



**College of Liberal Arts
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Faculty Review Guidelines**

Table of Contents

Department of Sociology and Anthropology Statement	1
Sociology Program Faculty Review Guidelines	2
Tenure and Promotion (Assistant to Associate).....	2
Promotion (Associate to Full) for Faculty on Research Track Guidelines.....	3
Annual Review	5
Post-tenure Review	7
Workload Policy	7
Anthropology Program Faculty Review Guidelines	9
Annual Review	13
Tenure and Promotion	17
Post-tenure Review	25
Workload Policy	26

Department of Sociology and Anthropology Statement

This document presents the criteria adopted by the tenured faculty of the sociology program of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for a departmental recommendation of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and promotion from Associate to Full Professor and annual review in accordance with the Handbook of Operating Procedures which states:

“Each department shall develop its own evaluation standards/criteria with the goal of becoming an emerging research institution. These shall be approved by the department faculty, chair, college dean, and the Provost/EVPAA (ADM-06-505)”

Anyone due to be evaluated under a previous version of these criteria may elect to be evaluated under the current version.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology shall abide by the faculty tenure and promotion procedures specified in the UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures.

The evaluation regarding tenure and promotion of the respective faculty shall cover the entire probation period in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, UTRGV.

Specific criteria are listed in three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Scholarship, and Professional Service. For tenure and promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, departmental requirements assume a six-year probationary period, with evaluation based on the first five years unless otherwise stated in the candidate’s contract.

It is recommended that the applicant follow all rules and procedures set forth by the faculty review policy outlined on the Provost’s website. Classifications and accomplishments not specifically mentioned below may also be assigned to categories at this point, with the assignment justified by the candidate.

The Sociology and Anthropology Department requires the Ph.D. degree for all tenured faculty. This requirement is to be made explicit at the time of employment.

Candidates for promotion and tenure are to be evaluated by the tenured faculty in the respective program through which they were hired--normally anthropologists are evaluated by anthropology faculty and sociologists by sociology faculty.

Sociology Program Faculty Review Guidelines

Tenure and Promotion (Assistant to Associate)

I. Research/Scholarship

1. Three (3) scholarly products, which may be any combination of peer-reviewed publications and/or externally funded grants of > \$20,000 on which the funded faculty member serves as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel.

In combination with any THREE of the following (for a total of SIX products), ONE of which must be an item from bullets a-g below:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Obtained seed grants from local agencies, foundations.
- h. A presentation at a national, international, regional academic conference
- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award.

Or

2. A scholarly book (not textbook or edited book), sole, first author, or second author, representing original research or theory and published by an academic publisher.

In combination with any THREE of the following (for a total of FOUR products), ONE of which must be an item from bullets a-g below:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Obtained seed grants from local agencies, foundations, or internal sources.
- h. A presentation at a national, international, or regional academic conference
- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award

In evaluating a candidate's contributions to Research and Scholarship the program's tenure and promotion committee will also consult letters from external reviewers.

II. Teaching

1. Candidate scores an average of **4.0** or greater on the 5.0 Overall Rating scale of the student teaching evaluations over the reviewed period.
2. The T and P committee will also consider other teaching effectiveness measures such as supervision of student research, development of new teaching aids, recipient of College or University teaching awards, and/or peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

III. Service

Service is valued including active participation in departmental, college, and/or university committees and events as well as to the discipline of sociology. In addition to a strong record of service, the department requires that any candidate score an average of at least 3.0 ("meets expectations"), **over the course of her/his probationary period,** in annual evaluation reviews in the category of professional service.

Promotion (Associate to Full) for Faculty on Research Track Guidelines

I. Research/Scholarship

The evaluation regarding promotion (associate to full professor) of the respective faculty shall cover the entire period that the candidate is at the rank of associate professor. A candidate must have completed at least four years at the rank of associate professor.

1. Four (4) scholarly products, which may be any combination of peer-reviewed publications and/or externally funded grants of > \$20, 000 on which the funded faculty member serves as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel.

In combination with any of the following THREE (for a total of SEVEN products), ONE of which must be an item from bullets a-g below:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies with majority positive reviews. Obtained seed grants from local agencies, foundations, or internal sources.

- g. Obtained seed grants from local agencies, foundations, or internal sources.
- h. A presentation at a national, international, or regional academic conference
- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award

Or

1. A scholarly book (not textbook or edited book), sole, first author or second author, representing original research or theory and published by an academic publisher.

In combination with any of the following THREE (for a total of FOUR products), ONE of which must be an item from bullets a-g below:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Obtained external seed grants from local agencies, foundations
- h. Presentations at a national, international, or regional academic conference
- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award

In evaluating a candidate's contributions to scholarship and professional achievement the program's tenure and promotion committee will also consult letters from external reviewers.

