion, and/or (b) to provide constructive feedback on how the faculty member might strengthen the overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The promotion process involves a much more extensive review of performance. For that reason, a "positive" promotion progress review should not be viewed as a guarantee of a successful promotion case.

If a faculty member is interested in having a promotion progress review, they should inform the Department Head at the time that they submit their annual review materials. If a faculty member requests a promotion progress review, the

faculty member's annual review materials will be shared with all faculty eligible to review that faculty member's promotion case (i.e., members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee eligible to review faculty at that rank and title). Members of the committee should review the annual review materials and provide feedback to the Department Head. The Department Head should independently review all annual review materials and provide oral feedback to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process).

In accordance with university guidelines, a faculty member may opt to come up for a non-mandatory promotion at any time. In other words, there is no requirement that a faculty member have an optional promotion progress review. Similarly, there is no requirement that a faculty member receives a successful outcome from a promotion progress review prior to coming up for promotion (though it would be inadvisable for a candidate to fully ignore advice from the department committee).

5.7 Assessment Outcomes that Require Action

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

5.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria.

For tenure track faculty, each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean. The report to the Dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and the Department Head, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 9.2 below) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see Section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

For academic professional track faculty, an unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean's office. In consultation with the Dean (and/or their delegates), the head will work with the faculty member to address areas of concern. An academic professional track faculty member who receives "Unsatisfactory" for more than one year may be subject to further action. For additional guidance, see University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion), and System Regulation 12.07 (Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty).

5.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their Department Head or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near-term improvement. For teaching or service, this plan should take one (1) year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may (but is not required) take up to three (3) years to complete successfully with clearly identified milestones at least yearly. For additional guidance, see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

If an academic professional track faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation, they must work with their Department Head to develop a plan for improvement.

5.8 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.

5.9 Complaint Procedure

A faculty member who believes that their annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of the College with a copy to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. The Dean of the College will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the Dean of the College may be appealed to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. See University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). A faculty member, however, may choose to write a written response to the head's evaluation. The head may revise their evaluation in the event that an error(s) was made. Alternatively, the response may be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

6. MID-TERM REVIEW FOR UNTENURED ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for untenured assistant professors subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) be conducted to determine the progress towards tenure. In the College of Arts and Sciences, mid-term reviews occur in the spring semester.

6.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the promotion and tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion and tenure decision. The review will mimic the promotion and tenure process as closely as possible, including the submission of dossier items by the faculty member, with the exception of external letters of recommendation.
- As with the promotion and tenure process, the mid-term review will include reviews by the department's Promotion and Tenure committee, the Department Head, the college's Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT), and the Dean. Mid-term reviews, however, do not go beyond the college.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress. The review must result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service to date. The review must also provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- If an untenured faculty member is not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, the review might result in action to not renew the appointment.

6.2 Process

In the College of Arts and Sciences, mid-term reviews are normally conducted between March and May of the target academic year. The mandatory probation period (and the timeline for the mid-term review) must be clearly stated in the faculty member's offer of appointment letter. The table below describes the timeline for a standard probationary period of 7 years.

First Year in Probationary Period	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
2024-25	7 years	March – May 2027

Faculty with a shorter probationary period may come up for mid-term review in their first or second year on the tenure clock, as indicated in their appointment letter. Faculty who are considering the option of coming up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year must come up for mid-term review prior to coming up for tenure (unless otherwise stated in their appointment letter).

Mid-term reviews are a significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of untenured assistant professors and are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews must be conducted carefully, and tenure-track faculty must be provided with accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

The Department Head will set a deadline for candidates to submit their mid-term review materials that allows sufficient time for the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee to meet and review the candidate's materials and submit departmental reports to the Department Head. The Department Head must submit their recommendation prior to the college deadline for mid-term reviews.

6.3 College-Level Requirements for the Mid-Term Dossier

Each candidate's dossier should be prepared in accordance with the guidance for promotion and tenure. Works under review or in progress should be included. External review letters are not required.

Each candidate's mid-term dossier should include the following:

- (1) The candidate's personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single-spaced, 12-point font). The statement should explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service accomplishments. Each of these three assigned areas of responsibility must be addressed separately.
- (2) An annotated curriculum vitae (CV) that follows university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through the Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. The CV should clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications and identify whether unpublished manuscripts have been accepted for publication or are under review. The CV must include a statement by the faculty member acknowledging that the CV is correct and up to date.
- (3) Copies of all annual review letters written by the Department Head and signed by the candidate. These letters are on file in the department and should be provided by the Department Head for the candidate to include in their mid-term dossier.
- (4) If the candidate is affiliated with an interdisciplinary program, the candidate may choose to include a support letter from the interdisciplinary program director or coordinator. This item is optional.
- (5) Materials submitted for the department-level review, including publications, course syllabi, course evaluations, peer observations of teaching, etc. Candidates for mid-term review should have a minimum of one peer observation of teaching (beginning in the 2024-25 review cycle).
- (6) Departments should submit a summary report with separate sections focused on each area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The report should include the Promotion and Tenure committee's yes/no vote on the following questions: "Is the candidate making satisfactory progress towards promotion with tenure?" and "Should the candidate's appointment be continued for another year?"

