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Introduction

The UA-Akron AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) contains processes, timelines and procedures for the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) of Bargaining Unit members, and should be referred to for such matters. This document serves to enumerate the minimum criteria for tenure/promotion relevant to the discipline(s) represented in the academic unit listed above. These criteria may include quantitative and/or qualitative measures, and meeting these minimum criteria does not guarantee a positive recommendation. Nothing contained in this document can conflict with the CBA or University rules.

Goals and Responsibilities of the Department

The Department of Sociology views its role as one that involves the dissemination of knowledge, contributing to the development of new knowledge and/or the implementation of existing knowledge.

The Department’s guide, then, is that a quality faculty offering a quality program and conducting quality research will provide the best formula for the maintenance and growth of a quality educational program.

Faculty responsibilities in addition to teaching include discipline-related service to both undergraduate and graduate majors, participation in appropriate Departmental and University Committees, and professional responsibilities to discipline and community. Each faculty member shall engage in scholarly activities, especially those consisting of research culminating in scholarly publications of high quality. The dimension of professional scholarship is most heavily weighted in regard to reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

1. Materials for the RTP file

A. Teaching: Evidence of work performance, including a complete copy of quantitative results of teaching evaluations

B. Research/Scholarly Activity: Copies of manuscripts/publications; any other professional data the candidate wishes to submit

C. Service: Evidence of professional activity, evidence of discipline-related service, evidence of other professional activity named in the letter of offer
2. Annual Reappointment

The responsibility of the Reappointment Committee is to review the status of all non-tenured bargaining unit faculty members eligible to be considered for a reappointment recommendation. Given the long-term implications, a recommendation to reappoint or not reappoint is to be made by this Committee after a careful review of the candidate’s actual and potential contributions to scholarly research, teaching, departmental participation, and university, professional and community discipline-related service. Candidates shall be evaluated annually on their progress toward tenure and promotion to associate professor.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

The criteria used by the Department of Sociology are consistent with the general criteria defined at the University level. In the following sections, we provide specific minimum criteria for consideration for the tenure and promotion to associate professor of bargaining unit faculty. Achieving the minimum criteria does not necessarily guarantee tenure or promotion. The Department recognizes that no set of criteria can adequately encompass a faculty member’s unique contributions to the Department, the particular requirements of his or her chosen specialty, or the profession. These criteria are intended, however, as a set of guidelines to help structure personnel decisions. Each candidate will be considered on a case-by-case basis with an emphasis on his or her unique contributions to the Department and the field of Sociology.

Although the successful candidate is expected to demonstrate quality contributions in the areas of teaching and service, what distinguishes a doctoral program from others is the success of its faculty in contributing to the advancement of the discipline through scholarship. As a result, the successful candidate must demonstrate that s/he has made significant, sustained contributions to the field of sociology and demonstrate growth over time in regard to the quality and significance of these contributions and promise for continued productivity post-tenure.

The primary criterion in judging the candidate’s research and scholarship in regard to tenure and promotion to associate professor is the degree to which the candidate has developed an independent program of research in a defined substantive area or areas of sociology. Most often, this means that the work needs to be progressive or programmatic — it is expected to unfold, with one contribution leading to another without being redundant or repetitive. Since sociology is a diverse discipline, there are different paths to achieving this independent program of research that cannot be reduced to a specific number of articles in a particular journal or set of journals. For instance, qualitative and historical work often requires book-length treatment due to the richness of the data; theorists publish relatively fewer articles due to the reduced number of outlets; some areas of expertise have higher probabilities of attracting external funding than do others. The expectations of the Department center on clear evidence that a body of research and scholarship, when taken together, demonstrate a trajectory of an independent program of research in one or more areas. The evaluation of this body of research and scholarship will include such things as: The quality of the work over time; the pattern of authorship; the quality of the outlets; the links among the work in a given
area or areas; the development over time of a set of ideas or concepts and or methodological techniques; evidence of progression in thought, method, and/or analysis.

