

**BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY**

Approved by Department Faculty on May 2, 2016;
Approved by the College of Liberal Arts on July 25, 2016
Approved by Dean of Faculties Office on July 25, 2016

Article I. Purpose and Intent

Anthropology is the holistic study of human biology and culture. By its very nature, anthropological research (archaeology, cultural anthropology, and biological anthropology) is interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and is concerned with human diversity, both physical and cultural, throughout the world.

Standard of Excellence

The Department expects its faculty to achieve excellence in research, teaching, and service. All faculty members are expected to serve on Departmental, College, or University committees as a part of their service requirement. The Department supports candidates for merit salary raises and promotion and tenure whose records combine achievement in all three areas, with the largest weight on scholarship. More information about the department's expectations for promotion and tenure can be found in Appendix I, Departmental Guidelines for Faculty Tenure and Promotion.

The Department of Anthropology at Texas A&M University includes Faculty studying humans from a wide variety of perspectives. As an academic unit within the College of Liberal Arts, Anthropology is responsible for educating undergraduate students and graduate students. This includes (1) undergraduates who are meeting their core curriculum requirements in creative arts; language, philosophy and culture; life and physical sciences; social and behavioral sciences; (2) undergraduate students completing Anthropology majors, Anthropology minors, or Museum Studies minors; and (3) graduate students at the MA, MS and PhD levels. Members of the Anthropology Faculty conduct research around the world, often with student participation. Finally, the Anthropology Faculty participates actively in the governance of the College and the University.

Within the Department, some Faculty members have close affiliations with the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA), the Center for Maritime Archaeology and Conservation (CMAC), and the Center for the Study of the First Americans (CSFA). As research organizations, INA, CMAC and CSFA provide research opportunities for Faculty and students of anthropology.

The Faculty of the Department of Anthropology established these Bylaws to provide guidance for the governance of the Department. The Bylaws are consistent with the principle of representative government by the Faculty, including student representation where appropriate, and are consistent with the rules and regulations of the Board of Regents of the University and the laws of the State of Texas.

Article II. Membership

- A. All persons holding full-time, part-time, visiting, and adjunct academic appointments in the Department with the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor, Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, or Instructor are members of the Faculty of the Department.
- B. Voting Faculty. The Voting Faculty includes all Faculty of the Department who hold tenure, tenure-track, or academic professional track appointments (i.e. instructional or research professors of any rank), as well as full-time Lecturers. This includes Faculty who hold joint appointments with other departments or administrative units of the University. Emeritus Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Graduate Assistants, and Adjunct Faculty of any rank have the privilege of the floor in Department Meetings, but do not vote. Unless otherwise stated in their appointment letters, responsibilities of the Voting Faculty in the governance of the Department include participation in Faculty Meetings, service on committees, review of graduate applications, preparation of annual review of professional accomplishments, preparation of supporting documentation for promotion and tenure consideration, and preparation of supporting documentation for post-tenure review.
- C. Adjunct Faculty. Any Voting Faculty member may recommend an-Adjunct Faculty member to the Department. Nominations and/or personal requests must be submitted to the Executive Committee in writing and must include a current curriculum vitae. With a favorable vote of the Faculty, adjunct appointments are forwarded to the College Dean and Dean of Faculties for final approval. Adjunct faculty who serve on Graduate Committees must also be approved by the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies (OGAPS). An Adjunct Faculty member must have a doctorate, be collaborating with at least one current faculty member, or otherwise be providing a service to the Department. In most instances, Adjunct Faculty will hold a faculty position at another university. Members of the faculty will review all adjunct appointments annually to ensure that the adjunct faculty appointment is continuing to benefit the department. In the event that the appointment is no longer necessary, the appointment will be terminated.

Article III. Departmental Programs

Programs within the Department recognize that, as a diverse discipline, some Departmental decisions should be made or reviewed by those Faculty whose teaching and research falls primarily within a particular subdiscipline of anthropology. For the purposes of these Bylaws, Departmental Programs include Archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology, and Nautical Archaeology.

- A. Membership. Faculty members have primary affiliation and voting privileges in the Program to which they were hired.
- B. Program Coordinator. Faculty in each Program will elect a Coordinator by a secret ballot; in general the Coordinator will be a tenured Faculty member in the Program. The tenure requirement may be waived by vote of the Program members. Program Coordinators comprise the Department Executive Committee.