- (7) The department must also submit a recommendation from the Department Head indicating their overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The head's letter should also indicate their vote on the two questions stated in (6) above. Finally, the head's letter must indicate any progress they think needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

6.4 Feedback from Mid-Term Review

All faculty members going through the mid-term review process must receive feedback on their progress towards promotion. In a memo to the Department Head, the Dean will convey the assessment and recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT), as well as the Dean's assessment based on the Dean's independent review of the dossier. The review of the DAC-TT will also include two votes as stated above. The memo will provide formative feedback on the formulating, implementing, and monitoring of plans for necessary actions in the remainder of the probationary period. The Department Head will schedule a meeting with the faculty member to review the Dean's memo and work with the candidate on a plan to address recommendations from both the department and the college.

7. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

This section outlines the procedures that are to be followed in promotion and tenure actions. Section 8 outlines the criteria upon which promotion and tenure actions will be evaluated.

7.1 Purpose

- To recognize the growing expertise and contributions of faculty at Texas A&M University.
- To provide an objective evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishments at several levels of review (i.e., department, college, university). For tenure track faculty, the evaluation will include external letters of evaluation focusing on research and/or creative work.
- To assess the quality, significance, and impact of a faculty member's work, as well as the potential for continued excellence.
- To determine whether a faculty member's performance in all assigned areas of responsibility merits promotion to the next rank within the career track corresponding to their job title (e.g., promotion from tenure track assistant professor to associate professor (with tenure), promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, promotion from instructional associate professor to instructional professor).

7.2 Focus

The focus of the promotion review process will vary by track and the desired rank for promotion. It is important to understand the "promotion" (from a lower rank to a higher rank within a job title track) is distinct from "reclassification" (from one job title track to another job title track). Promotion is based on an assessment that a faculty member's achievements and accomplishments meet the expectations of the higher rank and requires multiple levels of review (as indicated in this document). Reclassification is reserved for exceptional circumstances and is outside the scope of this document.

When evaluating performance for promotion, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and/or administrative work shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

7.3 Time Period of Review

The promotion process is on a similar timeline for all promotions, regardless of job title (with the exception of Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH) reviews). The overall timeline is set by the Office for the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, with college-level deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

In the spring of each year, the College of Arts and Sciences will release the timeline for review and submission of promotion materials to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs for the following academic year. This includes the deadline for departments to submit a candidate's dossier materials for external review and the deadline for departments to submit the candidate's dossier (including departmental reports) to the college. The Department of Anthropology begins soliciting external review letters (for tenure track promotion cases) in the spring (typically in March), and conducts the department level reviews in September. The college level review process takes place in October and November, and the college submits promotion cases to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs in December. The university-level review of promotion cases takes place in January. Promotion and tenure decisions are reviewed by the University President (for all cases) and the Board of Regents (in the case of tenure cases only) in the spring. Promotion and tenure decisions become effective on September 1st of each year.

7.3.1 Mandatory Tenure Reviews

The Department Head or Chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee should identify candidates for mandatory tenure review in the early part of the calendar year. Faculty with mandatory tenure reviews will be informed of the timeline for their review, and asked to confirm that they intend to submit the documentation for promotion and tenure.

7.3.2 Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

Faculty who are hired at Texas A&M University at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by a positive recommendation by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH is out-of-cycle for all TRUH candidates. The process may be expedited for TRUH candidates who are professors at aspirant peer institutions and/or professors who are members of the National Academy of Sciences. The Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include information on external review letter requirements for TRUH cases.

7.4 Time Considerations

7.4.1. Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)

Assistant professors have a mandatory review date for tenure set at the time of hire. The "standard" tenure clock at Texas A&M University involves a 7-year probationary period, with a "mandatory" tenure review that starts at the end of the 5th year and takes place during the 6th year. Some faculty may be hired with a shorter tenure clock, particularly if they have years of experience in a tenure track position at a peer university; this will be clearly stated in the faculty member's offer letter.

