

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY CRITERIA FOR TENURE & PROMOTION

With a premier applied anthropology program, the USF Department of Anthropology expects tenure-earning/tenured faculty to make substantial contributions to the mission of educating students in anthropological perspectives and their relevance to a liberal arts education for a range of careers. To achieve this mission, faculty members are expected to demonstrate and maintain excellence in basic and applied research and scholarship as well as engage in significant university, professional, and public/community service.

The Anthropology Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunity of faculty across a multi-campus university. In this spirit, the following department criteria for tenure and promotion are intended to conform to relevant College, University, and Board of Trustees guidelines, and the USF/United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement, and have the intent of furthering the mission of the University of South Florida and the Department of Anthropology. It should be noted that the departmental criteria discussed below reflect the revision of USF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines that were completed in 2015.

A. Tenure Expectations

The Department of Anthropology has developed criteria, using identifiable performance outcomes, for the evaluation of tenure and promotion in three specific areas: teaching, advising, and mentoring; research/creative/scholarly work; service to the university, the profession, and the public/community.

Tenure and/or promotion will be recommended only for faculty who demonstrate sustained teaching excellence, excellence in research/scholarship, and ongoing beneficial service carried out in the spirit of collegial citizenship. The criteria used to evaluate faculty performance are based on department and professional standards in applied anthropology.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

- Possession of the Ph.D. degree in Anthropology or closely related field
- Excellence in teaching, research, and service where the faculty member's performance achieves an evaluation of excellence
- Documented evidence of professional visibility beyond the faculty member's institution, at least on the local or regional level

Review of candidate's credentials by external reviewers will be handled by a review process in keeping with the College and University guidelines for external letters for tenure and promotion. In addition to the criteria in this document, candidates should familiarize themselves with the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, the College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures, and the USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

B. Tenure Evaluation of Teaching, Research/Creative/Scholarly Work, and Service

Teaching. Successful candidates for tenure must demonstrate excellence in teaching as outlined by the criteria below. The assessment of excellence in teaching occurs primarily at the departmental level, and should draw on documentation generated throughout the candidate's tenure-earning years.

The record of teaching activities leading to tenure and promotion must provide evidence of excellence in teaching as specified in the discipline of anthropology. Typical records specific to anthropology and the applied anthropology mission of our department include (but are not limited to): service-learning classes, online classes, field and lab-based research projects involving students, field schools, student-focused workshops, and mentoring activities.

The Department of Anthropology expects that excellent teaching by the candidate will include: student ratings that meet or exceed Department and College averages; effective classroom teaching as measured by reviews of syllabi, course materials, and peer observations; contributions to curriculum development and course (re)design; and successful mentoring and advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

Teaching excellence should be evaluated as a complete picture given the wide variability in teaching assignments, course levels, and enrollment for different faculty members. Teaching excellence should be assessed using criteria from each of the following three categories:

- Evaluation and Course Development
- Mentoring, Advising, and Student Outcomes
- Teaching Engagement and Success

Evaluation and Course Development

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness requires attention to both quantitative and qualitative portions of student evaluations of teaching, as well as assessments of teaching by the FAC and Department Chair in annual evaluations. The three areas that candidates will be evaluated in are curricular rigor, curricular innovation, and effective communication. Given the recognized limitations of student evaluations, we encourage candidates to provide (and expect committees to consider) evidence for the documentation of teaching excellence to include: course syllabi, instructional materials, innovative teaching methods, peer evaluations, and new course development, including online experiences.

Curricular Rigor: A successful candidate must meet the highest disciplinary standards of rigor appropriate to the content and level of each course. They should reflect up-to-date knowledge of relevant scholarship, and due consideration of the place of each course in the department and university curricula. Assignments should comply with disciplinary best practices.