C. Duties and Functions. Each Program has the following responsibilities:

1. Electing a Program Coordinator and representatives to all standing committees every year. Committee members are encouraged to serve on the same committee for at least two years.
2. Reviewing graduate applications. Graduate Student Applications will be divided according to the area of research indicated in the application, and each Program will review the applications and accept the students applying to their Program.
3. Reviewing applications for graduate assistantships from students in their Program and reporting their selections to the Academic Advisor, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Graduate Committee. Graduate Assistants Research (GAR) are selected by the Programs, Centers, Project Directors, or endowment holders. Graduate Assistants Teaching (GAT) are selected by the program, and recommendations are referred to the Graduate Committee. See V: B: 2: f.
4. Reviewing and voting on the recommendations of a Search Committee created to recruit a new Faculty member in their Program and communicating that vote to the whole Faculty.
5. Reviewing and approving new course proposals and curriculum plans, and coordinating class schedules with the Academic Advisor each semester for the Program.
6. Conducting annual reviews of graduate students each spring, and forwarding those reviews to the Graduate Committee.

Article IV. Officers

A. Department Head

The Department Head is appointed by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts in accordance with College and University Policy. The Department Head is the chief executive officer of the Department. In addition to those duties assigned by the Dean, the Department Head has the following duties:

1. Administrative. The Department Head represents the Department at official functions; promotes the Department Academic Programs and research activities; presides at Department Meetings; calls for nominations for election to Departmental, College, and University committees; hires new and replacement staff; supervises the clerical staff; conducts annual reviews of all Faculty; oversees tenure and promotion considerations; and encourages Faculty Development.

At the discretion of the Department Head one or more Associate Heads can be appointed. Duties and service conditions as well as monetary compensation, or course reduction, if any, will be stipulated at the time of the appointment. Each

Associate Head serves at the pleasure of the Head and, when designated, serves as the acting Department Head whenever the Department Head is unavailable and exercises authority for matters delegated by the Department Head.

2. **Communication.** The Department Head shall consult with the Executive Committee regarding programmatic and Departmental issues, including annual reviews of all Faculty, and strategic plans.
3. **Curricular.** The Department Head consults with the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees regarding developmental and long-range plans concerning the undergraduate and graduate curricula, graduate admissions, course scheduling, and program development.
4. **Budgetary.** The Department Head prepares the annual preliminary budget in consultation with the Executive Committee; presents an annual budget report to the Faculty; supervises Department expenditures; allocates appropriate salary increases to individual Faculty and staff in consultation with the Executive Committee; seeks gifts and grants for the Department; and recommends appropriate budgetary resources, including Faculty salary increases and competitive pay scales, Departmental operating expenses, and graduate assistantship concerns to the Dean.
5. **Reporting.** The Department Head reports to the Department and the Curriculum Committee the funding available for graduate assistantships and the number of graduate assistants to be selected each semester.
6. **Acting Head.** When the Department Head is unavailable an acting head will be designated by the Head, the chair of the Executive Committee or the Dean. Normally an acting head will be selected from the Executive Committee, if the Associate Head is not available.

B. Program Coordinators

Coordinators are elected by the Faculty of each Program as described in Article III, Section B.

Duties. The Coordinator chairs meetings of program faculty, including meetings to review graduate admissions and graduate assistantship applications; recommends Chairs for Promotion and Tenure Committees and Search Committees; represents the interests of the Program; and serves on the Executive Committee.

C. Director of Graduate Studies and Associate Director of Graduate Studies

The Director of Graduate Studies and Associate Director of Graduate Studies are appointed by the Department Head, in consultation with members of the Executive Committee.

Duties. The Director of Graduate Studies serves on the Graduate Instruction Committee of the College of Liberal Arts, and chairs the department's Graduate Committee. The

Director and Associate Director of Graduate Studies coordinate processes related to graduate admissions and recruitment; graduate funding decisions; graduate student awards nominations; annual reviews of graduate students and graduate instructors; and the preparation of reports related to the graduate program. Most of these tasks also involve members of the Graduate Committee and/or the Assessment Coordinator.

D. Director of Undergraduate Studies

The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Department Head, in consultation with members of the Executive Committee.

Duties. The Director of Undergraduate Studies serves on the Undergraduate Instruction Committee of the College of Liberal Arts, and chairs the department's Undergraduate Committee. The Director of Undergraduate Studies coordinates processes related to undergraduate recruitment, undergraduate funding and award decisions, undergraduate course proposals, undergraduate events, and the preparation of relevant reports. Most of these tasks also involve members of the Undergraduate Committee and/or the Assessment Coordinator.

E. Assessment Coordinator

The Assessment Coordinator is appointed by the Department Head, in consultation with members of the Executive Committee. The Assessment Coordinator serves as the department representative to the Assessment Committee of the College of Liberal Arts.