7.4.1.1 "Early" Tenure Reviews

Candidates may opt to undergo review prior to their mandatory year (i.e., early tenure review), as long as they have completed the mid-term review. Candidates considering this option are strongly encouraged to speak to their mentors and Department Head prior to indicating a desire to come up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year.

7.4.1.2 Tenure Clock Extensions

Candidates may request an extension to the probationary period. Requests for tenure clock extension are submitted by the faculty member, and approved by the Department Head, the Dean, and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions are held to the same standard as all other candidates. In other words,

they should not be expected to have a stronger record due to a clock extension. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions may later decide against using the clock extensions (as long as they inform their Department Head in the spring semester before coming up for tenure).

7.4.1.3 "Credit" for Accomplishments Prior to Employment on the Tenure Track at TAMU

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews for promotion (with tenure) factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to their appointment on the tenure track at Texas A&M University). The assessment of **scholarly impact** and **independence and intellectual leadership**, for example, will factor in all accomplishments. With the exception of candidates with a very short tenure clock (i.e. one or two years), assessments of **productivity and trajectory** will place greater weight on accomplishments achieved while on the tenure track at Texas A&M University. In other words, there needs to be evidence that there is both a continuous and a positive trajectory.

7.4.2 Tenured Faculty

Candidates who are tenured do not have a mandatory time to undergo review to professor. Faculty may choose to become a candidate for promotion at any time. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, with national and/or international recognition. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6 above, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors in order to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.4.2.1 "Credit" for Accomplishments Prior to Tenure

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews for promotion to professor factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to obtaining tenure at Texas A&M or elsewhere). For this second promotion, **productivity and trajectory** continue to be important guiding criteria, while **scholarly impact** and **independence and intellectual leadership** increase in relative importance. In other words, candidates for professor must be able to demonstrate that they have continued to be productive (with a positive trajectory) since obtaining tenure. In addition, there must be increasing evidence that their work is innovative and impactful, and that they have become an intellectual leader in their chosen area of specialty.

7.4.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. Candidates need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned areas of responsibilities, as defined in their letter of appointment. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6 above, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.5 Other Special Considerations

7.5.1 Reviewing Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments

Reviews of faculty with funded joint appointments will follow guidance in the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Such faculty will be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by both units in accordance with guidelines from both units. Both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers.

7.5.2 Reviewing Faculty Whose Records Qualify as Exceptions to Normal Requirements

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), Section 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion to professor, may sometimes be warranted. Examples include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. In all cases, performance in the other two dimensions must be at least acceptable. Few faculty members will possess qualities such as these, but those who do, deserve recognition and advancement. In those rare circumstances, it is expected that there will be ample evidence demonstrating the required excellence in one area to warrant such exceptions.

7.6 College-Level Requirements for the Candidate's Promotion Dossier

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the promotion dossier, as listed in the Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The following elements are **required** and must be submitted by any candidate seeking promotion.

7.6.1 Promotion Impact Statement

Candidates must submit an impact statement that explains the quality, productivity over time, and the impact of their accomplishments in each of their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work). Following university guidelines, the candidate's three-page narrative statement should:

- be organized with a separate section for any area of professional responsibility that applies to the candidate's job title,
- explain the quality, productivity, impact, and future trajectory of the candidate in each area of responsibility,
- be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (e.g., dean, president) and by a professional readership (e.g., external reviewers),
- address the candidate's perspective on past, present, and future performance and accomplishments,
- should provide a clear context for any metrics provided as indirect proxies for impact, and
- provide a narrative that provides a context for understanding other items in the dossier.

The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and departments, and the statement should reflect the weights assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 70% responsibility in teaching should dedicate the majority of the statement to describing the impacts of their contributions to teaching. For more detailed guidance on how to craft a promotion impact statement, see the additional examples and guides in the university guidelines for promotion and tenure.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their impact statement from their mentors, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, or Department Head prior to submission.

7.6.2 Annotated Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Candidates should prepare an annotated curriculum vitae (CV) following university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. Candidates are strongly encouraged to annotate their CV, as needed, to highlight the impact of their work and their specific contributions. Labels can also be added to indicate publications that include undergraduate, graduate or postdoc co-authors. In the areas of teaching and service, annotations can be added to describe new course preparations, modifications based on professional development activities, and contributions within a service role. Candidates should be careful to avoid padding their CV. For example, refereed publications should be listed separately from non-refereed publications, and publications that have been accepted but not yet published should be clearly labeled.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their CV from their mentors, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, and Department Head prior to submission.

