

## UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW HANDBOOK

*Faculty Handbook 4.7.2:* “The awarding of tenure is the most serious commitment the department, college/school, and University make to a faculty member. Tenure is a privilege, not a right, and is awarded only after the most serious deliberation and review. The tenure review consists of evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarly work, service and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit. For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas, and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work.” (Note from 4.8.2: “A favorable decision on promotion to associate professor rank shall normally be a basic prerequisite for the awarding of tenure.”)

*Faculty Handbook 4.8.3:* “Qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor include attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly work, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank in comparable Universities. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.”

### **MENTOR: (Probationary Candidates only)**

Appointed by Department Chair from tenured faculty at or above Candidate’s rank and normally from the same subfield.

Mentor receives a copy of this Handbook but does not serve on or participate in any Review Committee work. Rather, Mentor works closely with Candidate throughout the academic year as adviser and advocate, especially in matters relating to the review and tenure/promotion process.

### **REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

The Department Chair appoints three members from tenured faculty at or above Candidate’s rank, with Review Committee Chair normally from the same subfield and appoints the graduate student from another subfield who participates in the teaching evaluation only.

- Review Committee Chair is responsible for all committee work and for the final report to Department Chair.
- Review Committee Service member is from Candidate’s subfield with primary responsibility for evaluating service.
- Review Committee Teaching member is from outside Candidate’s subfield and responsible for the separate teaching evaluation.
- Review Committee Graduate Student from outside Candidate’s subfield works separately

with Review Committee Teaching member.

Each Review Committee member receives a copy of this Handbook. If tenure is involved, faculty Review Committee members receive copies of all Candidate's previous annual and mid-probationary reviews.

Throughout the review process, procedural or non-academic problems should be addressed to Department Administrator, the staff member who oversees all confidential faculty personnel matters. Academic problems should be addressed to the Associate Chair. **The utmost confidentiality is essential.**

*Note:* Department Chair does not participate in the review process until after the final Review Committee Report has been delivered.

#### **OUTSIDE REVIEWER LETTERS:**

The College requirement for outside reviewer letters is 8 letters. The Department goal is 3 letters from reviewers suggested by Candidate and 5 letters from reviewers chosen by Review Committee. If for some reason a 4<sup>th</sup> name is chosen from Candidate's list then there must be 6 reviewers of Review Committee's choosing, so that there are 2 more than from Candidate's list. If there are only 3 from Candidate's list there should be no more than 6 of Review Committee's choosing. In almost no case should there be more than 10 letters. If there are more, the reasons should be fully documented.

Appropriate outside reviewers are:

- 1) At or above the rank sought, or, if from outside the academy, of directorial or leadership status and widely known reputation for excellence;
- 2) If academic, tenured;
- 3) Neither from the dissertation committee nor during the three previous years a former/current research/writing collaborator; and
- 4) Preferably from institutions which are UNM's peers or "betters."

Exceptions (which should be rare, especially in promotion to full professor) must be fully justified in Review Committee Report.

In designating potential reviewers Review Committee Chair consults with Review Committee Service member. The Chair may also confidentially solicit suggestions from other tenured faculty in the department. In no case should Committee Chair seek suggestions from UNM faculty or staff outside the Anthropology Department or from scholars and professionals not affiliated with UNM.

**Calendar for Outside Reviewer Letters:**

<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of April	List of Possible Reviewers to Review Committee Chair	Candidate
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of April	Reviewer Packet to Review Committee Chair (electronic)	Candidate
By Last Friday of April	Reviewer Packet approval or revisions requested to Candidate.	Review Committee Chair
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	Reviewer Packet (revised if necessary) to Review Committee and Department Administrator	Candidate
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	Two rank-ordered lists of potential reviewers (with e-mail addresses) as well as the text for the review request to Department Administrator	Review Committee Chair
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	First 8 potential reviewers contacted (electronic)	Department Administrator
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of September	Final CV, expanded statement (electronic) RPT Application	Candidate
By January 31	Final Committee Report with signatures (electronic) to Department Administrator.	Review Committee Chair

**Reviewer Solicitation Letters:****Candidate's List of Possible Reviewers:**

- 1) Six names of possible outside reviewers with their current titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone and FAX numbers;
- 2) optional, without penalty or rationales: 1 or 2 names and affiliations of reviewers

unacceptable to Candidate;

- 3) name and current affiliation of all members of Candidate's dissertation committee; of all editors and the date of volumes/collections in which Candidate's work appears as a chapter; and of all non-student co-authors, co-editors and co-PIs during the 3 previous years.

