



*The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA®*

*Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost*

**Policy Approval**  
**Department of Anthropology**

**Policy Document:** Department of Anthropology Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

**Approved by:**

Department of Anthropology Faculty

David Wrobel, Dean, Dodge Family College of Arts and Sciences

Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty

**Approved on:**

August 17, 2023

**Effective on:**

August 17, 2023

**File name:**

8-17-23 Anthropology Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion

**Review Cycle:**

Annual review; Revision as necessary prior to the next unit APR review and in the case of University or College policy changes or other precipitating factors.



# DODGE FAMILY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

# ANTHROPOLOGY

*The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA*

## Department of Anthropology, University of Oklahoma

### Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

*Approved by vote of the Anthropology faculty on May 8, 2023*

This document addresses tenure-track and tenured (TT) faculty evaluation, including criteria and procedures for annual evaluation and tenure and/or promotion. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated with respect to their accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. Different criteria apply to non-tenure-track faculty (Renewable Term, Ranked Renewable Term, and Research faculty) and are not covered in this document. All TT faculty are expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in research, teaching, and service.

### FACULTY DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT

TT faculty are evaluated with respect to their accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The standard distribution of effort in the department is 40% research/creative activities, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Normal teaching load may be reduced (a) for research, (b) for significant service contribution to the Department or the University, or (c) negotiated at the time of hire. Changes in distribution of effort must be approved by Committee A and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. In cases of split appointments, the two units develop a memorandum of understanding delineating the expectations of each unit and outlining the evaluation process with respect to the TT faculty member.

### ANNUAL EVALUATION

#### Overview

The annual evaluation period is the calendar year. Evaluation of teaching, research, and service is based on the tenure and promotion criteria and expectations as detailed in this document.

#### Procedures

Each year, Committee A will request that faculty submit evaluation materials. At a minimum, these materials will include a complete and current curriculum vitae, a self-evaluation, and

updated mini-vitae using the University's submission procedures. In assessing teaching, Committee A considers student responses, peer review of teaching portfolios, and the nature and extent of other teaching-related activities such as service on student committees, direction of internships and independent studies, mentoring activities, and so forth. In assessing research, Committee A considers the nature and quality of publications as suggested by quality of journal or publisher and/or by peer assessment. Grant and contract activity and work in progress are also considered. Evaluation of service is based on peer assessment of the nature and range of activities.

## TENURE AND PROMOTION

### Criteria

Evaluation for promotion and granting of tenure will be based upon the criteria of performance in teaching, research, and service (university and professional) as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Promotion to the Associate Professor rank and the granting of tenure are essentially similar and will normally be based upon the same criteria. Promotion to Professor will require significant publications and the attainment of a recognized professional reputation. Elaboration of these criteria appears below. Faculty performance will be evaluated against norms of performance obtaining in departments of anthropology at comparable institutions, as indicated by the evaluation of external reviewers.

### *Research*

#### From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

- Candidates must have established a program of research that has been published in refereed journals and/or in nationally or internationally recognized presses. Though primary attention will be given to the volume and the quality of scholarly output, the reputation of the journals and publishers will also exert an impact on how publications are assessed.
- The intrinsic heterogeneity of the discipline of anthropology requires flexibility with respect to specific research expectations. We distinguish between two alternative academic trajectories: a "humanities" model in which one or more scholarly books is expected and a "natural science" model in which refereed journal articles, often co-authored, are the norm. While the humanities tradition is more common among cultural anthropologists and anthropological linguists and the natural science model among biological anthropologists and archeologists, members of any subfield may be found in either tradition or may straddle the two. This requires flexibility in the evaluation of dossiers.
- For those whose tenure and/or promotion relies heavily on books, it is always preferable that the book be published and available for purchase. However, it is an institutional custom to count books that have been accepted for publication and can be shown, through letters from the publisher, to be in the final pre-publication stage. A peer-reviewed sole authored book will weigh more heavily than a co-authored book; both of these will have more weight than an edited volume or a textbook. Generally, a

co-authored book, edited volume, or textbook alone is not sufficient for tenure. The important criterion is that any book being used as a primary document for tenure and/or promotion contain independent scholarship by the author and not merely be a synthesis and presentation of the work of others. With or without a book, a record of peer reviewed works published in respected journals, refereed chapters in books, or articles in refereed anthologies is also expected. It is expected that at least half of these publications will be sole/first authored or that the candidate will be a principal/senior author. Faculty should be prepared to explain their unique contributions to publications.