**A. Teaching:** The candidate, through his/her teaching and individual efforts with students (e.g., advising, supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate assistants when applicable), shall demonstrate successful contributions to the training and education of students. Teaching effectiveness shall, at a minimum, be assessed by student and peer evaluations of pedagogy (i.e., the activities related to educating, instructing, or teaching) and course materials (such as the evaluation of syllabi, exams, list of readings, and any other method used to instruct and/or evaluate students). Quantitative data (see next paragraph) from the Department-approved student evaluation of each sociology course taught for the Department of Sociology at The University of Akron will be included in this evaluation. In addition, self-evaluations, or any other evidence the candidate wishes to submit, may be used in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. When deemed appropriate, the departmental RTP Committee may require any or all of the listed methods of evaluation.

The minimum criteria for teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated in a number of ways, including but not limited to: (1) an average score in the middle 40% or higher on the T-scores for the summary IDEA teaching evaluations (T-scores adjust the student evaluations to a national norm of similar courses); (2) Submission of a teaching portfolio that includes demonstrated teaching quality, rigor, and/or innovation; positive student comments; evidence of mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students; and other materials to demonstrate quality teaching; (3) a pattern of attendance at relevant teaching-related seminars and workshops; (4) development and implementation of new courses within Sociology and/or in other programs/departments; and (5) teaching awards.

**B. Research/Scholarly Activity:** To achieve tenure and promotion, the successful candidate shall contribute to the scholarly literature in a defined substantive area or areas of sociology as well as regularly participate in the professional activities of the field. The candidate’s scholarly efforts shall result in professional publications and presentations of significant quality. These may include contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Evaluation of scholarly activity shall be primarily based upon, although not limited to, the criteria listed below which are collectively considered and thus not ranked in any particular order. These include:

a. **Holding of Graduate Faculty II status is a necessary but not sufficient indicator of productivity.**

b. **Authorship** (i.e., whether publications are singly or jointly authored): single authorship and/or a significant pattern of senior authorship are a sign of independent scholarship. An authorship pattern in which the candidate moves progressively from being a junior author publishing with more senior colleagues to being a sole or senior author (with colleagues or students) is more indicative of an independent program of research compared to an
authorship pattern in which the candidate is solely a junior author publishing exclusively with senior colleagues.

c. **Funding:** The primary purpose of applying for and/or receiving funding is to support research activities that result in scholarly publication; thus the main factor in judging funding is the degree to which it meets this criterion. Additional criteria include whether the funding is external or internal (external is rated more highly) and the source/prestige of the funding agency (federal/national agencies and foundations are rated more highly than local or state). Since the availability of funding depends on the candidate’s specialty area and shifting national/political priorities, the role of attracting funding in a candidate’s career development will vary.

d. **Publication Outlets:** Different forms of scholarship have different types of appropriate publication outlets. For example, even though each area has its own significant journals and presses, there also are other high-quality journals that cut across areas. Thus, a sociologist studying mental health and gender might have some of her/his work most appropriate for the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (the top ranked official ASA journal in the area), while other work may be best suited for *Gender & Society* (the official journal of Sociologists for Women in Society and the top ranked journal of gender scholarship) or *Social Science & Medicine* (this is a prominent outlet for international and policy-oriented scholarship). The candidate’s publication record will be evaluated based on the candidate’s ability to publish in significant outlets within her or his own area(s) of concentration. Publication outlets may be judged by a number of criteria, including but not limited to, Impact Scores in the Social Science Citation Index; whether the outlet is an official journal of a scholarly association or is a university or academic press; rejection rate; scholarly reviews of the material; and/or demonstrated quality of the Editor and Editorial Board.

The publication of textbooks will not count heavily toward scholarly contribution. The writing of a textbook is considered a teaching activity and not a scholarly activity because it does not evidence new knowledge. Unless peer reviews of the work are highly positive and attest to the text’s scholarly contributions, textbooks will be considered a teaching accomplishment.

Invited chapters do not necessarily count as much as articles in refereed journals because invited book chapters do not necessarily undergo the rigors of peer-review which journals require.

e. **Quality:** The overall quality of the candidate’s scholarly publications will be evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field, and future promise. Because faculty engage in a diverse range of studies using a wide array of theories and methodological approaches, quality will be assessed through an evaluation of the items constituting the publication record and the growth and
development of the record as a whole. Published works will be evaluated in terms of the theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive contributions being made to the candidate’s area(s) of concentration, including contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Positive published reviews of one’s published work (books), reprints, and receiving awards for one’s published work (articles or books) will be seen as additional indicators of publication quality.