The candidate sends this list Review Committee Chair by mid-April. The candidate also provides a current curriculum vita that will be sent to reviewers with the request.

### **Sample Reviewer Solicitation Letter:**

Dear Colleague,

During the Fall 20xx semester the Department of Anthropology in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of New Mexico is considering Assistant/Associate/Full Professor xxx for tenure and/or promotion to xxx professor. I serve as the review committee chair, with anthropology professors xxx and xxx the other members. You have been recommended as one who can assist us in evaluating her/his scholarly work and we would be deeply grateful should you be willing to undertake this important task.

In order to assist you in making a decision, we attach xxx's current vita. If you agree to serve as a reviewer, we will provide electronic files of the Department guidelines for tenure and promotion, xxx's brief narrative of her/his research, teaching and service accomplishments and goals, articles, grant applications, and other relevant data for your review. Our practice is to request reviewers' commitment early in the summer, when some but not necessarily all publications and will be available. The most current version of all review materials will be made available electronically to you by September x, 20xx. Your review will be due by November 1.

We ask that our reviewers develop a candid discussion that specifically addresses the following points:

- 1) A statement of your relationship with Professor xxx and the extent of your knowledge of her/his work.
- 2) Your characterization and assessment of her/his accomplishments and status both within and outside the field of anthropology.
- 3) How you would rank xxx in relation to other professionals at approximately the same stage in their career.

The University considers these letters a crucial part of the review process. Your evaluation will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law. I am the responsible party and my representative in the process, who keeps the records and coordinates all communications, is

Department Administrator Jennifer George. She oversees all faculty personnel matters.

Letters should be addressed to me; e-mails should go to both of us ([xxx@unm.edu](mailto:xxx@unm.edu); [jgeorge2@unm.edu](mailto:jgeorge2@unm.edu)) since she will be coordinating materials and managing the file. You are of course welcome to address me alone. I can be reached at xxxx or through the Department office number: (505) 277-4524.

We hope that you will be able to undertake this critical evaluation and we stand ready to reciprocate in whatever measure.

Sincerely, xxx

**Reviewer Solicitation Process:** By the first Friday in May, Review Committee Chair provides Department Administrator an electronic version of the letter's text and full contact particulars (name, titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone numbers) for each potential reviewer. (Note that the Department Administrator will not fill in any missing contact information; each entry must be complete when submitted.) The Review Committee Chair submits two lists: one with 6 rank-ordered names from Candidate and one with 6-8 rank-ordered names from Review Committee. The first 3 Candidate names are contacted, then the next one, and so on until 3 reviews are promised. If 3 Candidate-suggested reviewers cannot be secured, the Review Committee proceeds with whatever they have (or not) and does not ask Candidate for further names; the complement of 8 is filled with Review Committee names. The first 5 Review Committee names are contacted, then the next one, and so on until 5 reviews are promised. If 5 (more if required due to insufficient Candidate suggestions) Review Committee reviewers cannot be secured, then additional names will be added to the Review Committee list.

By mid-May, Candidate delivers of the electronic version of manuscripts and actual copies of any books for reviewer packets. (In some cases a manuscript or publication will not be ready until the beginning of September, but the bulk of the materials should be available for review during the summer.)

By the second Friday in May, Department Administrator contacts (electronic) the first 8 potential reviewers, with copies to Review Committee Chair including:

- 1) Solicitation letter from department e-mail address;
- 2) Curriculum Vitae;

Thereafter, when refusals come in, Department Administrator sends requests to the next on the list until the full complement of 8 is reached.

Department Administrator acknowledges receipt of acceptance or refusal electronically, with

copy to Review Committee Chair.

By the Tuesday after Labor Day, Candidate provides to Department Administrator:

- 1) Final Curriculum Vitae;
- 2) Final, expanded statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals;
- 3) Publications;
- 4) Grant Applications (if applicable);
- 5) Any other relevant materials for outside reviewers.