- The department refrains from establishing a hard-and-fast rule regarding the number of required articles and chapters, but expectations are in the range of three refereed publications (minimum) in addition to a book. Ten refereed publications (minimum) are required for the “natural science” model that does not require a book. The quality of the publications, not solely the quantity, is the most important criterion. The reputation and scope of the journal or book publisher are also considered as part of the candidate’s evaluation. The candidate’s distribution of teaching/research/service will also be taken into consideration when evaluating research productivity.
- Other types of scholarly output besides books, refereed journal articles, and book chapters will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship, as will presentations at conferences or other scholarly meetings. Evidence of peer-juried review will have more weight than non-peer reviewed scholarship, and published scholarship will have more weight than unpublished scholarship.
- The publication of dissertation-derived research is encouraged; however, evidence of expanded or new research must also be presented.
- Fellowships and scholarly awards will enhance the candidate's standing and are valued by the department.
- Obtaining research funding is highly encouraged; applying for funding is expected for tenure. Externally funded grants are more highly valued than internally funded grants. While valued by the department, research funding is not required for tenure and promotion.
- Public facing scholarship and community engaged scholarship are important components of contemporary scholarship. While they cannot make up the majority of a research profile, we will value these as making a contribution to the scholar’s research reputation. If you are engaged in such work, you should coordinate with Committee A on how best to receive credit.

#### From Associate to Full

- Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to have established an international reputation as a leader in their area of expertise. There must be evidence of a substantial record of publications since the candidate was tenured. For those publishing within a “humanities” model, post-tenure book publication is usually expected. For those publishing within a “natural science” model, the departmental

expectation is approximately two peer-reviewed publications per year since tenure. It is expected that at least half of these publications will be solely/first authored or that the candidate will be a principal/senior author. The quality of the publications, not solely the quantity, is the most important criterion. Grant submissions and awards, fellowships, and/or other scholarly awards are also considered an indication of research excellence. The candidate's distribution of teaching/research/service will also be taken into consideration when evaluating research productivity.

- Other types of scholarly output besides books, refereed journal articles, and book chapters will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship, as will presentations at conferences or other scholarly meetings. Evidence of peer-juried review will have more weight than non-peer reviewed scholarship, and published scholarship will have more weight than unpublished scholarship.

### *Teaching*

#### From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

- Candidates must demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching, which encompasses a broad spectrum of activities, *not* just traditional classroom work. Given the inherent biases and other problems of standardized Student Teaching Evaluations (STEs), student opinions should be viewed as only one line of assessment among many. We believe that the best teachers critically engage in their pedagogical practice, steadily working to improve themselves as educators.
- Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in a number of ways. At a minimum this includes peer evaluations of classroom performance. Evaluation could also include instructional materials (e.g. syllabi, exams); student evaluations; supervision of honors theses, directed readings, or independent studies; teaching fellowships and awards; supervision of Teaching Assistants; directing a field school or leading a study-abroad course; participation in teaching professional development; and course and curriculum development.
- We expect all candidates to demonstrate excellence by contributing to graduate education. This excellence will also be evaluated in a number of ways, which could include developing or teaching graduate courses, mentoring graduate students (including professional development), and serving on graduate committees.