It is expected that the candidate’s publication record will demonstrate the development of a specified area or areas of research concentration. A successful record of this type requires the publication of work that offers new knowledge and illustrates growth over time.

f. **Quantity of publications** (including journal articles, books, chapters in books, edited books, published book reviews, textbooks, etc.): Although the quantity of publications is a factor (the minimum, not sufficient, criteria is Graduate Faculty II status: At least four refereed scholarly publications or equivalent within the last five calendar years), the department of sociology also considers the related quality of publications. In addition, because the quantity of publications is heavily influenced by the kind of research being conducted, the department’s assessment of a publication record will take into consideration the candidate’s methodological and theoretical orientation. Ethnographers, for instance, may publish longer but fewer pieces (e.g., books) while quantitative researchers may publish a greater number of shorter pieces (e.g., journal articles).

Consistent efforts toward the contribution of new knowledge must be evidenced during the pre-tenure period. Evidence of these efforts comes in the form of sustained submissions of quality manuscripts for peer review across the probationary period.

g. **Paper/poster/roundtable presentations** at regional, national, and/or international meetings: The number and quality of presentations will be considered in addition to evidence of independent presentations and collaborative presentations (i.e., with senior, peer, and graduate student co-presenters).

h. **Consistency of published production** (i.e., demonstration that efforts toward publication have been taking place throughout the period following the candidate’s appointment to the Department at the rank of Assistant Professor): Evidence of consistency in scholarly production is determined by the number of original manuscripts sent out for review, the number of invited revisions, and the number of accepted publications. Again, because different approaches to research are to be expected (e.g., original ethnography versus secondary data analysis) the number of submitted manuscripts will depend upon the candidates area(s) of concentration and therefore will be taken into account.
i. **Other supporting materials, including evidence of application** of sociological work outside the academy, that the candidate wishes to provide.

**C. Service:** The candidate shall significantly contribute to and regularly participate in the ongoing activities and fulfill responsibilities related to the Department's operation and goals, including, where appropriate, limited college, university, professional, or community activities. Specifically, candidates shall have demonstrated minimal but active discipline related service to the Department, college, university, profession, and the community. Minimal but active service includes membership on one departmental committee per year. In addition, it is expected that the candidate will serve on at least one other college, university, and/or professional committee during the probationary period.

Other indicators of service are quite diverse. They can include membership on other college, university, professional and/or discipline-related community committees; special services rendered to students, faculty, and administration, including formal services to the AAUP; interaction with and helpfulness to the growth, development and functions of The University of Akron; meetings/sessions organized; uncompensated service rendered to industry, government, community, state, social services, courts, editorial boards, ad hoc journal reviewing, American Sociological Association (or other discipline-related professional associations) sections, special projects, etc.; workshops given; memberships in professional organizations; as well as awards and recognition.

**Code of Conduct:** The candidate will abide by the codes of professional conduct as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**4. Promotion to Professor**

The criteria used by the Department of Sociology are consistent with the general criteria defined at the University level. In the following sections, we provide specific **minimum criteria for consideration** for the promotion of bargaining unit faculty to the rank of Professor. Achieving the minimum does not necessarily guarantee promotion. The Department recognizes that no set of criteria can adequately encompass a faculty member’s unique contributions to the Department, the particular requirements of his or her chosen specialty, or the profession. These criteria are intended, however, as a set of guidelines to help structure personnel decisions. Each candidate will be considered on a case-by-case basis with an emphasis on her or his unique contributions to the Department and the field of Sociology.

To be awarded promotion to Professor in the Department of Sociology the candidate must show evidence of a **national reputation** in his or her area(s) of specialization, evidence of **quality contributions and/or mentorship** in the area of teaching, and evidence of **sustained leadership** in the area of service. The primary criterion of judging the candidate’s research and scholarship in regard to the promotion to Professor is the degree to which the candidate has demonstrated a sustained history of quality contributions to the literature and that this has resulted in the candidate establishing a national reputation as a leader in her or his area(s) of
specialization. Since sociology is a diverse discipline, there are different paths to achieving reputation in an area of specialty. As such, this process cannot be reduced to a specific number of articles in a particular journal or set of journals. Nonetheless, the expectations of the Department center on the candidate’s ability to provide clear evidence that a body of high quality research and scholarship, when taken as a whole, demonstrate the candidate’s reputation as a leader in her or his area(s) of specialization.