Duties. The Assessment Coordinator coordinates the department's assessment process, revises assessment procedures as required (in consultation with Undergraduate Committee, Graduate Committee, and Faculty), and prepares annual assessment reports for the university.

F. Placement Coordinator

The Placement Coordinator is appointed by the Department Head, in consultation with members of the Executive Committee.

Duties. The Placement Coordinator mentors graduate students on the academic job market, reviews job application materials, coordinates relevant departmental events, and maintains placement records of graduates.

Article V. Departmental Committees

Service on Departmental Committees is open to all Faculty members, with the exception of Promotion and Tenure Committees reviewing tenure-track or tenured faculty, which are only open to tenured faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.

A. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall advise the Department Head. The Committee also serves as a liaison between the Faculty and the Department Head.

1. Selection of Members and Chair. The Executive Committee shall consist of the four Program Coordinators and the Director of CSFA and CMAC as non-voting members. If a Program Coordinator will be off campus or on Faculty Development Leave, the Coordinator or the Program shall appoint a substitute. Annually, the Committee shall select a Chair in September from the four Program Coordinators.
2. Duties and Responsibilities. The Executive Committee advises the Department Head on Departmental administration, budget, and planning. The Department Head may also charge the committee with specific tasks. Results of the Committee's deliberations are normally presented to the Faculty at Departmental Faculty Meetings for further discussion, debate, and decision. Additional duties of the Committee include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Any member of the Executive Committee may serve as acting Department Head whenever the Department Head is unavailable, and exercises authority for matters delegated by the Department Head.
 - b. Review budget projections with the Department Head and making recommendations for allocation of Departmental Operating Expenses;
 - c. Review the annual reports of all faculty and the individual faculty ratings produced by the department head, and meet with the department head to discuss the department head's recommendations. The committee will review annual reports submitted by faculty, the performance review letters prepared by the Department Head, and the faculty ratings prepared by the Department Head. As part of this process, the Executive Committee will also recommend faculty who should be considered meritorious in the areas of research, teaching and service; faculty who may be considered below expectations in those areas; and faculty who should be nominated for internal and external awards. Merit raises will then be decided by the department head after consultation with the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee's annual review of faculty will serve as the department's method for conducting post-tenure reviews, as required by Texas A&M. The Executive Committee will also advise the head on cases where a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory review. A professional review will be initiated after three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews, or earlier in the event that the Executive Committee and Department Head agree that a professional review is necessary. (Procedures for professional review are described in SAP 12.06.99.MO.01 on Post-Tenure Review.)
 - d. Review strategic plans for the Department;
 - e. Review requests for Adjunct Faculty appointments;
 - f. Consider Faculty, Staff, and student issues brought to the committee and attempt to mediate disputes.

B. Graduate Committee.

The Graduate Committee reviews new graduate courses, changes in degree requirements, monitors graduate student progress, makes recommendations for student teaching assignments and awards, and course scheduling.

1. **Selection of Members and Chair.** The Graduate Committee shall include one Faculty member from each Program. Faculty in each Program will elect a Representative annually by a secret ballot listing all Faculty in the Program, excluding the Coordinator. If a Program Representative will be off campus or on Faculty Development Leave, either the Representative or the Program shall provide a substitute. The Director of Graduate Studies serves as the Chair of the Graduate Committee.
2. **Duties and Responsibilities.** The Graduate Committee addresses issues relating to curriculum planning, Graduate Programs, the review of graduate student applications, recommendations for graduate student awards, and the annual review of graduate students. The committee also consults with the Assessment Coordinator on issues related to graduate program assessment. The Department Head may also charge the committee with specific tasks. Results of the Committee's deliberations are normally presented to the Faculty at Departmental Faculty Meetings for further discussion, debate, and decision. Additional duties of the Committee include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Reviewing and approving new course proposals and 689 courses that have been approved by the Programs;
 - b. Reviewing and recommending changes to graduate degree requirements and certificate programs proposed by the Programs;
 - c. Working with Academic Adviser to schedule courses;
 - d. Recruiting prospective students, receiving Program recommendations for fellowships, and selecting applicants for Merit, Diversity, Vision 2020, and other awards;
 - e. Awarding graduate student funding for pilot dissertation research and conference travel;
 - f. Reviewing Graduate Assistant Teaching (GAT) applications and the recommendations from each Program. The committee reports the committee's final recommendations, based on available funding, to the Department Head for budgetary review and consultation with the Executive Committee to resolve any conflicts and make final approval;

- g. Coordinating annual reviews of graduate students by each Program each spring.