Curricular Innovation: In order to demonstrate excellence in teaching, candidates for tenure and promotion may present evidence of their participation in the renewal and maintenance of the department's curriculum. Such evidence can include the syllabi for experimental special topics courses, proposals for and design of new courses, and documented leadership in the certification or recertification of existing courses for the college and university.

Effective Communication: Effective teaching results in learning for those being taught and requires a thorough knowledge of the subject. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to communicate that knowledge clearly through media appropriate to the subject, discipline, and the needs of the students, and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a positive role model for students.

Mentoring, Advising, and Student Outcomes

Mentoring and advising undergraduate and graduate students form a significant part of teaching excellence. Candidates for tenure are expected to mentor and advise students and help prepare them

for achieving job/career or additional academic goals upon completion of their degree. Specific criteria for mentoring and advising and student outcomes are outlined below.

Mentoring and Advising: The successful candidate must demonstrate attention to mentoring and advising undergraduate and graduate students, in the context of individual abilities/limitations and differing opportunities, in order to enhance the student's learning experience. It is recommended that candidates demonstrate successful advising and mentorship of undergraduate students, research assistants, and/or MA/PhD students in the years leading up to tenure.

Student Outcomes: Excellence can be assessed through specific mentoring outcomes, such as former student career placement, student grants and awards, student learning outcomes, and mentoring provided for undergraduates, honors undergraduate thesis students, and MA and PhD graduate students in our department as well as in other departments.

Engagement and Commitment

Candidates are expected to demonstrate teaching excellence through their documented efforts to improve their teaching performance. Evidence of commitment to pedagogy includes participation in training sessions, workshops, and conferences devoted to pedagogy in higher education, or in anthropology in particular, and through contributions to publications on pedagogy. Documentation of success in their endeavors may include teaching awards or advising awards, publications on pedagogy, and/or demonstrating a commitment to improving teaching through peer evaluations or attendance at teaching workshops. This engagement can include teaching approaches that engage the public or apply anthropological insights through community-based or service learning projects that result in presentations, publications, reports, or public workshops based on class activities. The American Anthropological Association's "Guidelines for Evaluating Scholarship in the Realm of Practicing, Applied, and Public Interest Anthropology for Academic Promotion and Tenure" emphasizes that "engaged research provides a critical aspect of undergraduate and graduate education."

Research/Creative/Scholarly Work. The second component in the tenure and promotion decision process in the department is the evaluation of research/creative/scholarly work. Scholarly work in anthropology includes independent and collaborative/interdisciplinary research, basic and applied research, and community- and lab-based research. The purpose of research/creative/scholarly work is the substantive advancement of the field of inquiry or practice, whether by the generation of new knowledge or production of new research approaches and methodology. It is recognized in applied anthropology that community-based research takes time to organize and carry out, and that the production of scholarship may take different forms beyond refereed articles, peer-reviewed book chapters, and books. Where appropriate, these different forms of scholarship need to be taken into account in the tenure decision. The record of activities leading to tenure must provide evidence of excellence in one or more of these forms of research/creative/scholarly work.

To be recommended for tenure, a candidate is expected to have established an original, coherent and meaningful program of research and to have demonstrated and clearly documented a continuous and progressive record of scholarship predictive of a sustained contribution throughout the faculty member's career.

Excellence in scholarship can be divided into two distinct interrelated activities:

- Dissemination of Research
- Grant-Funded and Unfunded Research

Dissemination of Research

Candidates for tenure are expected to publish peer-reviewed research in top-tier journals, books (including edited volumes), book chapters, and other outlets appropriate to their area.

In addition, it is often the case that community-engaged scholarship may be demonstrated by high profile products, such as reports (which are often peer-reviewed) to local, national, or international agencies and formal presentations, as well as more traditional refereed venues. Other forms of applied scholarship include program or policy evaluation reports, professional commentaries or editorials, and writing for the media, such as scriptwriting and museum exhibitions.