A. Teaching: The candidate, through his/her classroom teaching and individual efforts with students (e.g., advising, supervision of graduate and undergraduate assistants), shall demonstrate a sustained record of successful contributions to the training and education of students. In particular, the committee shall consider the candidate’s overall record of high quality mentorship of students. Teaching effectiveness shall, at a minimum, be assessed by student and peer evaluations of pedagogy (i.e., the activities related to educating, instructing, or teaching) and course materials (such as the evaluation of syllabi, exams, lists of readings, or any other method used to evaluate students).

Quantitative data (see next paragraph) from the Department-approved student evaluation of each course taught since the candidate’s appointment to associate professor will be included in this evaluation. In addition, self-evaluations, or any other evidence the candidate wishes to submit, may be used in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. When deemed appropriate, the departmental RTP Committee may require any or all of the listed methods of evaluation.

The minimum criteria for teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated in a number of ways, including but not limited to: (1) an average score in the middle 40% or higher on the T-scores for the summary IDEA teaching evaluations (T-scores adjust the student evaluations to a national norm of similar courses); (2) Submission of a teaching portfolio that includes demonstrated teaching quality, rigor, and/or innovation; positive student comments; evidence of mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students; and other materials to demonstrate quality teaching; (3) a pattern of attendance at relevant teaching-related seminars and workshops; (4) development and implementation of new courses within Sociology and/or in other programs/ departments; and (5) teaching awards.

B. Research/Scholarly Activity:

The candidate shall have demonstrated a sustained history of quality contributions to the scholarly literature in a defined substantive area or areas in sociology as evidenced by scholarly book(s), scholarly book chapters, and/or a series of articles in high quality refereed journals. These may include contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. While contributions made over the course of the candidate’s career will be considered, those made since the awarding of promotion to associate professor will be the primary focus of the committee’s decision-making process. The body of scholarly work shall be such that the candidate has a national reputation in the discipline. Candidates may also be evaluated on their record of external funding and their record of leadership in the professional activities of our field. Evaluation of scholarly activity will be based upon, although not limited to, the criteria listed below which are collectively considered and thus not ranked in any particular order. These include:
a. **Holding Graduate Faculty II status is a necessary but not sufficient indicator of sustained productivity.**

b. **Authorship** (i.e., whether publications are singly or jointly authored): A sustained pattern of single authorship and/or senior authorship is one means of successfully demonstrating scholarly leadership. Further demonstration of scholarly leadership may also be indicated by publishing with students, even when one does not serve as a publication’s first author.

c. **Funding:** The primary purpose of funding is to support research activities that result in scholarly publication; thus the main factor in judging funding is the degree to which it meets this criterion. Additional criteria include whether the funding is external or internal (external is rated more highly) and the source/prestige of the funding agency (federal/national agencies and foundations are rated more highly than local or state). Since the availability of funding depends on the candidate’s specialty area and national and political priorities, the role of attracting funding in demonstrating scholarly reputation will vary.

d. **Publication Outlets:** The candidate’s publication record will be evaluated based on the candidate’s record of publishing within the most significant outlets within her or his own area(s) of specialization. Different forms of scholarship have different types of appropriate publication outlets. For example, even though each area has its own significant journals and presses, there also are other high-quality journals that cut across areas. Thus, a sociologist studying mental health and gender might have some of her/his work most appropriate for the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (the top ranked official ASA journal in the area), while other work may be best suited for *Gender & Society* (the official journal of Sociologists for Women in Society and the top ranked journal of gender scholarship) or *Social Science & Medicine* (this is a prominent outlet for international and policy-oriented scholarship). Publication outlets may be judged by a number of criteria including, but not limited to, Impact Scores in the Social Science Citation Index; whether the outlet is an official journal of a scholarly association; rejection rate; published scholarly reviews of the material, and/or demonstrated quality of the Editor and Editorial Board. The successful candidate’s record of publications since the appointment to associate professor with tenure will demonstrate consistency and/or improvement in the quality of publication outlets when compared to the record occurring prior to promotion to associate professor with tenure.

