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Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Track Bargaining Unit Faculty in the Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies

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 Anthropology and Classical Studies. 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 may conflict with the CBA or University rules.

1. Material for the RTP file
Specific materials, other than those already specified in the CBA, that may be included in the candidate’s RTP file:

Work that does not clearly fall into research, teaching or service categories, or that overlaps multiple categories, may also be documented by the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a rationale for including these efforts in her/his file and for the departmental RTP committee to evaluate the merits of this work as it pertains to the candidate’s role as a faculty member.

2. Annual Reappointment
Clear and specific measures of performance and indication of progress toward tenure:

A. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually on their progress toward tenure and promotion to associate professor. The responsibility of the Reappointment Committee is to review the status of the candidate’s actual and potential contributions scholarly research, teaching, departmental participation, and university, professional and community discipline-related service.

B. Candidates shall be examined with greater scrutiny in each successive year of reappointment deliberations.

C. It is the responsibility of the tenure-track candidate for reappointment to provide evidence that he or she is able to meet the criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor at the end of the probationary period.

3. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Professor
Clear and specific minimum criteria that a candidate must meet to be recommended for indefinite tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:
The Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies recognizes that no set of criteria can adequately encompass a faculty member’s unique contributions to the Department, the particular requirements if her or his chosen specialty or the profession. These criteria are intended as a set of guidelines to help structure personnel decisions.

As an undergraduate department with an emphasis on undergraduate research opportunities, the successful candidate is expected to demonstrate quality contributions in both teaching and research/scholarship. The candidate is also expected to contribute appropriately to service in the department, at the university, and in his/her discipline.

A. Teaching. The successful candidate must also demonstrate strong or consistently improving teaching activities.

   The candidate’s teaching credentials will be measured by the items listed below.

   1. List of all courses taught with syllabi and relevant course materials

   2. Results of all teaching evaluations (student evaluations using departmentally approved forms, written comments from students and peers, peer evaluations)

      a. Candidates are expected to provide evidence of teaching proficiency by achieving an average rating of ‘satisfactory’ or higher on departmentally approved student evaluations. While the department employs the IDEA evaluations, this means scores in the middle 40% or higher on the Converted Average Summary Evaluation Adjusted score (these scores adjust the student evaluations to a national norm for similar courses). Recognizing that there may be an acclimation period for new faculty, the candidate is not expected to reach a ‘satisfactory’ rating every semester, but to show satisfactory ratings averaged across their teaching reviews for the probationary period, and if below the that satisfactory level in early semesters, to demonstrate a positive trajectory over time.

   3. Descriptions of pedagogical innovations

   4. Details of courses or workshops developed

   5. Details of participation in conferences, courses and/or workshops on teaching

B. Research/Scholarship. The successful candidate must demonstrate a significant, sustained, independent program of research and growth over time in regard to the quality and import of these contributions along with a promise of productivity after tenure. The candidate's scholarly efforts shall result in professional publications
and presentations of significant quality. These may include scholarship of teaching and learning.

The candidate’s scholarly progress will be measured by the items listed below.

1. Quantity of Publications (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, chapters in books, edited books, published book reviews, textbooks, etc.). The candidate is expected to contribute to scholarly literature at a rate of two substantial, peer-reviewed publications every three years. It is recognized that the publication process can be unpredictable so this rate is to serve as a guide; candidates are expected to accumulate a total of at least four, peer-reviewed publications by the time of consideration for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

2. Authorship. Single authorship and/or a significant pattern of senior authorship are signs of independent scholarship. An authorship pattern in which a candidate moves progressively from junior author with a senior colleague to single authorship or senior author with colleagues or students is more indicative of an independent research program than an authorship pattern in which the candidate is junior author publishing exclusively with senior colleagues.

3. Funding. Applying for/or receiving funding to support research activities results in scholarly activity so efforts toward grant-seeking will be judged in terms of the degree to which they contribute to the candidate’s scholarly trajectory. It is recognized that disciplines vary in terms of the availability of research funds so the role of attracting funding in a candidate’s career development will vary.

4. Publication outlets. The subfields and disciplines encompassed by the department have different appropriate publication outlets. Each has its own significant journals and presses and there are also high-quality journals that cross-cut. The candidate’s publication record will be evaluated based on the candidate’s ability to publish in significant, peer-reviewed outlets within her or his own field. Publication outlets may be judged by a number of criteria including but not limited to, whether the outlet is an official journal of a scholarly association or is a university or academic press; rejection rate; readers’ reviews; and/or demonstrated quality of editor or editorial board.