Finally, online publications, such as e-books and blogs, are increasingly becoming vehicles for the dissemination of scholarship. Digital scholarship can be evaluated through similar means as traditional publications, including peer review, citations to indicate use by other scholars, the reputations of the institution(s) supporting the e-publishing product, and impact as documented through web-based citation systems that focus on the scholarly literature.

The peer review process is the best means of judging quality and impact of a tenure-earning/tenured faculty member's scholarship. Department evaluation of faculty members will include an assessment of the quality of the candidate's portfolio using peer-review and other measures (e.g., number of citations, external review letters). Further, faculty members should provide a rationale for publishing their research/creative/scholarly work in non-traditional venues, such as blogs and other types of media, along with data showing the visibility and/or impact of this scholarship.

The rating of excellence in research is determined by both quantitative and qualitative factors, and one does not carry more weight than the other. Highly cited publications, publications in high impact journals, and the publication of books/edited volumes/book chapters in prestigious academic presses are considered significant indicators of quality. At the same time, there are other factors that must be taken into account when evaluating research, for example, publications in unranked journals that reach underserved researchers/scholars in other countries are highly valued in applied anthropology. Similarly, the publication of books in presses that publish in languages other than English is also relevant to the department's research mission.

It is the responsibility of the candidate, the tenure and promotion committee (consisting of all of the tenured faculty in the department), and the Department Chair to make a strong argument as to why different types of scholarship are emphasized in any particular tenure application before it is submitted to the School of Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost's Office for evaluation.

The assessment of research scholarship will take into account the candidate's assigned duties (percentage of full-time effort in research) when evaluating research productivity during the pre-tenure period. It is understood that assigned duties are likely to vary from year-to-year according to teaching needs in the department. Therefore, productivity will be weighted by the percent effort dedicated to research.

Grant-funded and Unfunded Research

Successful grant writing is an important marker of current research productivity and also an indicator of a sustainable research portfolio in future years. Therefore, it is an important factor in the overall tenure

(and promotion) recommendation. Faculty members are expected to apply for grants during the pre-tenure period and throughout their professional careers.

Funding is not always required to carry out successful and important applied anthropological research. Therefore, faculty members should document their unsuccessful internal and external proposals as well as any unfunded research and the scholarship that emerges from these projects.

Unfunded research will be evaluated in the same way as grant-funded research, where effort in carrying out the research is evaluated along with the dissemination of findings through publications, technical reports, and non-traditional venues along with data showing the visibility and/or impact of this scholarship.

Considering that the grant writing process is time consuming and that most awards are highly competitive, the department values any efforts to carry out successful research whether or not it is funded. However, the department places significant weight on the receipt of external funding as part of considerations for Tenure and Promotion.

For more information regarding documenting research/creative/scholarly work in applied anthropology, candidates are encouraged to read "Promoting Applied Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion," which is published by the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs and the American Anthropological Association.

Service. The final component in the tenure recommendation process in the department is the evaluation of service. The Department expects that faculty members will make substantive contributions to the intellectual life and governance of the university, the profession, and the communities in which we live and work. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate will demonstrate substantive service in one or more of these areas. For promotion to Professor, the candidate will demonstrate substantial service in two or more of these areas.

Service to the university includes active and cooperative participation in department meetings, as well as committees and councils at the department, school, college, university, and university system levels.

Service to the profession includes but is not limited to: editing scholarly journals; reviewing manuscripts and proposals; active involvement and office-holding in professional organizations; the organization and execution of meetings, symposia, conferences, and workshops; participation on local, regional, state, national, or international professional committees, groups, or associations; participation in local, regional, state, national, or international boards, agencies and commissions; facilitating newsletters or social media for professional organizations.

Service to the community includes but is not limited to: engagement with schools, non-profit organizations, and other civic and community groups, as well as engagement with the broader public at local, national, and/or international levels.