#### **Review Letters:**

When the review letter arrives, Department Administrator acknowledges electronically. Department Administrator handles logistics of this acknowledgment process, including timely electronic reminder(s) in October about the impending November deadline. Each reviewer is contacted separately.

#### **CANDIDATE DOSSIER FOR REVIEWERS**

By September 1, the candidate should upload the following to the RPT Application:

- 1) Current CV;
- 2) Expanded/revised narrative statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals;
- 3) Published and unpublished materials;
- 4) Teaching evaluations;
- 5) Other relevant materials for review, including previous Annual and Mid Probationary reviews.

#### **GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS FOR TEACHING REPORT**

Working with instruction and oversight from Review Committee Teaching member, Review Committee Graduate Student solicits letters from Candidate's present and former graduate students and all current Department graduate students. These letters are read *only* by Review Committee Teaching and Review Committee Grad Student (and the Department Chair). The latter is responsible for handling these letters and maintaining confidentiality, until the separate Teaching Report has been written and signed. Review Committee Grad Student then sends all the letters electronically directly to Department Chair.

#### **Calendar for Graduate Student Letters:**

<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of September	List of grad students and contact info to Review Committee Teaching member	Candidate
By 3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday of September	Emails and electronic text of letter template to Candidate's grad students, and cc to Review Committee Teaching member (deadline for responses: First Friday of November)	Review Committee Grad Student
By first Friday in October	Text for letter template to current grad students to Review Committee Teaching member (deadline for responses: First Friday of November)	Review Committee Grad Student
By first Friday in October	Electronic letter emailed to Grad List, due first Friday of November	Grad Student

#### **Candidate's List:**

Candidate should provide electronically a list of all past and present graduate students within and outside the Department (UNM and other universities) with full contact particulars (if known; if unknown, so indicate). For students who have received their degree, indicate current or last known position.

#### **Sample Letter Text for Candidate's List:**

*The Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico is conducting a tenure and/or promotion [to rank] review of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor xxx. As part of the process, the review committee solicits evaluations of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring from graduate students who have worked with her/him in a teaching and/or research capacity. We would be very grateful for your participation in this important deliberation.*

*We are requesting candid evaluations that specifically address the following points:*

REVISED 11/17

- (1) Your relationship with Professor xxx and the extent of your knowledge of her/his work;*
- (2) Your characterization and assessment of the quality of her/his teaching and mentoring;*
- (3) Her/his impact on your own professional development.*

*Clear statements with concrete examples would be greatly appreciated.*

*If you are willing to assist us, we will need your letter postmarked by November xx, 20xx. These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law.*

*For the review committee report, graduate student letters are read only by Professor xxx, the member from outside xxx's subfield of xxx, and by myself, the committee graduate student representative from the xxx subfield. Anonymous summaries of and quotations from your statements will be incorporated into our comprehensive teaching evaluation report, which is a separately signed part of the committee's report to the faculty.*

*After Professor xxx and I have completed our report I will deliver them electronically to the Department Chair, the only other department faculty member to read your letter. He will use them in his confidential report to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Please send electronic statements to me at xxx  
Thank you for your assistance.*

*Sincerely, xxx*

**Sample Acknowledgment:**

*"I received your confidential evaluation of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring on xxx [date]. Professor xxx and I very much appreciate your participation in this important review process.  
Sincerely, xxx."*

**Graduate List Letter:**

Using the letter sent to current/former graduate students, the Review Committee Graduate Student posts this general solicitation to the anthropology graduate student list, which are due at the end of the first week of November.

**CALENDAR FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
Mid-October to mid-November	Classroom observations	Review Committee Teaching



Mid-October to mid-November	Research Colloquium	Candidate, Review Committee Chair, Department Administrator
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Monday of November	Dossier finalized	Candidate with Department Administrator
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday of November	Faculty notified dossier open	Review Committee Chair
By 5 pm, the last Friday before Thanksgiving Break	Review Committee Report, including separate teaching report (signed) to Department Administrator	Review Committee Chair and Review Committee Teaching member
By end of day last Monday of November	Review Committee Reports to faculty (electronic)	Department Administrator
1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of December	Special Faculty Meeting	
By 5:00 Monday after Faculty Meeting	Revised (if necessary) Review Committee Report (including separate teaching report) to Department Administrator	Review Committee Chair

#### **CANDIDATE DOSSIER:**

By the first weekday in November, Candidate, working with Department Administrator guidance, completes assembling the "Promotion and Tenure Dossier." Specifications are online in A&S "Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies/Procedures."