C. Undergraduate Committee

The Undergraduate Committee reviews new undergraduate courses and changes in degree requirements, and makes recommendations for student teaching assignments, awards, and course scheduling.

1. Selection of Members and Chair. The Committee shall include one Faculty member from each Program. Faculty in each Program will elect a Representative annually by a secret ballot listing all Faculty in the Program, excluding the Coordinator. If a Program Representative will be off campus or on Faculty Development Leave, either the Representative or the Program shall provide a substitute. The Director of Undergraduate Studies serves as the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee.
2. Duties and Responsibilities. The Undergraduate Committee addresses issues relating to curriculum planning, undergraduate programs, undergraduate student awards and prizes, and undergraduate program assessment. The Department Head may also charge the committee with specific tasks. Results of the Committee's deliberations are normally presented to the Faculty at Departmental Faculty Meetings for further discussion, debate, and decision. Additional duties of the Committee include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Reviewing and approving new course proposals and 489 courses that have been approved by the Programs;
 - b. Reviewing and recommending changes to undergraduate degree requirements and certificate programs proposed by the Programs;
 - c. Working with Academic Adviser to schedule courses; and
 - d. Selecting students for Undergraduate Research Awards, Undergraduate Research prize, and other awards.

D. Climate and Inclusion Committee

The Climate and Inclusion Committee acts to promote activities within the department that encourage multiculturalism, climate and diversity.

1. Selection of Members and Chair. The Committee shall include one Faculty member from each Program and a member of the Department Staff. Faculty in each Program will elect a Representative annually, excluding the Coordinator and faculty who will be on leave. A representative for each of the graduate student body and the undergraduate students shall be elected by online survey from a ballot of self-nominees. Emails calling for nominations will be sent to all students in September each year. Faculty and staff representatives should be selected in April of each year, and the Committee shall elect a Chair in May for the following academic year.

2. Duties and Responsibilities. The Climate and Inclusion Committee addresses issues relating to curriculum planning, faculty and student recruiting that are affected by diversity, equity, and climate. The Department Head may also charge the committee with specific tasks. Results of the Committee's deliberations are normally presented to the Faculty at Departmental Faculty Meetings for further discussion, debate, and decision.

E. Promotion and Tenure Committees

Tenure and Promotion Committees review tenure-track Faculty annually, candidates for the award of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, candidates for promotion from Associate to Professor, and promotion for academic professional-track Faculty.

1. Selection of Members and Chair. Committees reviewing academic professional-track positions for promotion shall consist of all Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Committees reviewing tenure-track Faculty and candidates for the award of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor shall consist of all tenured Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Committees reviewing candidates for promotion from Associate to Professor shall consist of all tenured Faculty at the rank of Professor. The Department Head does not serve on Tenure and Promotion Committees, but may be invited by the committee to provide needed information. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will select a Chair. The Chair shall arrange for meetings and then notify the appropriate faculty members in writing, as well as by e-mail about such meetings. The Chair is responsible for writing the Summary Report for each candidate. For each candidate being evaluated, the Program Coordinator shall recommend a Sub-Committee Chair for Research to the Department Head. The Sub-Committee Chair for Research will coordinate the various reports to evaluate that candidate.
2. Duties and Responsibilities. All reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the Texas A&M University, *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion 12.01.99.M2*, the Dean of Faculties', *Tenure and Promotion Packages Submission Guidelines* (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/promotion_and_tenure/tamu_pt_guidelines_1.pdf), the College of Liberal Arts, *Procedures for Review, Tenure and Promotion* (<http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/Guidelines%20By%20College/LIBA/AN-College-of-Liberal-Arts.pdf>), and the Department's *Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion* (http://anthropology.tamu.edu/images/ANTH_TP_Revised_Guidelines_April_2013_FINAL.pdf) (Also, see Appendix I). Votes shall be carried out by secret ballot. The Anthropology Department allows absentee voting on tenure/promotion only when the absent Faculty member has reviewed the relevant files. If this is not the case, as determined by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, then that person is not eligible to vote. Within 24 hours of the meeting where a vote on tenure/promotion is taken, absentee votes will be counted.

Absentee votes are to be in writing, including e-mails sent from by the absentee voter to either the Head of the Department, or the coordinator of the absent faculty member's program. Votes are to be cast for specific individuals clearly identified in the written vote. Proxy votes, to be cast as determined by a second party, are not eligible. Emeritus, Visiting Faculty and Adjunct Faculty do not have voting privileges on matters concerning tenure and promotion.

The responsibilities of the Committee include:

- e. Working with the Department Head to arrange for external review letters for each candidate for tenure or promotion;
- f. Assigning Sub-Committee Chairs for Teaching, Research, and Service reports;
- g. Reviewing all documentation provided by the candidate;
- h. Meeting to review, discuss, revise, and vote on each report and the summary report;
- i. Communicating the results of the evaluation to the Department Head.