II. Teaching

1. Candidate scores an average of **4.0** or greater on the 5.0 Overall Rating scale of the student teaching evaluations over the reviewed period.
2. The T and P committee will also consider other teaching effectiveness measures such as supervision of student research, development of new teaching aids, recipient of College or University teaching award, and/or peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness to assess the faculty member's commitment to pedagogical innovation, efforts at professional development and commitment to student success.

III. Service

Candidate score an average of at least 3.0 in annual reviews in the category of professional service.

Annual Review

According to the Handbook of Operations of UTRGV, each program must develop their own evaluation of faculty. The following standards were developed by the faculty of the sociology program based upon the rigors of the program and discipline.

Faculty members to be considered to be in good standing are expected to **meet expectations** in all three areas as defined by the faculty of the Sociology Program.

The Committee Chair and Department Chair will provide a written narrative highlighting the strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for improvements.

Faculty can appeal at each level.

Teaching

Exceeds Expectations Candidate scores an average of **4.5** (90%) or greater on the 5.0 Overall Rating scale of the student teaching evaluations over the reviewed year.

Meets Expectations Candidate scores an average of **4.0** (80%) or greater on the 5.0 Overall Rating scale of the student teaching evaluations over the reviewed year.

While the student evaluation scores are an important element of the evaluation, its overall outcome is not exclusively determined by them, The annual review committee will also consider other teaching effectiveness measures such as supervision of student research, development of new teaching aids, recipient of College or University teaching awards (1.0), and/or peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness to assess the faculty member's commitment to pedagogical innovation, efforts at professional development and commitment to student success.

Research/Scholarship

Exceeds Expectations equal **TWO** items from the following list, ONE of which must be an item from bullets a-g below:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Obtained external seed grants from local agencies, foundations
- h. Presentations at a national, international, or regional academic conference

- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award

Meets Expectations equal **ONE** items from the following list:

- a. An article in a refereed scholarly journal
- b. Book chapter or chapters
- c. An anthology of readings
- d. A college textbook
- e. An edited volume
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundations or federal agencies, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Obtained seed grants from local agencies, foundations, or internal sources.
- h. A presentation at a national or regional academic conference
- i. Academic journal editor
- j. Recipient of College, University or national level faculty research award

Service

Service is valued including active participation in **departmental, college, and/or university** committees and events as well as to the discipline of sociology.

Exceeds Expectations evaluation is dependent on 4.1-5.0

Meets Expectations evaluation is dependent on 3.0-4.0

Departmental Committees .5

Departmental Committee Chair .75

Departmental Search Committee .75

Departmental Search Committee Chair 1.00

Departmental Program Coordinator/Graduate Advisor 2.00

Departmental Associate Chair 3.00

Departmental Chair 4.00

Advisor to Sociology Club or Alpha Kappa Delta Honor Society .5

College/University Committee .75

College /University Committee 1.25

College/University Search Committee 1.00

College/University Search Committee Chair 1.5

Professional Service-Professional Association Member .1 (maximum total 1.00)

Professional Service-Committee Member .75

Professional Service-Committee Member Chair 1.25

Professional Service-Journal/Grant Reviewer .5

Professional Service-Journal Editor 2.00

Community Service-Board Member .5

Community Service-Invited Talk .5

Post-tenure Review

For post-tenure review, applicants must meet the *teaching* and *service* requirements for promotion from associate to full professor with similar criteria for **meets** and **exceeds expectations** applied accordingly. As far as research is concerned, the following model is applied:

Meets expectations: No fewer than 4 products from a-j.

Exceeds expectations: No fewer than 6 products from a-j.

Workload Policy

The Sociology Program values the efforts of its faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. In order to better ensure a more equitable distribution of teaching and scholarship faculty workloads, the following POLICY on faculty workload will be used within the Sociology Program.

1. This policy applies only to Tenured Faculty. All Tenure-Track faculty are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship program and produce published works on a regular basis in line with department/program standards leading to tenure. Lecturer faculty are hired to provide important capacity to meet teaching needs and this policy does not apply to them.
2. This policy is based on the annual reviews of the THREE previous academic years and thus will be updated annually as part of the College level review (i.e., Spring) for the next academic year.
3. Criteria are based on the Departmental/Program Criteria for Annual Review in the area of Research/Scholarship only. These Departmental/Program Criteria must have been approved by the UTRGV administration for annual review evaluation.

Criteria then are the following:

A faculty member on the 18 hour annual Research Workload (teaching load of 9 credits per term) whose Annual Review recommendations in the area of Research/Scholarship EXCEED or MEET EXPECTATIONS over two of three consecutive years, **and** does **not** have any recommendations of "UNSATISFACTORY" over said three year period **and** who has produced at least three (3) scholarly products, one (1) of which **must** be a peer reviewed

publication in print or in press, or its equivalent¹, during the three year review period may continue on the research workload. Accepted publications can only be claimed once, either “in press” or “in print” but not both..