The Department Administrator helps with procedural questions. The Candidate is responsible for the dossier contents and their timely placement in the file. The dossier must include:

- 1) The standard faculty vitae,
- 2) Arts and Sciences summary of teaching evaluations (form on A&S website), as well as copies of previous Annual and Mid Probationary reviews.
- 3) A Research Statement
- 4) A Teaching Statement
- 5) A Service Statement
- 6) A List of Supplementary Materials (form on A&S website)

Candidate notifies Review Committee Chair when dossier is complete. At the time of submission, candidate signs the Arts and Sciences Form 3 "List of Supplemental Materials" certifying that the dossier is complete, which is then signed by the Department Chair. Thereafter, Candidate has no further access to the dossier and must submit any changes to Department Administrator.

Review Committee Chair determines that the dossier is ready for viewing after Candidate attests that her/his part is completed. After the deadline for reviewer letters has passed, Review Committee Chair notifies the faculty and instructs them to follow the viewing procedures set up by Department Administrator, who is responsible for maintaining the files' integrity and confidentiality.

#### **CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS:**

Between mid-October and mid-November, by prior arrangement, Review Committee Teaching member visits one session of each department course and/or seminar taught by Candidate during the review semester and writes a 2-3-paragraph report on each class attended.

#### **CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM**

Candidate notifies Review Committee Chair of the title and works with Department Administrator to schedule the colloquium between mid-October and mid-November. Department Administrator sends e-mail announcement to Department faculty and graduate students. No flyers are posted.

The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on Candidate's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Only Department faculty and graduate students attend.

The Review Committee Chair introduces Candidate and afterward sets out the terms of the question period, which is then turned over to Candidate. Faculty members initially comment and pose questions. Then graduate students (and faculty who may later be prompted to raise additional points and questions) join the discussion.

#### **REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Review Committee Report is written during November. Responsibilities:

- 1) Review Committee Chair:
  - a) Report section on Scholarly Work;
  - b) Review and oversight of final document;
  - c) Creation of separate signature page;

- d) Obtaining all committee member signatures on report;
  - e) Presenting an overview of the review and the specific review on Scholarly Work to the full faculty;
  - f) Incorporating any revisions specified during the special faculty meeting.
- 2) Review Committee Service Member:
- a) Report section on Service;
  - b) Presenting the Service section of the review to the full faculty.
- 3) Review Committee Teaching member:
- a) Working with Review Committee Grad Student to obtain review letters from former and current graduate students;
  - b) Report section on Teaching in the form of a separate Teaching Report to be signed by both the Review Committee member and Grad Student;
  - c) Presenting the Teaching section of the review to the full faculty, including a summary of graduate student comments.

**By noon on the Monday before the first-Friday in December special faculty meeting:** Review Committee Chair submits the signed, original Review Committee Report (including separate teaching report) to Department Administrator. The Department Administrator then posts the confidential committee review electronically for faculty review.

The Review Committee Report will go forward and be read at all levels of the review process (faculty, chair, dean, provost). It should follow the format outlined below so that each candidacy is clearly and uniformly informed by College and Department criteria, policy and procedure.

**Review Committee Introductory Section Format:**

ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR XXX

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

December x, 20xx [date of special faculty meeting]

*Committee Members:*

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (Chair, X subfield)  
Associate Professor/Professor (X subfield)  
Associate Professor/Professor xxx (X subfield)  
*For the Separate Teaching Report only:*  
Graduate Student xxx (X subfield)

Assistant/Associate Professor xxx received her/his doctorate in [field] from xxx University in [date]. Proceed to account for all their positions/time since receiving the doctorate and before assuming the tenure-track position at UNM. Also include any significant time spent in visiting faculty or temporary research/fellowship positions away from UNM after assuming the tenure-track job here. This is the “elsewhere” paragraph.