7.6.3 Teaching Materials/Portfolio

Candidates are required to submit the documents as evidence and examples of materials they use in courses they teach. Documents required in the teaching portfolio are:

- (1) **Course syllabi** – candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of syllabi for all courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M (e.g., one syllabus for each course prep). All other candidates for promotion should minimally include copies of syllabi for all courses taught within the past 5 years.
- (2) **Representative sample of course assignments and exams** – candidates should provide a sufficient range of materials to assess the scope, rigor, and quality of course offerings.
- (3) **Student evaluations of teaching** – candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of all student evaluations of teaching for courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M. All other candidates for promotion should minimally include copies of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught within the past 5 years. Candidates should include a table summarizing their teaching evaluations (as outlined in the university guidelines).
- (4) **Peer observations of teaching** – the College of Arts and Sciences requires *two reports from peer observations of teaching* prior to each promotion evaluation (beginning with the 2024-25 review cycle). It is the department's responsibility to ensure that peer observations of teaching are conducted; however, a faculty member may make their own arrangements, as long as they inform their Department Head. Departments may choose to arrange for more than the required number of peer observations (i.e., annual peer observations). Peer observations may be conducted by departmental faculty or faculty from outside the department, as long as the faculty member holds a title that is at least the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion. Consultants from the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) can do formative reviews of teaching so faculty can strengthen their teaching practice, but the CTE does not do teaching observations for mid-term review or promotion purposes. Peer observations of teaching may be provided by departmental faculty who are not eligible to vote on a candidate's case (e.g., an instructional professor can conduct a peer observation for assistant or associate professor).

In the event that a candidate has had more than two peer observations of teaching, the candidate may choose which peer observations of teaching to include with their mid-term and promotion reviews. Candidates may choose to include reports from peer observations of teaching from different academic years to give a longitudinal evaluation of their teaching. Alternatively, they may choose to include reports from peer observations from different types of classes to show their versatility. Untenured assistant professors may include the report submitted with their mid-term review materials as one of the two required reports.

Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide copies of the report to the candidate and the department personnel file. A sample document that can be used to write a report summarizing the peer observation of teaching is provided in Appendix B of the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines. Alternative instruments are available on the Center for Teaching Evaluation's website.

- (5) **Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdocs** – this information should be listed on the CV and may also be in the narrative statement.

7.6.4 Research and/or Creative Work Materials

Candidates who have research and/or creative work as one of their assigned areas of responsibilities are required to submit the following materials:

- (1) Selected publications that best exemplify a scholar's greatest research and/or creative contributions (Faculty may choose to include all publications, or a subset of publications)

Other sources that may be helpful, but are not required, to evaluate research and/or creative work include:

- (1) Information regarding digital scholarship, performances, or creative work (other than published work),
- (2) Copies of funded grant proposals,
- (3) Copies of patents, and/or
- (4) Information on scholarly metrics that are valued within the discipline or department, such as journal impact factors, H-index, etc. (if included, metrics should be contextualized within the discipline, and journal impact factors should be provided for all journals).

7.6.5 Service Materials

There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV and the promotion impact statement. Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance in their dossier, including support letters, emails that acknowledge service contributions, etc.

7.6.6 External Review Letters

Requirements for external review letters vary by track and job title.

7.6.6.1 Tenure Track Faculty

External letters are required for candidates in tenure track positions seeking promotion to either associate professor or professor. Following university guidelines, the college expects a minimum of five letters, with a minimum of three letters selected by the departmental Promotion and Tenure committee. (Per university guidelines, potential reviewers that are on both the department list and the candidate list can count in either category.) Departments should follow university guidelines on procedures for selecting potential letter writers, sending solicitation letter, and for documenting such requests. Departments should request approval from the Dean for any letters that are not "arm's length" from the candidate as defined in the university guidelines. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the department list and four from the candidate list. Those who review a candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate. At no time should a candidate inquire about the status of reviewers they nominated or contact them about their review.

7.6.6.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty (All Other Tracks)

For academic professional track job titles, external review letters are optional. The Department of Anthropology does not require external letters for APT faculty promotions.

7.6.7 COVID-19 Impact Statement (Optional)

Faculty may include an optional COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion dossier that provides a context for evaluating performance in each of their assigned areas of responsibility. For most faculty, this would include a combination of research or creative work activities, teaching activities, and service activities. For some faculty in the college, this might also include clinical and administrative responsibilities. The option to include COVID-19 impact statements will continue until the point at which the timeframe for a given promotion review no longer includes the years that are covered by the COVID-19 impact statement (i.e., 2020 and 2021). The primary objective of the COVID-19 impact statement is to provide a context for understanding the impact of the pandemic on a faculty member's professional workload and responsibilities.