A faculty member whose Annual Review recommendation does not meet these criteria will be placed on a 24-hour annual Teaching Track load (teaching load of 12 credits per term) for a period of at least one academic year.

Any tenured faculty member on the Research Track may elect to be on a Teaching Track workload. These assignments will be for one (1) academic year, at a minimum.

4. A faculty member on the Teaching Track may return to the Research Track workload by:
 - a. submitting a proposal detailing a research plan that will allow them to meet research track expectations in their annual reviews to their Chairperson and Dean. Upon approval by the Chair and Dean, the faculty member may return to the Research Track workload.
 - b. Showing that their scholarship MEETS or EXCEEDS expectations for their department/program Annual Review criteria for scholarship for the previous three years during the annual review process and that they have met the criteria in bullet 3 above.

Each department chair/program coordinator will assign faculty to teaching load based on these criteria unless the department/program has criteria more exacting than these as part of the department/program policies.

¹ This would include demonstrated evidence of progress towards a major publication such as a book, a grant which received peer evaluation whether or not it was funded, etc. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit this evidence.

Anthropology Program Faculty Review Guidelines

I. Procedure

A. Unified Dossier Submission for Annual Review, P/T, and Post-Tenure Review

All faculty members shall submit one review dossier annually for evaluation. Tenure-track faculty and those applying for Tenure, Promotion, and/or Post-Tenure Review do not need to submit an annual evaluation dossier; the T/P/PTR dossier will suffice. Merit decisions are based on Annual Review and will be based on the departmental and Chair evaluations as described in section IV. To be eligible for merit, faculty must receive “exceeds” or “meets” expectations.

B. Dossier Content

The faculty dossier will follow the format and include the items outlined in the document Format for Faculty Review Dossier developed and posted by the Office of the Provost. The dossier should also include any supporting documentation for any activities the faculty member has reported in the dossier.

- Faculty are advised that the content of narrative summaries is particularly important to application of the departmental guidelines for evaluation: See IIIA below.

C. Submission Mode

The dossier will be submitted through the mode (electronic, FPT, or print) required by the Office of the Provost for the year under review.

D. Submission Dates and Timeline

The dates for dossier submission and the timeline for completion of each level of the review process will follow the Pathways for Faculty Review Deadlines developed and announced annually by the Office of the Provost.

II. Anthropology Program Review Committee

A. Faculty Evaluation Committee

Full-time tenured and tenure-track/promotion faculty shall determine by secret ballot the membership of the Anthropology Faculty Evaluation Committee [AFEC]. This committee will conduct all reviews—T&P, Annual Faculty Evaluation, and PTR. The committee should be composed of 3 members, each one chairing one of the review processes. The following restrictions on membership apply:

- The Department Chair shall not be a member of the AFEC.
- The Committee must be composed exclusively of tenured faculty.
- Promotions to full professor and Post-tenure reviews must be reviewed by a committee composed of at least 3 full professors in the program. If three full

professors are not available, a full professor from another department can be substituted.

III. Anthropology Program Evaluation General Guidelines

A. Evaluation Philosophy

Anthropology is a broad discipline that values both humanistic and scientific modes of inquiry. This document respects the variety of scholarly expectations of the four subfields of anthropology and presents policies that are consistent with those expectations and publication standards. It also takes into account the educational mission of UTRGV and the high teaching loads that impact the research productivity of UTRGV faculty members.

A generalized, quantitative criterion is established as a baseline for the level of activity that faculty members of each rank are expected to achieve as the minimum for an evaluation of Meets Expectations in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. This threshold is expressed differently for each of the three areas under review. In Teaching, it refers to a faculty member's overall course evaluations; in Service, to a range of service activities; in Research/Scholarship, to a range of professional achievements of varied types. The program recognizes that professional achievements are not limited to publication alone but can be realized in different modes. The program review committees will use the baselines outlined below as quantifiable guidelines for determining whether faculty members have met expectations.

All reviews are holistic in nature. The AFEC will consider all aspects of Teaching, Research & Scholarship, and Service during the period under review including the context in which these occur.

The AFEC is charged with ensuring that each faculty member's performance also reflects quality and meaningful impact on the field of study in which the faculty member is working. This can only be determined if faculty members actively demonstrate the impact of their Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities for the period under review through the Narrative Summaries submitted in each faculty member's review dossier.

B. Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching shall be evaluated on the basis of official teaching evaluations administered by the university, peer evaluations of teaching, and teaching enrichment activities reported by each faculty member. These three elements contribute equally in reflecting a faculty member's performance in Teaching for the period under review.