Dr. Xxx joined the tenure-track faculty in the Department as an assistant/associate/full professor in August/January xxxx [if there is some kind of joint appointment, so state here]. A member of the X subfield, s/he successfully underwent a mid-probationary review in xxxx/earned tenure and promotion to associate professor in xxxx. According to the *UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*: “Unless otherwise indicated by contract or other written agreement, the record under consideration for tenure and promotion to associate Professor/tenure as Associate Professor/promotion to Full Professor/tenure as Full Professor is that accrued since beginning the tenure-track position at UNM/promotion to Associate Professor or the previous six years/promotion to Associate Professor/promotion to Full Professor or the previous six years.” [If this is not the case, quote directly from the contract or other written document.]

#### **Review Committee Teaching Section Format:**

**Teaching: (NOTE: There is a separate Teaching Report that is appended to the committee report [see below])**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should be involved in teaching at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels. [here insert the wording under Teaching for tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.] (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Sample of the single sentence: Based on the attached Teaching Report by Professor xxx and graduate student xxx, the Committee agrees that Professor xxx has fully met these criteria. Modify as appropriate.

#### **Review Committee Scholarly Work Section Format:**

##### **Scholarly Work:**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most

important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should demonstrate.... [here insert the paragraph on scholarly work from tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.]

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category. Scholarly work in public anthropology involves funding, research, conceptualization, and the presentation of a final product. The candidate documents their role in (1) obtaining external funding to carry out the research, (2) carrying out research to be used in the product, (3) providing a conceptual analysis, and (4) publication or promulgation of the product as well as statements about collaboration with communities, networks, or organizations that were part of the research, training that they may have offered students, community members or organization members, and a discussion of the dissemination of the scholarship (audience reached and significance). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Review Committee Chair's report on scholarly work (see below) begins here. Review Committee Chair bases this evaluation on the outside reviewer letters and Candidate's CV, expanded statement of professional achievements/goals, dossier materials, and research colloquium. In tenure cases, annual and mid-probationary reviews are also taken into consideration.

The first paragraphs of this section constitute a summary overview of the scholarly record: number and kinds of publications, status of work in press and/or in progress, public anthropology work completed or in progress, grants received or under review, other writing, etc.

The concluding overview paragraph gives the date, title, and an evaluation of the research colloquium. Include the expectations as stated in this Handbook: "The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on the candidate's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Only Department faculty and graduate students attend."

Next is a paragraph about outside reviewers. Sample text:

The review committee solicited letters of evaluation from scholars/professionals with expertise in Professor xxx's research areas. According to the Department's current *Tenure and Promotion Review Handbook*: "Appropriate outside reviewers are: (1) at or above the rank sought, or, if from outside the academy, of directorial

or leadership status and widely known reputation for excellence; (2) if academic, tenured; (3) neither from the dissertation committee nor during the three previous years a former/current research/writing collaborator; and (4) preferably from institutions which are UNM's peers or 'betters.'" A total of xx potential outside reviewers was contacted, xx [no.] from a list submitted by Professor xxx and xx [no.] from names proposed by committee members and other knowledgeable senior faculty members. A total of xx outside reviewer letters are in the file, [xx] from the candidate's list and [xx] from the committee's.

Next are four sets of numbered names. Each set is introduced in this order:

Those from xxx's list, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise (AAA = American Anthropological Association), are:

- (1) xxx
- (2) xxx

Those from xxx's list unable to do the review, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise and their reason(s) for declining, are:

- (1) xxx
- (2) xxx

Those chosen by the review committee, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise, are:

- (1) xxx
- (2) xxx

Those from the review committee list unable to do the review, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise and their reason(s) for declining, are:

- (1) xxx
- (2) xxx

The thumbnail sketches should be uniform and objective. The first choice is the scholar's profile from the AAA Guide. The second choice is a succinct characterization from the scholar's department or work website. Those lacking, give a brief characterization of the person's research areas and one or two important bibliographic references, preferably books authored or edited. If the reviewer has declined, succinctly give the reason(s) at the end. Sample text:

xxx [name], Professor of Anthropology [full title], Department of xxx, University of xxx: xxxxxxx [profile of research interests and geographic areas] (AAA Guide). Or xxxxxxx [profile of research interests] (department website). Or xxxxxxx [brief characterization of research]; (co-) author xxxxxxx [title of book(s)]; (co-) editor

xxxxxxx [title of book(s)]. [If the reviewer has declined, add:] Reason(s): xxxxxxx [ill health; overbooked; on sabbatical; in the field; etc., using short quotes from the letter if needed, e.g.: "Xxx is a wonderful scholar but I have to teach 3,000 core curriculum students this semester."]