The publication of textbooks will not count heavily toward scholarly contribution. The writing of a textbook is considered a teaching activity and not a scholarly activity because it does not evidence new knowledge. Unless
peer reviews of the work are highly positive and attest to the text's scholarly contributions, textbooks will be considered a teaching accomplishment.

In general, invited chapters are not as highly regarded as publications in journals because invited book chapters do not necessarily undergo the rigors of peer-review which journals require. However, given that the primary criterion for promotion to Professor is the candidate's ability to demonstrate a national and/or international reputation in her or his area(s) of specialization, invited chapters may reflect the development of a scholarly reputation. Candidates are encouraged to present evidence that published chapters reflect known expertise in an area or area(s) of specialization.

e. **Quality:** The overall quality of the candidate's scholarly publications will be evaluated in terms of its demonstrated impact on the field. Because faculty engage in a diverse range of studies using a wide array of theories and methodological approaches, quality will be assessed through an evaluation of the items constituting the publication record and the quality of the record as a whole. Published works will be evaluated in terms of the theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive contributions being made to the candidate's area(s) of specialization, including contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Positive published reviews of one's published work (books), reprints, and receiving awards for one's published work (articles or books) will be seen as additional indicators of publication quality.

f. **Quantity of publications** (including journal articles, books, chapters in books, edited books, published book reviews, textbooks, etc.): Although the quantity of publications is a factor, the department of sociology also considers the related quality of publications. In addition, because the quantity of publications is heavily influenced by the kind of research being conducted, the department's assessment of a publication record will take into consideration the candidate's methodological and theoretical orientation. Ethnographers, for instance, may publish longer but fewer pieces (e.g., books) while quantitative researchers may publish a greater number of shorter pieces (e.g., journal articles).

The successful candidate will present evidence of a sustained record of publication since the time of appointment to associate professor. This record must surpass the record used as evidence for the appointment to associate professor.

**g. Other supporting materials.** including the application of sociological work outside the academy, that the candidate wishes to provide.

**C. Service:** The candidate shall demonstrate sustained leadership in regard to ongoing activities of the Department and in regard to fulfilling his or her responsibilities concerning the Department's operation and goals. Candidates for professor will also demonstrate
leadership in regard to college, university, professional, and/or community activities. Minimal but active service includes leadership of one departmental committee per year. In addition, it is expected that the candidate will lead at least one other college, university, and/or professional committee during her/his time as Associate Professor.

Indicators of leadership beyond the department can be quite diverse. They may include chairing college, university, professional and/or discipline-related community committees (within or outside the university); special services rendered to students, faculty, and administration, including formal services to the AAUP; demonstrated leadership in regard to the growth, development and functions of The University of Akron; meetings/sessions organized; uncompensated service rendered to industry, government, community, state, social services, courts, editorial boards, ad hoc journal reviewing, American Sociological Association (or other discipline-related professional associations) sections, special projects, etc.; workshops given; holding elected office in professional organizations; as well as awards and recognition.

**Code of Conduct:** The candidate will abide by the codes of professional conduct as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

5. **Materials for External Review**

A. Teaching: NA

B. Research/Scholarly Activity: Candidate’s narrative statement and publications

C. Service: NA

D. Bases of Assessment:

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, external reviewers are asked to follow these instructions:

As you examine Dr. YYY’s publications we would like you to address the following three questions: What is the quality of her/his publications? How would you rate her/his contribution to this domain of scholarship? How would you assess her/his professional development?

At the University of Akron, since tenure decisions are based upon a multiple set of criteria, we ask that you not comment directly about Dr. YYY’s worthiness for tenure and promotion here or elsewhere. Instead, your substantive appraisal will help us understand the quality of Dr. YYY’s scholarship and professional development.
For Promotion to Professor, external reviewers are asked to follow these instructions:

As you examine Dr. ZZZ’s scholarship we would like you to address the following three questions. What is the quality of her/his work? How would you rate this candidate’s contribution to this domain of scholarship? To what degree has s/he achieved a national reputation for this body of work?

At the University of Akron, since promotion decisions are based upon a multiple set of criteria, we ask that you not comment directly about her/his worthiness for promotion here or elsewhere. Instead, your substantive appraisal will help us understand the quality of Dr. ZZZ’s scholarship and professional reputation.