F. Search Committees

Search Committees conduct searches for new Faculty members whether or not it is a temporary replacement position or tenure-track position.

1. Selection of Members and Chair. The Program Coordinator from the Program recruiting a new Faculty member will recommend a Search Committee Chair to the Department Head. Four additional members shall be appointed to the Search Committee (one from each Program) by the Department Head after consulting with each Program. Members serve until the search is completed. Search committees for temporary non-tenure track positions will consist of the Department Head or designate and two faculty.
2. Duties and Responsibilities. The Search Committee is responsible for all stages of the search from advertisement through presenting final recommendations to the Program and the Faculty. Specific tasks include:
 - a. Preparing an announcement of the position and ensuring that it is widely disseminated and contacting colleagues and potential applicants about the vacancy;
 - b. Reviewing applications and notifying applicants of their status during the search;
 - c. Providing updates of the progress of the search at each Departmental Faculty Meeting held during the search;

- d. Providing the Faculty with summary information about each candidate;
- e. Soliciting letters of recommendation for candidates as needed;
- f. Handling all arrangements and scheduling for on campus visits by candidates; and
- g. Finalizing hiring recommendations in consultation with the Program hiring the member, and communicating the recommendation to the whole Faculty for discussion and action.

The search committee makes a recommendation to the department, and Voting Faculty vote on new hires following voting procedures outlined in Departmental Procedures for Making Decisions. The Anthropology Department allows absentee voting on new hires only when the absent Faculty member has reviewed the relevant files. Emeritus, Visiting Faculty and Adjunct Faculty do not have voting privileges on matters concerning new hires.

Article VI. Departmental Meetings

- A. The Department will hold at least two Faculty Meetings each semester. The Department Head will provide an Agenda for each meeting. Faculty meeting agendas will correspond to the department's Procedures for Making Decisions. (See Appendix II.)
- B. Special Faculty Meetings may be called by the Department Head as needed. Normally these meetings will be dedicated to a single topic that is too complex or time-consuming to be handled during the regular Faculty Meetings.
- C. Faculty Meetings are open to all Faculty without regard to rank.
- D. The Graduate Student Council (GSC) representative shall serve as a liaison with the Faculty and attend Faculty Meetings. The representative may not be present when graduate students, faculty evaluations, or personnel matters are discussed.
- E. On formal matters concerning curriculum, Faculty searches, and when other formal votes are taken, only Voting Faculty shall have voting rights. In straw polls, advisory votes, and informal faculty resolutions, all Faculty and the graduate student representative may vote. All Faculty and the graduate student have the right to participate in discussions and debates prior to formal votes. All decisions regarding personnel (hiring, promotion and tenure) will be by secret ballot. Provisions will be made for absentee balloting as needed.
- F. Recommendations of the Department's Executive, Curriculum, and Search Committees will be brought before the whole Faculty for discussion and debate prior to their implementation by the Department Head.

Article VII. Amendments

Amendments to the Bylaws may be proposed by any Voting Faculty member and must be provided in writing to the Executive Committee. After reviewing the Amendment(s), the

Executive Committee will present the Amendment(s) to the Department at a regular Faculty Meeting along with their recommendations.

Appendix I

Departmental Guidelines for Faculty Tenure and Promotion

Guidelines for tenure-track and tenured faculty approved by the Department April 7, 2013
Guidelines for academic professional track faculty approved by the Department May 2, 2016

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Anthropology's Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for assessing candidates for tenure and promotion to associate and full professor. It takes into account the candidates' academic record, with a respective weight of 50, 30, and 20 given to research, teaching, and service. For promotion to associate professor, the committee is composed of all tenured faculty of the department. For promotion to full professor, the committee is restricted to full professors. The committee is called into active service at four occasions: 1) to conduct an annual review of assistant professors; 2) to undertake a detailed mid-term evaluation of the progress toward tenure and promotion by assistant professors (normally in the 3rd year of their appointment); 3) to carry out a review of untenured assistant professors being considered for promotion and tenure (normally in the 6th year of their appointment); 4) to conduct a formal review of associate professors who are being considered for promotion to full professor. There is no standard period of time between the two promotions. Prior to such a review, candidates may submit their CV and Personal Statement to the full professors of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for an informal evaluation of their readiness to begin proceedings for promotion to full professor.