Teaching evaluations administered by the university shall be assessed for a *baseline* evaluation as follows. Faculty should report the UT system required 5-question weighted average for the period under review:

Exceeds Expectations evaluation will be dependent on an average of $\geq 90\%$ of student evaluations in the combined Agree/Strongly Agree category

Meets Expectations evaluation will be dependent on an average of $\geq 80\%$ of student evaluations in the combined Agree/Strongly Agree category

Does Not Meet Expectations will be dependent on an average of less than 80% of student evaluation in the combined Agree/Strong Agree category

Peer evaluations of teaching provide professional perspective on teaching expertise and are equally important in judging baseline performance.

Faculty members shall provide peer observations according to the timeline published in the document Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation and posted by the Office of the Provost. The frequency of observation cited there is the following:

- All **tenure-track faculty** shall be observed at least once per academic year.
- All **tenured faculty** shall be reviewed at least once every three years.
- Faculty members with the rank of **Lecturer I, Lecturer II, and Lecturer III, or Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, and Clinical Associate Professor** shall be observed at least once per academic year.
- Faculty members with the rank of **Senior Lecturer and Clinical Professor** shall be observed at least once every three years.

The AFEC will also assess each faculty member's teaching by reviewing the Teaching Enrichment activities reported for the period under review to assess the faculty member's commitment to pedagogical innovation, efforts at professional development and commitment to student success. See section V.B.3 for a list of provides a list of possible teaching enrichment activities that faculty members should report in their dossiers.

C. Guidelines for Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

The AFEC will consider the scholarly activities listed in the Research/Scholarship sections that follow when assessing Research/Scholarship. The venues for professional achievement in Research/Scholarship include but are not limited to publications and external grant funding.

The baseline for meeting expectations in Research/Scholarship varies according to a faculty member's workload determination and tenure status for the period under review.

- **Lecturers** are not required but are encouraged to engage in research/scholarship that complements their teaching duties and individual scholarly interests.
- **Tenure-track faculty** are expected to actively engage in research/scholarship while completing their probationary periods working toward tenure. The baseline evaluation of research/scholarship for tenure-track faculty is specified further in section V.C and reflects a trajectory of professional development over the course of the probationary period. Tenure-track faculty should show evidence of development throughout the probationary period. Annual Reviews will note progress toward tenure and promotion with regard to required publications.
- **Tenured faculty** are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship agenda after the achievement of tenure. However, the trajectory and intensity of their research and teaching activities may shift as a result of the expanded service and administrative commitments which tenured faculty are asked to perform for the university. These shifts will be acknowledged and accounted for in the annual reviews leading to PTR. When applicable, Annual Reviews will note progress toward promotion with regard to required publications.

D. Guidelines for Evaluation of Service

The Department Review Committees will consider the service activities listed in Section V.D when assessing a faculty member's Service.

The *baseline* for meeting expectations in Service varies according to a faculty member's workload determination and tenure status for the period under review:

- **Lecturers** are expected to serve primarily within the department with support that complements their teaching duties and individual scholarly interests.
- **Tenure-track faculty** are expected to have reduced service commitments while completing their probationary periods working toward tenure.
- **Tenured faculty** are expected to have expanded service commitments to the department, the college, and the university. They are more likely to serve nationally and/or internationally within their disciplines, for example as officers of professional organizations or on the editorial boards of periodicals.

E. Summary Ratings

Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory for each one of the

three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following:

- For a Summary Rating of ***Exceeds Expectations*** in an Annual Review or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must exceed expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation.
- For a Summary Rating of ***Meets Expectations*** in an Annual Review or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must at least meet expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation, but not meet the standard for Exceeds Expectations.
- For a Summary Rating of ***Does Not Meet Expectations*** in an Annual Review or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.
- For a Summary Rating of ***Unsatisfactory*** in an Annual Review or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 2 categories of the evaluation.

Annual Review

According to the Handbook of Operations of UTRGV, each program must develop its own evaluation of faculty. The following standards were developed by the faculty of the anthropology program based upon the rigors of the program and discipline.

Faculty members to be considered to be in good standing are expected to **meet expectations** in all three areas as defined by the faculty of the Anthropology Program.

The AFEC Chair and Department Chair will provide a written narrative highlighting the strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for improvements.

Faculty can appeal at each level.

A. Teaching

Exceeds Expectations: overall rating on teaching evaluations for period under review of **4.5**.

Meets Expectations: overall score on teaching evaluations for period under review of **4.0-4.49**

The annual review committee will also consider other teaching effectiveness measures such as peer evaluations and teaching enhancement activities to assess the faculty member's commitment to pedagogical innovation, efforts at professional development and commitment to student success. See list in V.B for teaching activities and enhancements.