#### From Associate to Full

- Candidates must demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching.
- Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in a number of ways. These could include, for example, peer evaluations of classroom performance; instructional materials (e.g. syllabi, exams); student evaluation; supervision of honors theses, directed readings, or independent studies; teaching fellowships and awards; supervision of Teaching Assistants; directing a field school or leading a study-abroad course; participation in teaching professional development; and course and curriculum development.

- We expect all candidates to demonstrate excellence by contributing to graduate education. This excellence will also be evaluated in a number of ways, which could include developing or teaching graduate courses, mentoring graduate students (including professional development), serving on graduate committees, and chairing MA and PhD committees when possible.

### *Service*

#### From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

Candidates must have demonstrated, through sustained on-campus presence and regular involvement in on-campus and professional service activities, their commitment to enhancing the life of the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. While service commitments in any given year may emphasize one or two units (e.g., professional and university), over the longer term (every five to six years), service to most or all units is expected.

- Research and teaching are the primary foci of most early-stage tenure-track faculty. We do expect meaningful contributions to the life of the department in the form of participation in departmental committees, student advising, and regular participation in faculty meetings. As faculty near tenure, these responsibilities normally increase.
- Scholarly service to the discipline (e.g. reviewing submissions to journals and panel participation at professional meetings) is also expected. Service contributions to the community in the faculty member's area of expertise are encouraged. Additionally, the department values contributions to the communities with whom we work.
- Regular tenured faculty are expected to organize their professional lives in a manner compatible with service to OU and to its students. Off-campus sabbaticals [and fellowships] are a normal part of the academic trajectory. The University and the Department also grant occasional semesters of extramural professional activities on a leave-of-absence basis. For tenure and promotion to Associate, however, on-campus semesters must substantially outnumber off-campus leaves of absence.

#### *From Associate to Full*

- Between the granting of tenure and application for Full Professor, the candidate should demonstrate a history of substantial and sustained service on department committees, e.g., serving as chair of standing or search committees or serving in department leadership positions, along with service on College and/or University Committees.
- The categories of scholarly service to the discipline and to the larger community are the same as those at the tenure decision, but the level of expected service is greater. This includes service to professional associations (e.g., as officer or committee member), journal editor, service on NSF, NIH, NEH, or Wenner-Gren panels, and the like. Such extramural service, however, is a supplement to, not a substitute for, the earlier-mentioned requirement of on-campus service to the university and its students.

## **Procedures**

The department evaluates TT faculty with respect to tenure and/or promotion during and after the probationary period. The following procedures are followed by the department as informed by College of Arts and Sciences and Provost guidelines, as well as Faculty Handbook protocols.

### *Peer Teaching*

The department will conduct peer teaching evaluations at least once during each of the first 5 years of a probationary faculty's appointment. Minimally, peer teaching evaluation will involve one tenured faculty member reviewing syllabi and course materials and observing a class session. The reviewer will prepare an evaluation of the probationary faculty's teaching which is shared with the faculty and Committee A. This review becomes part of the tenure and promotion dossier. Tenured faculty can request peer evaluation of their courses.

### *Progress towards Tenure*

Committee A evaluates the research/creative activities, teaching, and service records of probationary TT faculty on an annual basis in their first 5 years. Committee A reviews a self-evaluation produced by each probationary faculty, alongside peer teaching evaluations, student responses to course evaluations, and a current CV. Progress towards Tenure letters become a part of the candidate's Tenure and Promotion dossier.

In the late fall the Chair will send out a call for Progress towards Tenure materials. This call will detail what materials should be turned in for review, and what the due date is. These materials are generally due early in the Spring semester. Committee A will review the materials with respect to department criteria for Tenure and Promotion in the areas of teaching, research, service. Committee A will produce a letter detailing whether the candidate is making progress towards a positive tenure recommendation and offering recommendations for areas to improve in the coming year(s). These letters are cumulative during the probationary period (unlike annual reviews). During the late spring semester, each probationary faculty will review a draft of this letter during a meeting with Committee A.