C. Examples of Research Records in the Tenure Portfolio

Example #1. Eight to twelve peer-reviewed publications (articles or chapters), with at least half representing substantive work by the faculty member (e.g., solo author or first author); some of these should appear in journals of national/international scope. Receipt (as PI or Co-PI) of a significant external grant (e.g., NSF, NIH, NPS) or two or more other types of grants (e.g., USF, local, foundation).

Example #2. An edited volume published by a major press and six to ten peer-reviewed publications (articles or chapters), with at least half representing substantive work by the faculty member (e.g., solo author or first author); some of these should appear in journals of national/international scope. Receipt (as PI or Co-PI) of a significant external grant (e.g., NSF, NIH, NPS) or two or more other types of grants (e.g., USF, local, foundation).

Example #3. A significant academic monograph published by a major press and four to eight peer-reviewed publications (articles or chapters), with at least half representing substantive work by the faculty member (e.g., solo author or first author); some of these should appear in journals of national/international scope. Receipt (as PI or Co-PI) of a significant external grant (e.g., NSF, NIH, NPS) or two or more other types of grants (e.g., USF, local, foundation).

Example #4. A substantial applied research product (e.g., prominent film or digital initiative, major exhibition, influential agency report, etc.) that makes a demonstrably significant contribution to engaged research and four to eight peer-reviewed publications (articles or chapters), with at least half representing substantive work by the faculty member (e.g., solo author or first author); some of these should appear in journals of national/international scope. Receipt (as PI or Co-PI) of a significant external grant (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, NPS) or two or more other types of grants (e.g., USF, state, foundation).

These examples are not meant to be prescriptive, but instead to be used as general guidelines for the careful and thorough evaluation of research scholarship for tenure and promotion in the Department by the tenured faculty. For example, fewer journal articles may reflect excellence when publishing in journals with high impact factors, flagship journals in a candidate's specialization, or articles that are highly cited. The evaluation process should consider the candidate's entire record as a whole. Depending on subfield variation, research products should reflect these differences in expectations, for example, emphasis on peer-reviewed articles or books. The candidate is encouraged to seek guidance from the Chair and tenured colleagues, especially those who work in the same sub-field. Finally, the faculty member is encouraged to submit grant proposals and to document these efforts, even those that are not funded.

D. Promotion

The promotion process may be initiated by a faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair and the FAC, at any time post-tenure. The judgment of readiness for promotion to higher academic rank is based on the same criteria used for assessing tenure plus additional requirements.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

- Documented evidence for excellence in teaching and scholarship, and substantial university, professional, or community service
- Documented evidence of national or international visibility in research, teaching, and/or service
- Review of candidate's credentials by an external review process

E. Timing of Tenure and Promotion

An Associate Professor who is considering applying for promotion to Professor should request that the Chair conduct a promotional review before applying. The review process will involve a meeting with the Chair to discuss the promotion and a review of the CV with a focus on teaching, scholarship, and service

since receiving tenure. Further, upon request, an Associate Professor may request a promotional review by the FAC, Chair, and the tenured Professors prior to deciding on whether to apply for promotion.

F. Annual Evaluations of Performance

All tenured, tenure-earning, and permanent instructors will complete an annual evaluation of performance. This evaluation will be reviewed by the FAC and Chair, and faculty will receive a written appraisal of performance. The criteria in Section B on teaching, scholarship, and service will be used to evaluate performance annually. Faculty members shall use the annual evaluations of performance as markers of progress towards tenure and promotion.

G. Reviewing Progress toward Tenure (The Mid-Tenure Review)

- The tenure-earning faculty member will receive written appraisals of progress toward tenure from the FAC and Department Chair as part of the annual evaluation of performance.
- More extensive mid-tenure review will be conducted at the mid-point of the probationary period, usually (but not always) during the third year, by the Department Chair and the entire tenured faculty. The Department Chair will write an evaluation and the FAC will write a separate evaluation based on feedback and the vote of the entire tenured faculty.