B. Research/Scholarship

Faculty should indicate progress toward the Tenure and Promotion publication requirements in their Annual Review materials. This would include manuscripts in preparation, submitted and under review, undergoing revision for resubmission, and in press.

Exceeds Expectations equals TWO scholarship points for items from the following list plus evidence of progress toward the T&P publication requirement. The AFEC will consider both points and progress in their Annual Review.

- a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article (1 point)
- b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume (1 point)
- c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications (2-4 points, at the discretion of the evaluators)
- d. Peer-reviewed edited volume (2-4 points, at the discretion of the evaluators)
- e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book (4 points)
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive (1 point)
- g. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources, the majority of reviews must be positive (1/2 point)
- h. International- or national-level faculty research award (1/2 point)
- i. Regional, state, or local honor or award (1/4 point)
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.) (3/4 point)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide. (1 point)
- l. Research-related or applied activity not having resulted in publication, e.g., focus groups, ethnographic interviews, participant observation, visual anthropology, field work, surveys, excavation, life histories to total one hundred hours during the evaluation period. One hundred hours of effective activity is considered the equivalent of 1 refereed article = 1 point.
- m. Research report to agency or sponsor. (1 point)
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more = 1 point; less than 5000 words = ½ point)
- o. Presentation of scholarship at international or national conferences (1 point)
- p. Presentation of scholarship at regional or state academic conferences. (1/2 point)
- q. Book and film reviews published in recognized scholarly journals and platforms (e.g., H-net, AnthNews, AAA) (1/2 point)

Meets Expectations equals ONE scholarship point for items from the following list plus evidence of progress toward the T&P publication requirement. The AFEC will consider both points and progress in their Annual Review.

- a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article (1 point)
- b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume (1 point)
- c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications (2-4 points, at the discretion of the evaluators)
- d. Peer-reviewed edited volume (2-4 points, at the discretion of the evaluators)
- e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book (4 points)
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive (1 point)
- g. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources, the majority of reviews must be positive (1/2 point)
- h. International- or national-level faculty research award (1/2 point)
- i. Regional, state, or local honor or award (1/4 point)
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.) (3/4 point)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide. (1 point)
- l. Research-related or applied activity not having resulted in publication, e.g., focus groups, ethnographic interviews, participant observation, visual anthropology, field work, surveys, excavation, life histories to total one hundred hours during the evaluation period. One hundred hours of effective activity is considered the equivalent of 1 refereed article = 1 point.
- m. Research report to agency or sponsor. (1 point)
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more = 1 point; less than 5000 words = ½ point)
- o. Presentation of scholarship at international or national conferences (1 point)
- p. Presentation of scholarship at regional or state academic conferences. (1/2 point)
- q. Book and film reviews published in recognized scholarly journals and platforms (e.g., H-net, AnthNews, AAA) (1/2 point)

Service

Service is valued including active participation in **departmental, college, and/or university** committees, in community events and organizations, as well as to the discipline of anthropology.

Exceeds Expectations: overall score based on the service activities listed below 4.0-5.0

Meets Expectations: overall score based on the service activities listed below 3.0-3.99

Service to the Department

- Departmental or Program Committees .5
- Departmental or Program Committee Chair .75
- Departmental or Program Search Committee .75
- Departmental or Program Search Committee Chair 1.00
- Departmental Program Coordinator/Graduate Advisor 2.00
- Departmental Associate Chair 3.00
- Departmental Chair 4.00
- Research equipment and/or lab management .5
- Advisor to Anthropology Club or Lambda Alpha Honor Society .5
- Other administrative duties (explain)

Service to the College or University

- College/University Committee .75
- College /University Committee Chair 1.25
- College/University Search Committee 1.00
- College/University Search Committee Chair 1.5
- Faculty Senator .75
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee 1.0
- University Task Force
- Associate Dean 4.0

Service to the Profession

- Professional Association Member .1 (maximum total 1.00)
- Committee Member .75
- Committee Member Chair 1.25
- Journal manuscript/Grant Reviewer .5
- Journal Editor 2.00
- External reviewer for T&P at non-UTRGV institution 1.0
- Organizing, chairing, or discussant of a panel at an academic conference .5
- Officer of a professional organization 1.0
- Participation on boards and committees of professional organizations 1.0

Service to the Community

- Board Member .5
- Invited presentations, workshops, conferences, seminars within the community .5
- Active participation in community organization based on disciplinary expertise .5
- Professional consulting in community .5

Participation in community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g., HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA) .5

C. Summary Ratings for Annual Review (See section III.E)

Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory for each one of the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following:

- For a Summary Rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in an Annual Review a faculty member must exceed expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation.
- For a Summary Rating of **Meets Expectations** in an Annual Review, a faculty member must at least meet expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation, but not meet the standard for Exceeds Expectations.
- For a Summary Rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations** in an Annual Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.
- For a Summary Rating of **Unsatisfactory** in an Annual Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 2 categories of the evaluation.