The department recommends that all candidates for tenure and promotion also refer to university and college guidelines on Tenure and Promotion, available on the Dean of Faculties website:

- University Rule, 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion;
- University Rule, 12.01.99.M2 – Appendix I. Examples of Criteria That May be Employed in Evaluation of Faculty;
- Office of the Dean of Faculties Tenure and Promotion Packages Submission Guidelines; and
- College of Liberal Arts Review, Tenure and Promotion Procedures.

Generally, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have strong records in all three categories: teaching, research, and service. According to University Rules on Tenure & Promotion, however, exceptions to these normal requirements may sometimes be warranted. In such cases, candidates should clarify that they are seeking promotion on the basis of this exception clause.

TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

Scholarship

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate.

By the mid-tenure review, the candidate would be expected to have a peer-reviewed publication track record related to the dissertation, and to have a new research direction identified beyond the dissertation as evidenced by fieldwork, grants, and/or progress on refereed journal articles or a second book project.

By the tenure review, successful candidates have historically produced a substantial corpus of publications, including articles in highly regarded, peer-reviewed journals and/or a book in a university press (or the equivalent) to obtain tenure. If a candidate's publications include a monograph with a reputable university or commercial press, then fewer research articles are expected. However, candidates should not expect that they will gain tenure by publishing a book only. Similarly, if the candidate generated significant amount of funding from peer-reviewed grants and fellowships, the number of expected research articles will be less. Refereed book chapters will also be taken into consideration in assessing a candidate's research record. Peer reviewed publications resulting from invited specialized conferences in which the invitation itself to participate indicates the writer's prominence in that research topic are also of value in this regard, as well as long-term fieldwork, conservation analysis, and success in generating substantial contracts.

The number of publications is not the only measure of a candidate's scholarly record. The preponderance of a candidate's publications should be in appropriate and highly ranked journals and presses in their particular field. The review process will factor in the quality and ranking of publication venues according to the ISI Impact Factor and other measures. In some programs, appropriate journals do not have impact factors. In that case, other measures of quality would be useful. This might include evidence that articles published in this journal have impacted the field or evidence that other highly regarded scholars have published in the journal. For presses of published books of the candidate, contextual information may be of use, such as whether the book is part of a notable series in the field or whether other important scholars have published significant books in the press. The reputation of the candidate as an influential scholar in the field is a significant factor in tenure consideration. This is evidenced by external reviewers assessing the candidate's research record as well as by citations by others of the candidate's publications. Additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly reputation includes honors and awards of published work, and invitations to present research at other universities.

Given the diversity of programs within the department and of the disciplinary backgrounds of its faculty, including joint appointments, it is recognized that some candidates publish in interdisciplinary journals and journals specific to the field/discipline of their research interest,

rather than in “mainline” anthropology journals (whether biological, archaeological, or cultural). In these cases, the ranking of the publication venues will be used that is standard in the field/discipline of the candidate’s research interests as agreed by the tenured professors of the individual programs, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and in consultation with interdisciplinary program directors in the case of joint appointments.

It is also recognized that co-authored publications, edited works, and site monographs (all peer reviewed) play a greater role as evidence of progress toward tenure in some programs than in others. A peer-reviewed book that qualifies as a final excavation report may be considered equivalent to a single authored book, once the role of the candidate as principal investigator is established. In cases of co-authored publications, it is the candidates’ responsibility to document their contribution toward conceptualizing, funding, implementing, analyzing, and writing up the work. Candidates’ contributions, along with significance of position in order of authorship, may be documented through ‘statements of contribution’ provided by the candidates, preferably with the explicit consent of the senior author of the publication. Candidates may opt to have co-authors provide support letters documenting the candidate’s contribution to co-authored publications.

In all instances, the overall research and publication record of the candidate needs to show a coherent trajectory that goes well beyond the dissertation. The quality of the record will be assessed by tenured members of the candidate’s program and department, as well as by external reviewers associated with the respective disciplinary fields of the candidate’s program and the candidate’s research interests. For faculty with joint appointments, external reviewers will be drawn from the respective fields of the department and the relevant program.

Promotion to Full Professor

Similar to promotion to associate professor with tenure, candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate. All of the statements for the first promotion apply to the second promotion. There is no standard period of time between the two promotions. Candidates considered for promotion to full professor will have achieved an outstanding body of publications based on an active research agenda that extends beyond the first promotion. By the time the candidate comes up for the second promotion, his/her overall research record should represent a coherent and significant research contribution to the candidate’s discipline, and he/she should have gained a national/international reputation as an expert in his/her area of specialty. Indications of this reputation, such as citations by others of the candidate’s works, will be taken into account as will the evaluations of external reviewers who have expertise in the candidate’s research field. Also important are major external grant and fellowship funding received for research. The quality of the record will be assessed by full professors of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, as well as by external reviewers with expertise in the respective disciplinary field of the candidate’s program.