7.6.8 Verification of Contents

A verification statement is certified by the candidate in Interfolio, indicating that they have accurately represented the materials they have submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration.

7.7 College-Level Requirements for the Department Level Review

7.7.1 Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

The composition of the Department of Anthropology's Promotion and Tenure Committee is variable, being rank and track specific as outlined below:

Rank Sought	P&T Committee – eligible voting faculty titles
Senior Lecturer Instructional Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Associate Professor, Professor
Principal Lecturer, Instructional Professor	Principal Lecturer, Instructional Professor, Professor
Associate Professor with Tenure	Associate Professor, Professor
Professor	Professor

The Department Head does not serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, but may be invited by the committee to provide needed information. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall arrange for meetings and then notify the appropriate faculty members in writing, as well as by e-mail, about such meetings. The Chair is responsible for compiling the Department summary report for each candidate, and for securing internal letter writers to produce the teaching, research, and service components of the summary report. All Promotion and Tenure committees need to have a minimum of five eligible committee members, as required by university guidelines. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty in the Department. All committee members should participate in the discussion and vote of each case, unless there is a legitimate reason for them to recuse themselves from the discussion. Discussion typically takes place in-person, though accommodation can be made for remote participation if it becomes necessary; steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the discussions during the meeting.

7.7.2 Department Voting Procedures

Votes shall be carried out by secret ballot. Eligible Promotion and Tenure Committee members should make every effort to attend the Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings. Absences are allowed only with a justifiable cause, and that cause should be noted in the Department Summary Report. Recusals are allowed only in cases where there is a significant conflict of interest (e.g., spouse); professional collaborators within the department are still eligible to vote. Following University rules, abstentions are not allowed. Emeritus, Visiting Faculty, and Adjunct Faculty do not have voting privileges on matters concerning promotion and tenure. All faculty who vote must indicate that they have reviewed the candidate's materials.

The Department of Anthropology allows absentee voting on tenure/promotion only when the absent faculty member has reviewed the relevant files. If this is not the case, as determined by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, then that person is not eligible to vote. Within 24 hours of the meeting where a vote on promotion/tenure is taken, absentee votes will be counted. Absentee votes are to be in writing, including e-mails sent from by the absentee voter to either the Department Head, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the Coordinator of the absent faculty member's program. Votes are to be cast for specific individuals clearly identified in the written vote. Proxy votes, to be cast as determined by a second party, are not permitted.

7.7.3 Department Report

The department's Promotion and Tenure Committee must prepare a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the assigned areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). Sections should be proportional to weights assigned to each area of responsibility. The report should evaluate the level of accomplishment and trajectory relative to disciplinary norms and standards. The research section should include a review of the quality and impact of selected publications or works, and address the candidate's contributions to any multi-authored works. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The service section should explain the candidate's involvement and contributions, as well as the impact of their service activities. The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The report must address any negative comments from external review letters (as applicable), identify any questions that emerged during the discussion of the case, and explain the votes, including the context and justification for negative votes (if discussed during the meeting). The department report and recommendation to the Department Head is advisory in nature. The report should include the Promotion and Tenure committees' yes/no vote on the promotion case, following university guidelines. Departmental committee discussions must be kept confidential.

7.7.4 Department Head Recommendation

The Department Head's letter must provide an independent review of the candidate's teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The Head's letter should provide a basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The Head's letter should also provide relevant contextual information for understanding the case. This might include disciplinary and departmental norms regarding authorship, publication venues, citations, grants, teaching assignments, student evaluations of teaching, undergraduate and graduate student mentoring, and service assignments (relative to job title and rank). The Head's letter should address any elements in the Promotion and Tenure committee report that needs clarification (e.g., low rate of participation, discrepancies between votes and assessment, unclear evaluative statements). The Head's letter should also address any special considerations, including but not limited to unresolved issues with the candidate's professional conduct that resulted in documented sanctions, and restrictions or other personnel actions. If the Department Head's recommendation is contrary to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, the Head should clearly explain the basis for their recommendation.

8. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

This section outlines the criteria upon which promotion and tenure actions will be evaluated. Section 7 outlines the procedures that are to be followed in promotion and tenure actions.

8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

8.1.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

To meet expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet Department criteria. The Department criteria, with sample indicators, are described in **Appendix B**.