E. Merit Evaluations

- As stated in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-502.5.a “The outcome of each faculty member’s annual performance evaluation will be used in determining the amount of merit awarded to the faculty member, should merit pay be available.”
- A faculty member who receives a summary evaluative rating of unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for annual yearly progress shall automatically receive the same evaluative rating for purposes of merit pay in that year. For the determination of summary ratings, see III.E. See section VI for details on Annual Review.

Tenure and Promotion

A. Procedure

All Tenure-track faculty members shall submit one review dossier annually for evaluation, as stated above in *Section I: Unified Dossier Submission*.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a complete tenure and promotion dossier adhering to University, Departmental, and Program requirements. Departmental mentors and the Department Chair should provide guidance in this process. Additional documentation may be requested by the Committee and/or Department Chair in the course of the evaluation process.

Tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually in accordance with UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures* ADM 06-502, ADM 06-504, and ADM 06-505. The evaluation of their first year of tenure track status will occur during the spring semester of their first year and during the fall semester of each year successively thereafter until the final tenure evaluation.

Each subsequent T&P evaluation shall be cumulative in nature, i.e., all relevant achievements and activities for the entire time the faculty member has been on tenure track, or in rank as a tenured faculty member, will be included in each year's annual evaluation file.

Each T&P evaluation shall describe, quantitatively and qualitatively, the candidate's annual yearly progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and/or promotion in the three areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. In making this assessment, the AFEC shall take into account the type of scholarly work being undertaken by the candidate, but it shall be the candidate's responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward tenure. This should be done in the *Applicant Statement and Self-Evaluation* and *Narrative Summaries* of the faculty member's dossier.

Tenure-track faculty shall be informed in writing of the AFEC's evaluation based on their performance as reflected in their dossier, in accordance with the departmental evaluation guidelines, along with an indication of the Committee's decision regarding whether the candidate is likely to complete the remaining probationary period. Each level of review (i.e., committee and chair) must include a written narrative highlighting strengths of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement, if deemed necessary, by the committee.

The Department Chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member annually after completion of the Chair's evaluation to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward the achievement of tenure, and the Chair is expected to facilitate this by providing guidance about strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for continued progress.

The fourth year of the tenure-track shall be a pre-tenure review. The AFEC and the Chair shall clearly state their assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and identify any remaining activities to be completed by the sixth year on the tenure track in order to receive a positive recommendation for tenure from the Annual Review Committee and Chair, respectively.

B. Evaluation Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion: Teaching

All faculty considered for promotion from **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor** AND for promotion from **Associate Professor to Full Professor** are required to meet the following requirements in teaching effectiveness:

1. An overall student evaluation rating of Meets Expectations using the program criteria for assessing Teaching Effectiveness on student evaluations stated in III.B.
2. Peer evaluations that attest to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
3. A range of diversified Teaching Activities/Enhancements undertaken throughout the candidate's probationary period. The program will consider the following when assessing teaching effectiveness:
 - a. Evidence of professional development in the area of teaching (attendance at workshops or other seminars on teaching development)
 - b. Contributions to curriculum and course development, such as designing and implementing learning outcomes assessments
 - c. Development and teaching of new courses, additions to curriculum, on-line courses, special problems courses, Learning Communities courses in cooperation with other departments, innovative teaching strategies (community service learning, field trips, study abroad, travels with students for academic or cultural purposes, creation of a lecture series, innovative teaching in classroom).
 - d. Mentoring of students
 - i. Mentoring Teaching Assistants
 - ii. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students who make presentations at state/region/national conferences
 - iii. Mentoring and supervision of undergraduate and graduate student research
 - iv. Graduate Thesis Committee member
 - v. Chair of Graduate Thesis Committee
 - vi. Chair of Undergraduate (Honors) Thesis Committee
 - vii. Undergraduate (Honors) Thesis Committee member

e. Development of substantial new curriculum materials or teaching methods, e.g., production or organization of slide/tape presentations, Blackboard course development, computer programs, lab exercises, field trips, workbooks, demonstrations, bibliographies of selected readings, substantial revisions or new preparations of existing courses, etc. Amount of time can be devoted to a single extensive project or distributed across a variety of smaller activities.

f. Awards and honors of teaching excellence

g. Continuing education in content area leading to certification

h. Guest lecturer at non-UTRGV institution or 3 guest lectures at UTRGV.

i. Commuting to teach to either the Brownsville or Edinburg campus to teach a course for one semester.

The above list is not exhaustive, nor are the items listed in any order or preference. Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the significance and impact of these activities in their review narratives.