Teaching

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A meritorious record in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is important to be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance will be based on course syllabi, student evaluations (both numerical scores and written statements), and in-class peer reviews by Tenure and Promotion Committee members. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes developing a breadth of teaching experience at lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, creation of new courses (or major revisions of existing ones), usage of innovative and effective new teaching methods, receipt of teaching awards, and other relevant evidence. The record of graduate advising at the master's and doctoral levels will also be taken into account when assessing the candidate's teaching performance. For faculty with joint appointments, the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee will take into account the time and effort that goes into teaching for both units, though the review will focus on courses taught in the Anthropology Department.

Promotion to Full Professor

In the case of candidates for promotion to full professor, the high standards of teaching expected for the promotion to associate professor continue to be relevant. At this stage the candidate is expected to have mentored a significant number of graduate students (M.A. /Ph.D.). In this regard, the committee will consider the extent to which the candidate's graduate students have successfully generated external funding for their research, participated in scholarly conferences, published their work, completed their degrees, and secured professional positions. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes publication of textbooks and other instructional material, peer reviewed grants for teaching, and other relevant evidence.

Service

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for promotion to associate professor will usually have a record of service primarily to the department. This is in the form of membership in departmental standing or *ad hoc* committees. Service on committees includes attendance and active participation. The candidate is also likely to have advised student organizations and participated in mentoring programs that serve students. For faculty with joint appointments, the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee will take into account the time and effort that goes into service for both units, though the review will focus on service conducted in the Anthropology Department.

Promotion to Full Professor

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have contributed to the governance of the department, college, and university. Candidates are also expected to have a record of service to professional organizations within the candidates' discipline (elected or appointed office, committee membership). As relevant, candidates may also have a record of service to the broader public (community organizations, public lectures, popular articles) that relates to their professional expertise. The candidate's presence on editorial boards of highly ranked scholarly journals and presses, participation in grant review panels, scholarly awards of achievement by professional groups, and other similar indices will also be taken into consideration.

ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK (APT) FACULTY

Candidates for promotion to instructional associate professor or instructional professor are expected to have made significant contributions in teaching and any particular scholarship or service roles as defined in their position descriptions. Review for promotion to instructional associate professor normally occurs after a minimum of five years in the department, while review for promotion to instructional full professor typically happens after a minimum of five years of service at the rank of instructional associate professor.

Teaching

Promotion to instructional associate professor is based largely on meritorious teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following criteria:

- Strong teaching performance, as demonstrated by peer evaluation, student evaluation and student outcomes;
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as shown by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes;
- Evidence of very high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments;
- Successful development of new courses or major revising of existing courses;
- Effective coordination of a multi-section course;
- Demonstrated success in service as departmental undergraduate program director (which could also be included as a service activity if appropriate);
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness;
- Earning competitive grant funding for teaching;
- Participation in University Honors or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students;
- Offering high-impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, field school, critical-thinking seminars, Freshman seminars, senior honors theses);
- Selection for a college or university outstanding teacher award.

Promotion to instructional full professor is based on demonstrated excellence in teaching, as measured by some combination of the following criteria:

- Outstanding teaching performance, as demonstrated by peer evaluation, student evaluation, and student outcomes;
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence;
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials;
- Receipt of external grant support for teaching/learning projects;
- Recognition through awards for success in teaching;
- Significant contribution to the professional development of students;
- Outstanding performance as departmental undergraduate program director (which could also be included as a service activity if appropriate);

- Frequent offering of high-impact experiences for students.

Service

For promotion to instructional associate professor, the candidate should demonstrate meritorious service to the department. Normal activities could include serving on departmental, college, or university committees; advising a student organization; filling administrative roles within the department; serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate; completing significant self-development activities leading to enhanced effectiveness in service roles; providing service to a national or international organization focusing on teaching or the faculty member's individualized service role.

For promotion to instructional full professor, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in service to the department, college, university, and/or profession. Examples of suitable service activities include chairing a departmental, college, or university committee, advising a student organization for a sustained period; serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate; completing sustained, significant self-development activities leading to enhanced effectiveness in service roles; and serving in a leadership position in a national or international organization focusing on teaching or the faculty member's individualized service role.