H. Departmental Procedures for Review Tenure and Promotion Applications

Applicants for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- i. The application file will first be reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Faculty Review Committee, which comprises the entire tenured faculty, excluding the Department Chair.
- ii. Prior to the start of the term in which the review is conducted, the Committee will elect a Chair from among its members. The Chair will preside over the committee for all Tenure and Promotion cases for that year. The Chair will be responsible for summarizing the Committee vote and drafting the written evaluation for each case.
- iii. Based on the timeline established by the Dean and the Provost, a meeting of the Committee will be scheduled to discuss the Tenure and Promotion cases. All tenured faculty, except the Department Chair, are expected to read all the application files, attend the meeting, and participate in the discussion.
- iv. Once the discussion ends, a vote by secret ballot will be taken. Members of the Committee who cannot attend the meeting in person should submit their vote to the Committee Chair at least 24 hours before the meeting commences.
- v. All tenured faculty members are expected to vote for or against recommending Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty members may not abstain from voting unless they have a conflict of interest that would prevent them from fairly judging the case. Faculty with a conflict of interest should not attend or participate in the meeting. A faculty member who wishes to abstain must provide written justification to the Committee Chair.
- vi. The Committee Chair will record the Committee vote in the application file, and insert the narrative evaluation in the file, before forwarding to the Department Chair for review.
- vii. The Department Chair will add her/his narrative review and is responsible for ensuring that the file is complete by the deadline established by the College.

Applicants for Promotion to Professor

- i. The application file will first be reviewed by the Professor Review Committee, which comprises all full Professors, excluding the Department Chair.

- ii. Prior to the start of the term in which the review is conducted, the Committee will elect a Chair from among its members. The Chair will preside over the committee for all Professor Promotion cases for that year. The Chair will be responsible for summarizing the Committee vote and drafting the written evaluation for each case.
- iii. Based on the timeline established by the Dean and the Provost, a meeting of the Committee will be scheduled to discuss the Professor Promotion cases. All full Professors, except the Department Chair, are expected to read all the application files, attend the meeting, and participate in the discussion.
- iv. Once the discussion ends, a vote by secret ballot will be taken. Members of the Committee who cannot attend the meeting in person should submit their vote to the Committee Chair at least 24 hours before the meeting commences.
- v. All full Professors are expected to vote for or against Promotion to Professor. Faculty members may not abstain from voting unless they have a conflict of interest that would prevent them from fairly judging the case. Faculty with a conflict of interest should not attend or participate in the meeting. A faculty member who wishes to abstain must provide written justification to the Committee Chair.
- vi. The Committee Chair will record the Committee vote in the application file, and insert the narrative evaluation in the file, before forwarding to the Department Chair for review.
- vii. The Department Chair will add her/his narrative review, and is responsible for ensuring that the file is complete by the deadline established by the College.

I. Review Schedule (Mid-Tenure; Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, and Professor Promotion)

- i. Each year the Chair will establish the date on which all completed mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, and promotion materials must be submitted to the department, taking into account provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (that mandate a candidate's access to the materials after each level of review) and the date of submission to the Dean's Office.
- ii. The Review Committee will meet to discuss any cases and vote by secret ballot.
- iii. The Review Committee Chair will prepare a summary of the vote and narrative evaluation.
- iv. The Department Chair will complete her/his evaluation (s).
- v. The complete packet of materials, including the Committee and Chair reviews and the voting tally, along with a response from the candidate if offered, will be submitted to the Office of the Dean by the set deadline using the Faculty Information System (Archivum)
- vi. Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cares for faculty members on the branch campus prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost (see USF Consolidation Handbook).

Note: this document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members of the Faculty at any regular meeting of the department. After amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

Approved by faculty vote on November 2, 2015

Approved by Dean's Office on November 5, 2015

Approved by the Provost's Office on June 1, 2016

Effective June 1, 2017

Revised for Consolidation--Approved by faculty vote May 15, 2020; Approved by Dean's Office and Provost's Office June 5, 2020