C. Evaluation Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion: Research/Scholarship

All faculty considered for tenure and promotion from **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor** are required to meet the following requirements in professional achievement/scholarship/research:

1. Three (3) research/scholarly achievements which may be any combination of peer-reviewed articles in refereed journals, book chapters in refereed edited volumes with candidate as any author, and/or externally-funded grants that total $\geq \$10,000$ on which the faculty member serves as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel.

In combination with any ONE of the following peer-reviewed written products (total of FOUR written, scholarly products):

a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article

b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume

c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications

d. Peer-reviewed edited volume

e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book

f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive

- g. Submitted and funded research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources that total \geq \$10,000
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide.
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more)

Or

2. A peer-reviewed book (not textbook or edited book) that is an original research or theoretical contribution with candidate as author or co-author, and published by a scholarly publisher.

In combination with any ONE of the following peer-reviewed written products (total of TWO written, scholarly products):

- a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article
- b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume
- c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications
- d. Peer-reviewed edited volume
- e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive
- g. Submitted and funded research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources that total \geq \$10,000
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide.
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more)

The above list is not exhaustive. Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the significance and impact of the scholarly achievements in their review narratives.

3. External reviews of scholarship: In evaluating a candidate's contributions to scholarship and professional achievement, the AFEC will also consult letters from external reviewers. External reviewers will be selected using UTRGV university and Anthropology Program External Review policies.

Tenured faculty are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship agenda after the achievement of tenure. However, the trajectory and intensity of their professional activities may shift as a result of the expanded service and administrative commitments which tenured faculty are asked to perform for the university.

All faculty considered for promotion from **Associate Professor to Full Professor** are required to meet the following requirements in professional achievement/scholarship/research:

1. Three (3) research/scholarly achievements which may be any combination of peer-reviewed articles in refereed journals, book chapters in refereed edited volumes with candidate as any author, and/or externally funded grants that total $\geq \$10,000$ on which the faculty member serves as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel, realized since the faculty member's last promotion.

In combination with any ONE of the following peer-reviewed written products (total of FOUR written, scholarly products):

- a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article
- b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume
- c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications
- d. Peer-reviewed edited volume
- e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive
- g. Submitted and funded research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources that total $\geq \$10,000$
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide.
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more)

Or

2. A peer-reviewed book (not textbook or edited book) that is an original research or theoretical contribution with candidate as author or co-author, and published by a scholarly publisher.

In combination with any ONE of the following peer-reviewed written products (total of TWO written, scholarly products):

- a. Peer-reviewed scholarly article
- b. Peer-reviewed book chapter in edited volume
- c. Peer-reviewed college textbook published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications
- d. Peer-reviewed edited volume
- e. Scholarly peer-reviewed book
- f. Submitted and reviewed research or teaching grant proposal to national foundation or federal agency, the majority of reviews must be positive.
- g. Submitted and funded research or teaching proposal to state or regional agencies, private foundations or to internal sources that total \geq \$10,000
- j. Digital or audio-visual scholarship that requires discipline-related expertise. Digital Scholarship denotes the use of *digital tools, methods, and models* to support and enhance scholarly inquiry and the dissemination of research. This may take the form of online databases and archives, digital models and virtual reality, the development of digital tools, and web-based exhibits or other forms of public education, among others. (Digital scholarship does NOT mean maintaining a blog, faculty website or administering a departmental website.)
- k. International or national exhibition of scholarship that includes a written exhibit guide.
- n. Peer-reviewed encyclopedia and reference book entries (5000 words or more)

The list is not exhaustive. Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the significance and impact of the scholarly achievements in the review narratives.

3. External reviews of scholarship: In evaluating a candidate's contributions to scholarship and professional achievement, the AFEC will also consult letters from external reviewers. External reviewers will be selected using UTRGV university and Anthropology Program External Review policies.

D. Evaluation Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion: Service

Service is valued including active participation in program, departmental, college, and/or university committees and events as well as to the discipline of anthropology or other related fields in which candidate works (i.e., history, public health). The minimum service requirements to meet expectations for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor** are **below**. AND for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Full Professor**, it is expected that the candidate demonstrate **University-level leadership**.

An overall score of at least 3.0 ("meets expectations"), over the course of her/his probationary period, in annual reviews in the category of professional service.