Scholarship Enhancing Teaching and Service

Because candidates for promotion in the academic professional track are not judged according to success in research, any such scholarly activities should be carefully linked to the candidate's teaching and service records. Specifically, in Anthropology it is understood that some high-impact experiences for undergraduates (e.g. laboratory classes, internships, field schools) cannot be de-coupled from research activities, in that they often lead to the accumulation of new materials and knowledge that ethically need to be reported to the professional community. Additionally, in some cases extraordinary service roles of some APT faculty could lead to special opportunities in grant-proposal writing, presenting at conferences, or publishing that are not commonly considered part of an APT dossier.

All of the above text follows System policies, University rules, and College guidelines.

Appendix II

Departmental Procedures for Making Decisions

Adopted During Faculty Retreat (September 2013)

Revised During Faculty Meeting (November 2013)

(1) Holding Conversations within the Department

For major departmental decisions, we selected two different options for holding conversations before a decision is made. The objective of these conversations is to generate options. With both options, *decisions* about which option to take will be made during a separate occasion from the *conversation*.

Option 1 – We will use a new process to ensure greater faculty participation in the process. The issue is presented to faculty ahead of time. The issue is then discussed in *small groups organized by program*, using a roundtable format. The roundtable format allows each person in the group to share their opinion for a specified time period (for example, one minute per faculty member). After the roundtable discussion, each group will provide a summary. The first set of small group conversations will then be followed by a second set of conversations by *small groups organized by rank*, using a roundtable format. As before, after the roundtable conversation, each group will provide a summary.

Option 1A – The small groups meet *during* the faculty meeting. Similar to the retreat, each group (by program) will discuss the item for about 10 minutes before sharing with the group. This process will be repeated for the second set of groups (by rank). The person facilitating the process will ask a *representative* from each group (four programs, three ranks) to provide an *oral summary* to the entire faculty. After the meeting, the person facilitating the process will provide a summary of the discussion points made by each group, before a decision is made (using one of the decision process options below).

Option 1B – The small groups meet *before* the faculty meeting. With this option, the small group meetings might last a little bit longer. Each group would provide a *written summary* to the Department Head. The Department Head would circulate the written summaries (*without group identity*) to all faculty, before a decision is made (using one of the decision process options below).

Option 2 – The issue is presented to faculty ahead of time. Program meetings are scheduled, and the issue is discussed during program meetings. Each program provides a recommendation to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee meets to evaluate the four program recommendations, and members of the committee come up with their own recommendation. This recommendation is then presented to the faculty before a faculty meeting, and voted on during a faculty meeting.

(2) Revisiting Departmental Decisions

Sometimes a group makes a decision that is not well received by a minority. For situations like this, we agreed on a new process for individuals to request that the department revisit a previous decision. In general, it is understood that any individual (or group) who wishes to revisit a decision should wait until the decision has been in play long enough to suggest that it may be wise to revisit the decision. For some decisions, this may be a few months. For other decisions, this may be one year or longer.

According to the new process, any individual or any standing committee may request that the department revisit a previous decision. The request to revisit an issue will be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee, along with a justification for why the issue should be revisited. The Executive Committee will meet to decide whether the issue needs to be revisited.

Typically, when an item is revisited, the process will initiate with a departmental conversation (using one of the options above). If a previous decision has been revisited at least one time before with no change, a majority vote of the faculty is required to have the decision reconsidered an additional time. In such cases, the Department Head will add the item to the agenda as a simple decision to revisit the item or not.

(3) Making Departmental Decisions

We agreed on two different options for making departmental decisions. For most decisions, Option 1 will be used. However, any faculty member may propose that Option 2 is used for a particular decision. If a simple majority votes in favor of using Option 2, Option 2 will be used to make a decision.

For most major decisions, the ideas for consideration will originate from departmental conversations (using one of the processes described above). For some types of decisions, however, faculty may vote on an issue without having a departmental conversation first. In such a situation, the faculty will vote first on whether they would like to vote on an issue (without going through the process for having a conversation).

Option 1 – Simple Majority. In this option, all faculty members will have one vote. The alternatives should be stated clearly. The decision will be made based on the alternative that receives the majority of votes.

Option 2 – Two-thirds Majority. In this option, all faculty members will have one vote. The alternatives should be stated clearly. An alternative will need to have a two-thirds majority vote in order to be approved.

(4) New Format for Faculty Meeting Agendas

Each item on the agenda will contain the following components:

- Title
- Background
- Objective
- Process (from options above)
- Time Limit

Such components will be provided by the person who is adding the item to the agenda. In many cases, this will be the Department Head. As appropriate, however, other faculty members (such as a committee chair) may add items to the agenda and facilitate the process.

Only items on the agenda will be discussed during meetings. We will no longer have a “New Business” section on the agenda. Instead, the meeting will end with an opportunity for people to add items to the following faculty meeting agenda.