8.1.1.1 Teaching

Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate, and where appropriate, graduate teaching. Candidates must have a record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** in their department, though such contributions might be limited to the development of new courses. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

The Department's evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance will be based on course syllabi, student evaluations, and in-class peer reviews. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes developing a breadth of teaching experience at lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, creation of new courses (or major revisions of existing ones), usage of innovative and effective new teaching methods, receipt of teaching awards, and other relevant evidence. The record of graduate advising at the master's and doctoral levels will also be taken into account when assessing the candidate's teaching performance.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.1.1.2 Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and their research record must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. The candidate must provide evidence of **productivity** as appropriate for their discipline. The candidate must also demonstrate that they have established scholarly **independence and intellectual leadership** through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The candidate should also be making original research contributions within their area of specialty. The research record should also include some signs of **scholarly impact** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). The candidate must also demonstrate that they are on a **positive trajectory**, as evidenced by projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Anthropology are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate. By the tenure review, successful candidates have historically produced a substantial corpus of publications, including articles in highly regarded, peer-reviewed journals and/or a book in a university press (or the equivalent) to obtain tenure. If a candidate's publications include a monograph with a reputable university or commercial press, then fewer research articles are expected. However, candidates should not expect that they will gain tenure by publishing a book only. Similarly, if the candidate generated significant amount of funding from peer-reviewed grants and fellowships, the number of expected research articles will be less. Refereed book chapters will also be taken into consideration in assessing a candidate's research record. Peer reviewed publications resulting from invited specialized conferences in which the invitation itself to participate indicates the writer's prominence in that research topic are also of value in this regard, as well as long-term fieldwork, conservation analysis, and success in generating substantial contracts.

The number of publications is not the only measure of a candidate's scholarly record. The preponderance of a candidate's publications should be in appropriate and highly ranked journals and presses in their particular field. The review process will factor in the quality and ranking of publication venues according to Journal Impact Factors and other measures. In some programs, appropriate journals do not have impact factors. In that case, other measures of quality would be useful. This might include evidence that articles published in this journal have impacted the field or evidence that other highly regarded scholars have published in the journal. For presses of published books of the candidate, contextual information may be of use, such as whether the book is part of a notable series in the field or whether other important scholars have published significant books in the same press. At this stage in the candidate's career, the

potential to become an influential scholar in the field is a significant factor in tenure consideration. This is evidenced by external reviewers assessing the candidate's research record as well as by citations by others of the candidate's publications. Additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly reputation includes honors and awards of published work, and invitations to present research at other universities.

Given the diversity of both the programs within the department and the disciplinary backgrounds of its faculty, it is recognized that some candidates publish in interdisciplinary journals and journals specific to the field/discipline of their research interest, rather than in "mainline" anthropology journals (whether biological, archaeological, or cultural). In these cases, the ranking of the publication venues that is standard in the field/discipline of the candidate's research interests as agreed by the tenured professors of the individual programs will be used, in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

It is also recognized that co-authored publications, edited works, and site monographs (all peer-reviewed) play a greater role as evidence of progress toward tenure in some programs than in others. A peer-reviewed book that qualifies as a final excavation report may be considered equivalent to a single authored book, once the role of the candidate as principal investigator is established. In cases of co-authored publications, it is the candidates' responsibility to document their contribution toward conceptualizing, funding, implementing, analyzing, and writing up the work. Candidates' contributions, along with significance of position in order of authorship, may be documented through the annotated CV. Candidates may opt to have co-authors provide support letters documenting the candidate's contribution to co-authored publications.

In all instances, the overall research and publication record of the candidate needs to show a coherent trajectory that goes well beyond the dissertation. The quality of the record will be assessed by tenured members of the candidate's program and department, as well as by external reviewers associated with the respective disciplinary fields of the candidate's program and the candidate's research interests. For faculty with joint appointments, external reviewers will be drawn from the respective fields of the department and the relevant program.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in research for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure are provided in Appendix B2.

8.1.1.3 Service

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show evidence that they meet at least two guiding criteria for service: ***institutional engagement*** and ***commitment to the discipline***. Candidates may also show evidence of achievements related to three additional guiding criteria: ***academic leadership***, ***professional mentoring***, and ***public engagement and outreach***. Faculty members who have significant achievements in these three service criteria may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in either of the two required service criteria for promotion to associate professor.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in the Department of Anthropology will usually have a record of service primarily to the department. This is in the form of membership in departmental standing or *ad hoc* committees. Service on committees includes attendance and active participation. The candidate is also likely to have advised student organizations and participated in mentoring programs that serve students.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in service for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure are provided in Appendix B4.

8.1.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet department criteria. The Department criteria, with sample indicators, are described in **Appendix B**.