### *Third-year Review*

Probationary faculty undergo a review of their cumulative performance during the third year of their appointment. This review includes external evaluation of the research portion of their contributions by at least two higher-ranked faculty at peer institutions.

In the fall of the third year, the Chair will send out a call for third year review dossiers. Probationary faculty provide the department with a research dossier (research statement, copies of publications, information on external funding, updated CV), a teaching statement, and the names of 5 external reviewers who are experts in their field, are at higher rank at peer institutions, and are not close contacts or collaborators. The department will independently generate a list. In the late fall or early spring semester the Chair will distribute the research

dossier to two external reviewers and ask them to comment on how the faculty's progress to date compares with faculty at similar stages in their careers elsewhere, and to comment on whether they believe the reviewed faculty are making sufficient progress towards tenure. Committee A will write the Progress to Tenure Letter that includes a review and discussion of the third-year review materials, along with the usual self-appraisal and annual evaluations. Faculty under third year review will not see the external reviews, but Committee A will provide summaries and/or quotes from them.

#### *Tenure and Promotion or Promotion-only Dossier Submission and Review*

Procedures, required materials, and deadlines for the submission and review of Tenure and Promotion, or Promotion-only dossiers are governed by the Provost and the College of Arts and Sciences. In the year preceding review, the Chair will remind eligible faculty of the upcoming processes.

As a broad overview, in the early Spring of the semester preceding review candidates will provide Committee A with a list of 5 to 10 potential external evaluators. Committee A will independently generate a list of potential reviewers. Together, these lists will be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. Letters will be solicited from no fewer than six external reviewers, of which no more than half can be suggested by the candidate. External evaluators should not be Ph.D. advisers or committee members, postdoctoral mentors, research collaborators, coauthors, or close personal friends. They must be tenured and Associate Professors or higher (for tenure and promotion cases), or full Professors or higher for Promotion-only cases. They should be from peer institutions (the College considers universities listed under "Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity" by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education as peer institutions). In the late spring candidates for Tenure and Promotion review or Promotion-only review will provide the department with the research dossier, CV, and appendices. Those materials will be shared with external reviewers who will complete letters of evaluation over the summer. Candidates must complete the remainder of their dossiers by the identified deadlines (typically by the start of the Fall semester). The dossiers, including all required materials, will be uploaded to the university tenure and promotion system. Eligible faculty will have at least 15 days to review the materials prior to discussion and voting to recommend granting or denying tenure. After the vote, the candidate will be notified of the outcome by the chair (positive, negative, or split). The candidate may request the vote counts in writing.

#### *Tenure and Promotion or Promotion-only Voting Eligibility*

Only tenured Associate Professors or Professors have the right to access and review tenure and promotion or promotion-only dossiers, attend faculty meetings to discuss cases, and vote on granting tenure and/or promotion. There are certain exceptions which would make a faculty member ineligible to participate, such as when a faculty member has a conflict of interest. The most common conflict of interest is when a tenured faculty member is the spouse of the candidate.



## **Post-Tenure Review Procedure**

Post tenure review is a periodic and peer-based evaluation of tenured faculty members. The purpose is to guide career development and if necessary, support faculty members in the development of a professional development plan. The Post Tenure Review follows the procedures and policies in the OU Faculty Handbook and includes: (1) a retrospective review of faculty member performance in teaching, research and service over the five years preceding the review and (2) a formative evaluation for future professional growth. Post tenure reviews are initiated immediately following the completion of the annual evaluation process. The Office of the senior Vice President and Provost identifies annually the faculty members who must undergo the post tenure review and publish the deadlines and time frame for completing the review. Committee A completes the post tenure review evaluation, and the OU Faculty handbook includes all of the elements required for the post tenure review dossier. When the faculty member evaluation indicates performance below expectations, the faculty member is instructed to develop a professional development plan. The deadlines and components of this plan are highlighted in the OU Faculty handbook and deadlines are provided annually by the Office of the Provost.