Next is a paragraph with a version of the following text:

Reviewers were sent a copy of *UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion* and were asked to address three points in their "candid discussion": (1) A statement of your relationship with Professor xxx and the extent of your knowledge of her/his work. (2) Your characterization and assessment of her/his accomplishments and status both within and outside the field of anthropology. (3) How you would rank xxx in relation to other professionals at approximately the same stage in their career." They received xxx's c.v., expanded statement, and a packet containing xxxxxxx [list full contents of the reviewer packets by title, date].

The remainder of this section is a careful reading of the letters. It should begin with a statement about their overall quality, e.g.: "Altogether, the xx [no.] letters are long, thoughtful and laudatory...." Address the kinds of significant positive or equivocal points raised by reviewers and all substantively negative critique. End with the reviewers' recommendation(s) for or against the tenure/promotion. Throughout, quote from the letters at enough length to show the context. If the reviewer has cited partial bibliography or esoteric jargon or theory not immediately clear to non-anthropologists, briefly explain or define the terms, give the full-title, dated citations, etc.

Sample last sentence: The Committee concurs with the majority of the reviewers and deems Professor xxx to have met fully and well the Department criteria for Scholarly Work. Modify as appropriate.

#### Review Committee Service Section Format:

##### Service:

Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and teaching.... Untenured assistant professors.../Ongoing service to the University, the profession and the public is expected for promotion to full.... [Follow with the paragraph on service from tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure wording.]

The University recognizes "two broad categories of faculty service: professional

and public.” The former “consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession.” It includes department, University, and “beyond the University...service to professional organizations and other groups that engage in or support educational and research activities” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.3.a.1*). The latter “consists of activities that arise from a faculty member's role in the University...activities [that] normally involve the sharing and application of faculty expertise to issues and needs of the civic community in which the University is located” (*ibid 1.2.3.a.2*).

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category.... Public anthropology evaluated as service may be considered professional and/or public service according to the University criteria. (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion, January 19, 2007*)

Review Committee Service Member's report on service (see below) begins here. Review Committee Service member bases this evaluation on the CV, expanded statement of achievements/goals, and dossier. In tenure cases, annual and mid-probationary reviews are also taken into consideration. Relevant categories should be presented in the following order: (1) subfield, (2) department, (3) university, (4) profession, and (5) public.

Sample first sentence: Professor xxx's service record is excellent with respect to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community. Modify as appropriate.

**Review Committee Concluding/Recommendation Section Format:**

The Anthropology Department expects faculty excellence in research that contributes to our national and international standing and “effective teaching...[that] provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.1.b*). Research is expected to inform teaching.... Unless they compromise the Department's teaching and research mission, Personal Characteristics are considered part of the evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly Work, and Service as influencing “an individual's effectiveness as a teacher, a scholar, researcher, or creative artist, and a leader in a professional area” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.4*). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion, January 19, 2007*)



**Sample concluding paragraph:** The Committee unanimously recommends Professor xxx for tenure/promotion to Associate/Full Professor of Anthropology on the basis of a superior teaching record, demonstrated excellence in scholarship, and active service to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community. Modify as appropriate.

**Signature Page:**

On a separate but numbered page: space for three signatures [Review Committee Chair, Review Committee Service member, Review Committee Teaching member] and the date for each.

**Teaching Report:**

Review Committee Teaching member and Review Committee Graduate Student base this evaluation on:

- 1) The CV;
- 2) Candidate Teaching Statement
- 3) ICES, IDEA, seminar and other evaluation reports from the entire time period since beginning the tenure track or promotion to associate/full professor;
- 4) Review-semester class observations by RC Teaching;
- 5) Candidate's record of student advisement and individual instruction;
- 6) Review Committee Graduate Student-solicited letters from Candidate's list of past and present graduate students inside and outside the department and from all current anthropology graduate students. In tenure cases, annual and mid-probationary reviews are also taken into consideration, but Review Committee Grad Student *does not have access to those documents*.

Review Committee Teaching member has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report (separate from the committee report and attached). The rest of the Review Committee should review this only after it is written. Review Committee Graduate Student writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to Review Committee Teaching member for review. Either the Grad Student or Teaching member may raise confidential questions about the letters directly to Department Chair only. The Review Committee Chair and Review Committee Service member have no involvement with the Review Committee Grad Student report in any way; its wording remains as agreed upon between Review Committee Teaching member and Grad Student (and if necessary Department Chair).

