Excellent intellectual attainment is the standard for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. In evaluating intellectual achievement, the Department emphasizes that candidates are to be active scholars and effective teachers and advisors. While service is important and necessary, we recognize it to be a lesser component of the overall evaluation. Candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Anthropology Department will be evaluated in three areas: Research and Scholarship (typically 40%), Teaching and Advising (typically 40%), and Service (typically 20%). However, faculty members that hold modified appointments, such as the Director of the Consulting Archaeology Program (CAP), will be evaluated in accordance with the distribution of work detailed on their annual workload plans. Since we recognize that in accomplishing our mission, faculty members are a team and have different strengths and contribute towards the department and university in a multitude of ways, each candidate will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Department members eligible to participate in the evaluation and voting process (see below) are henceforth referred to as “the Committee.”

Preparation of the RPT paperwork will follow guidelines provided by the university and the most recent Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). A timetable for this procedure shall be developed by the Chair in consultation with the candidate to enable the chief parties to make decisions with due care and consideration.

**Candidate file:** The candidate’s file will form the basis for all decisions made by the Committee members and Chair. The candidate will make all materials available to the Committee at least two weeks before the Committee meets to consider the personnel action. After this point, the candidate, in compliance with the applicable provisions of the CBA, may update the publication and/or funding status of items mentioned in the original dossier.

- **Candidate’s CV.** An updated CV should follow the Provost’s Office guidelines for preparation.
- **Candidate’s RPT statement (“Green Sheets”).** Candidates should refer to university and CBA procedures in preparing their Green Sheets. In the case of untenured tenure-track faculty, we ask that narratives include a clear discussion of how the candidate intends to meet departmental tenure expectations, as well as the progress currently made toward that goal.
- **Evaluations from Prior Green Sheet Review.** These include evaluations from the department, Faculty Standards’ Committee, Dean, Professional Standards’ Committee, and the Provost (for first reappointments, only the first three parties perform reviews).
- **Copies of all peer-reviewed articles, books, and manuscripts** that are relevant to the RPT action, as well as any non-peer-reviewed publications and grant or contract proposals at the candidate’s discretion.
• **Teaching Portfolio.** In addition to the statement included in the candidate’s Green Sheets and the student and peer teaching evaluations, the portfolio can include syllabi, sample assignments, handouts, and exams, supplementary student evaluations, self-evaluations, and any other pertinent information.

• **Evaluation by External Scholars.** For tenure and promotion, reviews from external evaluators will be solicited by the Chair

• **Other Supporting Documentation.** In consultation with the Chair, the candidate may include additional materials.

**Research and Scholarship Criteria, Indicators, and Methods of Evaluation**

**Criteria (Research and Scholarship)**
Substantial and sustained research and scholarship of high quality are essential for reappointment, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. Research that does not yield a significant body of peer-reviewed scholarly publications is not sufficient.

The Department recognizes the professional and legal necessity for the CAP Director to produce non-peer-reviewed technical reports for all CAP projects. In accordance with the parameters established in the initial job description, letter of offer, and the annual workload plans, the CAP Director will be expected to produce a record of peer-reviewed scholarship that is commensurate with the percentage of appointment defined in these documents. In addition to the timely completion of all required technical reports, the Department expects the CAP Director to engage in the examination of a cohesive body of scholarship that represents the Director’s larger scholarly interests in anthropological archaeology.

The following criteria will be considered when assessing Research and Scholarship:
• Quantity – number and length of publications.
• Quality – quality and impact on the field of published research, along with the recognized status of publication venues within anthropology and related fields.
• Development of research agenda/program – continuing development of a substantive and sustained research program.