8.1.2.1 Teaching

Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate and graduate teaching. The types of contributions in the areas of professional development, curricular development, and impact beyond the classroom should be more substantial than that expected for promotion to associate professor. Candidates must have a record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates for promotion to professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** in their department. Contributions to curricular development should be substantial for those seeking promotion to Professor. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

In the case of candidates for promotion to Professor in the Department of Anthropology, the high standards of teaching expected for the promotion to Associate Professor continue to be relevant. At this stage the candidate is expected to have mentored a significant number of graduate students (MA, MS, PhD). In this regard, the committee will consider the extent to which the candidate's graduate students have successfully generated external funding for their research, participated in scholarly conferences, published their work, completed their degrees, and secured professional positions. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes publication of textbooks and other instructional material, peer reviewed grants for teaching, and other relevant evidence.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.1.2.2 Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Candidates for promotion to Professor must show evidence accomplishment and stature sufficient to merit promotion at any major research university. Candidates must provide evidence of continued **productivity** as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates must demonstrate that they have established scholarly **independence and intellectual leadership** through their scholarly record, as well as the candidate's national and international visibility. The candidate's contributions to the discipline or area of specialty should be viewed as original and creative. The research record should include significant signs of **scholarly impact** within the discipline, and more broadly. Candidates must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a **positive trajectory**, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

Similar to promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, candidates for promotion to Professor in the Department of Anthropology are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate. *All of the statements for the first promotion apply to the second promotion.* There is no standard period of time between the two promotions. Candidates considered for promotion to Professor will have achieved an outstanding body of publications based on an active research agenda that extends beyond the first promotion. By the time the candidate comes up for the second promotion, their overall research record should represent a coherent and significant research contribution to the candidate's discipline, and they should have gained a national/international reputation as an expert in their area of specialty. Indications of this reputation, such as citations by others of the candidate's works, will be taken into account as will the evaluations of external reviewers who have expertise in the candidate's research field. Also important are major external grants and fellowship funding received for research, as well as research awards.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in research for promotion to Professor are provided in Appendix B3.

8.1.2.3 Service

Candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for multiple guiding criteria for service: **institutional engagement, commitment to the discipline, academic leadership, professional**

mentoring, and **public engagement and outreach**. Faculty members who have significant achievements in this last area may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in any of the other areas.

Candidates for promotion to Professor in the Department of Anthropology are expected to have contributed to the governance of the Department, College, and University. Candidates are also expected to have a record of service to professional organizations within the candidates' discipline (elected or appointed office, committee membership). As relevant, candidates may also have a record of service to the broader public (community organizations, public lectures, popular articles) that relates to their professional expertise. The candidate's presence on editorial boards of highly ranked scholarly journals and presses, participation in grant review panels, scholarly awards of achievement by professional groups, and other similar indices will also be taken into consideration.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in service for promotion to Professor are provided in Appendix B5.

8.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Academic professional track faculty members will typically be reviewed by departments for promotion after five years in any rank. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of at the next level, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank.

Academic professional track faculty should be evaluated for promotion based on accomplishments in their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching and/or service). For promotion, candidates must demonstrate they have meritorious accomplishments that align with the guiding criteria set by the College (see Section 4.0), the specific criteria set by the Department, and demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence.

Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Instructional Associate Professor must demonstrate impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer or Instructional Professor must demonstrate significant and sustained impact within the university, or some achievements beyond the university in at least one of their assigned areas of responsibility.

Because candidates for promotion in the academic professional track are not judged according to success in research, any such scholarly activities should be carefully linked to the candidate's teaching and service records. Specifically, in Anthropology it is understood that some high-impact experiences for undergraduates (e.g. laboratory classes, internships, field schools) cannot be de-coupled from research activities, in that they often lead to the accumulation of new materials and knowledge that ethically need to be reported to the professional community. Additionally, in some cases extraordinary service roles of some APT faculty could lead to special opportunities in grant-proposal writing, presenting at conferences, or publishing that are not commonly considered part of an APT dossier.

8.2.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated impact of the accomplishments within the university. Candidates seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must have an established record of **high-quality teaching** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** in their department, as appropriate for the department, and may demonstrate **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students, though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to Principal Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Candidates seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer must have a record of meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership, particularly as it relates to teaching, within the university or have some teaching related achievements beyond the university. Candidates must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Contributions in the areas of **professional development** are required and should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to Senior Lecturer. For promotion to Principal Lecturer, candidates must have some achievements that demonstrate **impact beyond the classroom**. Achievements in **curricular development** are not generally required for this track, though may be appropriate in some departments. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the Lecturer track.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.2.3 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor requires demonstrated impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letters

8.2.3.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor must have an established record of **high-quality teaching** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** in their department (as appropriate for the department) and may have achievements that demonstrate an **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department), though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.2.3.2 Service

Candidates seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor must have a meritorious record of service. Candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for **institutional engagement**, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria: **academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring, and/or public engagement and outreach**.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in service for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor are provided in Appendix B4.