5. Quality. The candidate’s scholarly publications will be evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field, and future promise. Evaluation will take into consideration theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive contributions in the candidate’s field including scholarship of teaching and learning. Positive published reviews of work and awards for published works will be seen as additional indicators of publication quality.

6. Other supporting materials. The candidate is encouraged to include reports, evidence of application of research or work in Anthropology or Classical Studies
outside the academy, etc. that demonstrates the extent of their scholarly/research activity.

C. Service. The successful candidate will significantly contribute to and regularly participate in ongoing activities and fulfill the responsibilities related to the department's operation and goals, including, where appropriate, limited college, university, professional, and community activities. Specifically, candidates are expected to demonstrate service to the department through membership on committees as needed every year. Additionally, the candidate is expected to serve as a member of at least one college, university, or professional committee a year for at least two years of the probationary period. It is recognized that service activities should be lighter for new faculty and should gradually increase in number and/or level of responsibility over time.

Additional indicators of service can include membership on other college, university, professional, and/or discipline-related community committees; special services rendered to students, faculty, staff, and administration, including formal services to the AAUP; uncompensated service to editorial boards; special projects or workshops given, etc.

4. Promotion to Professor
Clear and specific minimum criteria that a candidate must meet to be recommended for promotion to Professor:

Promotion to Professor in the Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies requires that the candidate shows continuing progress in research, teaching, and service. Additionally, the candidate is expected to show evidence of leadership in teaching, research and service. The Promotion to Professor Committee shall consider the candidate's leadership roles in these areas in the context of the candidate's entire career and may place emphasis on different areas in light of the individual candidate's specific trajectory.

A. Teaching Expectations. In addition to ongoing success in teaching as describe under the guideline for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the successful candidate for Professor must demonstrate leadership in teaching. Leadership may be evidenced by supervision of student research, curricular development, or other appropriate activity.

B. Scholarship/Research Expectations. Candidates should continue to produce peer-reviewed publications and seek external funding appropriate to the nature of the scholarship. Such scholarship may include the scholarship of teaching. The nature and number of the publications for promotion to Professor shall not be less than specified under Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor above, and these publications must be subsequent to the candidate having attained the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. In addition, the candidate will demonstrate leadership in research/scholarship which may include editing a
journal, editorial board membership, review panel participation, mentoring of junior scholars, etc.

C. Service Expectations. Candidates are expected to show continued service in keeping with the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Additionally, the candidate is expected to take on leadership roles within that service including but not limited to chairing or co-chairing committees, participating in the organization of professional activities at the regional, state, national, and/or international level.

5. Materials for External Review

The departmental RTP committee shall solicit, receive, and consider external reviews of the scholarly activities of candidates applying for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. In order to insure that the minimum of three reviews go forward with the file, the committee is encouraged to enlist more reviewers; there is no limit to the number.

Materials to be sent to external reviewers will include the candidate’s curriculum vita, the candidate’s narrative statement, and copies of the candidate’s publications.

Attachment A is a draft of the letter to be sent to possible reviewers which includes the bases of external assessment.

6. Conflicts and guideline revisions
   A. In case of conflict, the applicable provisions of the Bargaining Unit Contract supersede all other guidelines.

   B. Subsequent reviews of these departmental criteria may be initiated by no fewer than one-third of the departmental bargaining unit faculty, the college dean, or the senior vice president and provost.
Dear Prof. {X}:

I am writing to enlist your expertise in the review process for Dr. {X} in the Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies at the University of Akron. Dr. {X} is being considered for promotion to the rank of {X} [or for tenure], and we would be grateful if you would review Dr. X's publications and other scholarly activities. Dr. X's curriculum vitae is attached.

I will be in touch soon to ask whether you will be able to act as a reviewer. If you agree, we will express mail to you either all of Dr. X's publications or those which you feel fall within your area of expertise. We are working under guidelines which specify early deadlines, and we would ask that you communicate your review to me by {date specified in CBA}.

Since promotion decisions at the University of Akron are based on several criteria, we ask that you do not comment directly upon the candidate's qualifications for promotion, but rather upon the quality of her/his scholarship, contributions to this field, and professional development. In particular, our committee would value your assessment of the importance of Dr. X's publications and other research activities overall to the broader field of {Anthropology or Classical Studies}, as well as the primary contributions made by individual publications or other projects.

Although we will not voluntarily disclose or make your review available to Dr. X, Ohio's Public Records Law may require us to disclose it to her/him. If she/he requests to see your review, we will inform you of this request.

The department offers its sincere appreciation for this important contribution to the profession and the development of our younger colleagues.

Sincerely,

Dr. {Y}
{Title}
Chair, RTP committee