**Indicators (Research and Scholarship)**
The department recognizes that scholarship takes many forms and that some forms should be given greater weight than others when evaluating candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The following tiers represent the value the department places on various types of scholarly output. Items within tiers appear in no particular order. Peer-reviewed outputs are considered the gold standard and should comprise a substantial portion of a candidate’s publications at the time of the tenure review. If candidates are considering scholarly outlets that are not listed here, they should contact the Committee through the Chair for advice on the value of that outlet. Agreements between the candidate and the Committee regarding exceptional publications should be in writing.
Tier I*
- Peer-reviewed books
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes (external peer review only)
- Successful competitive grant applications (external)

Tier II
- Successful competitive grant applications (internal)
- Editorship of collected volumes
- Editor-reviewed books
- Editor-reviewed journal articles
- Editor-reviewed chapters in edited volumes
- Peer-reviewed, published technical reports

Tier III (these venues will be taken as indicators of progress within a research agenda, “stepping stones” to publication and/or fulfilling scholarly obligations to the field)
- Non peer-reviewed or unpublished technical reports
- Presentations at scholarly meetings or public-policy summits, invited lectures/papers
- Organizing sessions/panels at scholarly meetings
- Grants under review, unsuccessful applications for competitive grants, and invitations/permits from other research institutions
- Book and film reviews
- Evidence of ongoing field research, such as trips to field sites to collect data, consultation with colleagues, or participation in ongoing projects.
- Works in progress or under review
- Indirect evaluation by outside experts (as evidenced by awards, honors, quality of publication venues, citations, invitations to lecture, membership on editorial boards).
- Popular and other publications, such as professional newsletter submissions and articles in newspapers and popular magazines†

Methods of Evaluation (Research and Scholarship)
The Committee will review the following to determine to what extent the candidate has met the research and scholarship criteria outlined above. The specific methods employed will vary depending on the RPT action being considered (see below).
- The candidate’s CV and RPT statement
- Professional judgment of department and university colleagues, if appropriate
- In cases of tenure and/or promotion, the professional judgment of external reviewers
- The candidate can provide a list of non-departmental colleagues from whom letters will be solicited. The Chair is responsible for soliciting and contextualizing these letters of support.

* The department recognizes that all items under each tier are not necessarily equivalent. Importantly, articles in top tier journals are more prestigious than second-tier journal articles and book chapters. At the same time, edited book volumes are valued and frequently cited in our discipline, and contributions are generally subjected to extensive peer review before they are accepted for publication.
† Candidates are discouraged from spending significant time on these endeavors before tenure.
These letters are distinct from those of external evaluators and generally would be requested for candidates involved in significant interdepartmental collaboration (e.g., with the Food Systems TRI or the Linguistics Program) or who collaborate heavily with others outside of the department, such as scholars at other institutions or regulatory bodies.

The onus is on the candidate to indicate and provide evidence as to the precise status of a manuscript or grant proposal, i.e., a letter from the editor indicating whether it is in press, accepted or accepted subject to revision and when the publication might be forthcoming. It is also the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of peer review and of the extent and nature of the candidate’s contributions to joint-authored publications.

**Procedures Regarding External Evaluators**
In the case of tenure and/or promotion, potential external reviewers should be contacted during the spring semester, no later than May 1, when a letter of inquiry with a copy of the candidate’s CV will be sent out.

Evaluators who have agreed to review the dossier will be sent the candidate’s publications, CV, and statement of future research, as well as Department RPT Guidelines. Selected unpublished manuscripts and other supporting materials (such as grant proposals) may be included at the discretion of the candidate, in consultation with the Chair. Procedures for selecting and contacting external evaluators and preparing letters of invitation will follow those outlined by the CBA and the Provost’s and College of Arts and Sciences websites. The deadlines for the evaluations to be returned will be agreed upon by the Chair and the outside reviewers.

**RPT EXPECTATIONS**
In the area of research and scholarship, both quantity and quality of publications will be considered. Moreover, the continuing development of a substantive and sustained research program is also essential. Faculty members make incremental progress toward tenure and promotion.

**Review for Promotion to Professor**
The determination of whether the candidate should be promoted to Professor will be made using the following standards for teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

*Research and Scholarship:*
The expectation for promotion to Professor includes evidence of national and/or international standing in the field as evidenced by a substantive body of sustained scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor. The expectation is that candidates for promotion to Professor will be evaluated on their scholarly productivity following their tenure and promotion. Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate that their research agenda is sufficiently developed that further high quality contributions are expected on a regular basis, as evidenced, for example, by publication plans, manuscripts that have been contracted, or successful applications for external funding for research and scholarship.