Exceeds Expectations: overall score based on the service activities listed below 4.0-5.0

Meets Expectations: overall score based on the service activities listed below 3.0-3.99

Service to the Department

- Departmental or Program Committees .5
- Departmental or Program Committee Chair .75
- Departmental or Program Search Committee .75
- Departmental or Program Search Committee Chair 1.00
- Departmental Program Coordinator/Graduate Advisor 2.00
- Departmental Associate Chair 3.00
- Departmental Chair 4.00
- Research equipment and/or lab management .5
- Advisor to Anthropology Club or Lambda Alpha Honor Society .5
- Other administrative duties (explain)

Service to the College or University

- College/University Committee .75
- College /University Committee Chair 1.25
- College/University Search Committee 1.00
- College/University Search Committee Chair 1.5
- Faculty Senator .75
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee 1.0
- University Task Force
- Associate Dean 4.0

Service to the Profession

- Professional Association Member .1 (maximum total 1.00)
- Committee Member .75
- Committee Member Chair 1.25
- Journal manuscript/Grant Reviewer .5
- Journal Editor 2.00
- External reviewer for T&P at non-UTRGV institution 1.0
- Organizing, chairing, or discussant of a panel at an academic conference .5
- Officer of a professional organization 1.0
- Participation on boards and committees of professional organizations 1.0

Service to the Community

Board Member .5

Invited presentations, workshops, conferences, seminars within the community .5

Active participation in community organization based on disciplinary expertise .5

Professional consulting in community .5

Participation in community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g., HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA) .5

The above lists are not exhaustive.

Post-tenure Review

All tenured faculty will be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty performed every six years following the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post tenure review. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, the review may be delayed with the approval of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If the post tenure review cycle coincides with the faculty member's application for promotion, the latter will be considered as a concurrent application for post tenure review. Any recommending entity that recommends for promotion shall be deemed to have given an equivalent recommendation for PTR. If a recommending entity recommends against promotion, then that entity should make of the other three additional recommendations provided below:

- a. The faculty member exceeds expectations and no further action is warranted.
- b. The faculty member meets expectations and no further action is warranted.
- c. The faculty member does not meet expectations as there are areas of serious concern that justify a meeting among the faculty member, department chair, and dean to address these areas of concern.

Faculty can appeal at each level.

Workload distributions vary greatly among tenured faculty. Some faculty continue on a heavy research path with little change in teaching or service. Other tenured faculty take on much greater service loads that can slow research/scholarship productivity. These different post-tenure trajectories should be taken into account by the reviewers in the post-tenure review process.

Faculty must have received Exceed Expectations or Meet Expectations evaluation in the areas of teaching and service in the previous five Annual Reviews. With respect to Research/Scholarship, the following apply:

Meets expectations: No fewer than 5 scholarship points from the a-q list (see Annual Review section) over the five year period.

Exceeds expectations: No fewer than 8 scholarship points from the a-q list (see Annual Review section) over the five year period.

Workload Policy

The Anthropology Program values the efforts of its faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. In order to better ensure a more equitable distribution of teaching and scholarship faculty workloads, the following POLICY on faculty workload will be used within the Anthropology Program.

1. This policy applies only to Tenured Faculty. All Tenure-Track faculty are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship program and produce published works on a regular basis in line with department/program standards leading to tenure. Lecturer faculty are hired to provide important capacity to meet teaching needs and this policy does not apply to them.
2. This policy is based on the annual reviews of the THREE previous academic years and thus will be updated annually as part of the College level review (i.e., Spring) for the next academic year.
3. Criteria are based on the Departmental/Program Criteria for Annual Review in the area of Research/Scholarship only. These Departmental/Program Criteria must have been approved by the UTRGV administration for annual review evaluation.

Criteria then are the following:

A faculty member on the 18 hour annual Research Workload (teaching load of 9 credits per term) whose Annual Review recommendations in the area of Research/Scholarship EXCEED or MEET EXPECTATIONS over two of three consecutive years, **and** does **not** have any recommendations of “UNSATISFACTORY” over said three year period **and** who has produced at least three (3) scholarly products, one (1) of which **must** be a peer reviewed publication in print or in press, or its equivalent², during the three year review period may continue on the research workload. Accepted publications can only be claimed once, either “in press” or “in print” but not both.

² This would include demonstrated evidence of progress towards a major publication such as a book, a grant which received peer evaluation whether or not it was funded, etc. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit this evidence.

A faculty member whose Annual Review recommendation does not meet these criteria will be placed on a 24 hour annual Teaching Track load (teaching load of 12 credits per term) for a period of at least one academic year.

Any tenured faculty member on the Research Track may elect to be on a Teaching Track workload. These assignments will be for one (1) academic year, at a minimum.

4. A faculty member on the Teaching Track may return to the Research Track workload by:
 - a. submitting a proposal detailing a research plan that will allow them to meet research track expectations in their annual reviews to their Chairperson and Dean. Upon approval by the Chair and Dean, the faculty member may return to the Research Track workload.
 - b. Showing that their scholarship MEETS or EXCEEDS expectations for their department/program Annual Review criteria for scholarship for the previous three years during the annual review process and that they have met the criteria in bullet 3 above.

Each department chair/program coordinator will assign faculty to teaching load based on these criteria unless the department/program has criteria more exacting than these as part of the department/program policies.