8.2.4 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Instructional Professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and that candidates have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to Instructional Professor must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter.

8.2.4.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to Instructional Professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have significant contributions in **professional development** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor. Candidates may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. Candidates must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department) or **curricular development**.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching for all promotions are provided in Appendix B1.

8.2.4.2 Service

Candidates must have a meritorious record of service. Candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for **institutional engagement**, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service: **academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring** and/or **public engagement and outreach**.

Sample indicators for demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in service for promotion to Instructional Professor are provided in Appendix B5.

9. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development. Post-tenure review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan that should enable them to return to expected levels of productivity.

There are two different levels of post-tenure review:

- (1) Annual performance reviews conducted by the department head (See Section 5 of these guidelines).
- (2) Periodic peer review by a committee (as described in this section).

9.1 Purpose

- (1) Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- (2) Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- (3) Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- (4) Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2 Peer-review Committee

The Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee is comprised of all voting members of the Department's Executive Committee, which itself is comprised of one representative from each of the four Programs in the Department. In cases where the individual(s) under review are at the rank of Professor, if a voting member of the Executive Committee is at the Associate Professor rank, that individual will be replaced by a Professor from the same program as appointed by the Department Head, or from another program if one is not available from the same program.

9.3 Process

9.3.1 Materials to be Reviewed by Peer Review Committee include:

- (1) Annual evaluations for the preceding six years
- (2) Current curriculum vitae

9.3.2 Responsibility of the Peer Review Committee

The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the department guidelines and should be consistent with annual performance evaluations (see Section 5.4).

9.3.3 Process for Each Rating of Review

9.3.3.1 Satisfactory

If all the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the Department Head, whichever is earlier.

9.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory

A rating of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see Section 9.4).

9.3.3.3 Needs Improvement – Two Categories

A rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

9.3.3.4 Needs Improvement – One Category

A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.

9.3.4 Department Responsibility to Submit Information on Tenured Faculty

Every year, no later than May 31st, each department will submit the following information to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (through the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences):

- (1) The year when each tenured faculty member in the department last underwent a review
- (2) Faculty members reviewed that year for post-tenure periodic peer review
- (3) The outcome of each periodic peer review conducted that year and any required follow-up plans
- (4) Faculty members scheduled to be reviewed the following year

9.4 Professional Development Review

A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or one “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review or upon request of the faculty member. The Department Head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review and provide information on the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the Department Head, with approval of the Dean, when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, Department Head, and the Dean. The faculty member, review committee and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan.” The Professional Development Plan is reviewed by the Executive Associate Dean or Associate Dean for faculty affairs and approved by the Dean.

9.4.1 Objectives of Professional Development Review

There are three objectives for the Professional Development Review:

- (1) Identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance,
- (2) Develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and
- (3) Monitor progress toward achievement of the Professional Development Plan.

9.4.2 Ad Hoc Review Committee

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an *ad hoc* review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the Department Head. The three-member *ad hoc* faculty review committee will be appointed by the Executive Associate Dean and/or Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Dean, the Department Head, and the faculty member to be reviewed. Specifically, the Dean’s Office will identify individuals to serve on the *ad hoc* committee and will confirm their availability (without identifying the faculty member), and then consult with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine that the committee composition is acceptable. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with one or more of the selected committee members (due to personal conflicts or conflicts of interest), the Dean’s Office will identify a potential alternate(s). When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

9.4.3 Faculty’s Review Dossier

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements that they deem relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of the Professional Development Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. The dossier will include at minimum the following items:

- (1) a current curriculum vitae,
- (2) a teaching portfolio,
- (3) a statement summarizing current research and/or creative work, and
- (4) a statement summarizing current service responsibilities

9.4.4 Department Head’s Review / Addition to Dossier

The Department Head will add to the dossier any further materials deemed necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the Department Head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

9.4.5 Department Head’s Review / Addition to Dossier

The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

- (1) No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, Department Head, and the Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the *ad hoc* committee report.
- (2) Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan.
- (3) Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, Department Head, and the Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” which is reviewed by the Executive Associate Dean and the Associate Dean for faculty affairs, and approved by the Dean.

9.5 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in faculty member’s performance (as measured against stated criteria in the department guidelines) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head/supervisor, and the Dean’s Office, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member’s obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan, see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post Tenure Review).

9.6 Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review and Professional Development Review)

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-Tenure Review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 (Faculty Grievance Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee’s finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the Dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. (See University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member, Department Head/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the Dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. (See University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

9.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary post-tenure review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head or supervisor. (See University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).