The introductory paragraphs of the report constitute a summary of Candidate's career teaching history at UNM and elsewhere, with the kinds of courses taught in each place and a statement about the research that informs this teaching record. The total number of UNM courses taught during the review period, the titles of each course and the number of times it was taught, a

statement about typical enrollments at each level, and the class(es) currently being taught complete this teaching history introduction.

Sections follow in this order:

- 1) **Teaching Statement:** a characterization of (with quotations from) Candidate's teaching statement;
- 2) **Course Evaluations:**
  - a) ICES, including a chart presenting the Summary of Teaching (provided by candidate) data and general summary statements about the ICES scores and the student comments written on the forms;
  - b) graduate seminar evaluations, including a chart presenting the data and general summary statements about the scores and student comments. Other evaluation forms should be treated similarly.
- 3) **Classroom Observations by Professor xxx [Review Committee Teaching member]:** The 2-3-paragraph classroom observations are included verbatim here.
- 4) **Student Advisement and Individual Instruction:** a chart presenting the number of students in 497, Honors, 597/598, MA/MS committee, MA/MS chair; 697/698, PhD committee, PhD chair, Graduate external grant during the review period, and job placement of graduated students, together with general summary comments on this record.
- 5) **Graduate Student Letters:** This section, after being written and signed by Review Committee Grad Student, is not subject to any further revision. In writing this evaluation from the confidential graduate student letters, Review Committee Grad Student must make every effort to safeguard the anonymity of respondents. Make no reference to the number of letters from a particular subfield or a particular class/seminar. This is a general summation/evaluation of the letters as a group.

Review Committee Grad Student begins by identifying her/himself as an x-year graduate student in x subfield. Also indicate any previous association with Candidate, e.g., taking a class from or serving on a committee with them. Then in a list indicate how many review letter solicitations were successfully mailed (*not* how many could not be delivered) from Candidate's list and when that mailing went out. Then indicate when the graduate electronic list was contacted and when the reminder went out. Finally, indicate the total number of letters received and thus used in the evaluation report. This is followed by a discussion of the letters, signed and dated at the end.

- 6) **General Summary of Teaching:** This summation ends with the Review Committee Teaching member and Review Committee Grad Student recommendations and is co-signed and dated, and then appended to the Review Committee full report.

#### **SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON TENURE/PROMOTION CASES:**

Both tenure-track and voting research faculty participate in this special, highly confidential, first-Friday-in-December meeting, but only tenure-track faculty receive the Review Committee Report and vote on tenure/promotion cases. No visiting faculty or presenters from outside the department attend. Department Administrator attends and takes notes for Department Chair's eyes only. None of the candidates and no spouses/domestic partners are in attendance for any part of the meeting. If any of these sits on a review committee, another committee member must substitute for them.

The order of presentation is junior to senior and alphabetically within each category (tenure/promotion to associate, tenure as associate, promotion to full, tenure as full). The Review Committee Chair introduces the case, followed by separate presentations on teaching (Review Committee Teaching member), scholarly work (Review Committee Chair), and service (Review Committee Service Member). Review Committee Chair concludes the presentation and moderates subsequent discussion, which may include suggestions for revisions to the Review Committee document (except the Review Committee Grad Student report on the graduate student letters).

Department Chair does not vote or participate in the discussion of candidates except for points of order. At the conclusion of discussion about each candidate Department Chair (with Department Administrator help) conducts a secret, written, provisional yes/no/abstain ballot and announces the results (afterward conveying them non-numerically to Candidate by phone). Until confidential ballots have been submitted by all tenure-track faculty, this department vote, which is advisory to the chair, is not official. It is possible that some of those voting at the meeting may change their vote before filing the full confidential ballot that goes forward in Candidate's dossier. (Candidate will learn the final department recommendation when they receive the redacted version of the chair's report to the dean.)

**NOTE:** The Review Committee Chair and/or Review Committee Teaching member make any revisions called for during the special faculty meeting. Signature pages remain the same but a full, new electronic version of the text (if necessary) must be delivered to Department Administrator by 5:00 on the Monday following the special meeting. Except for Review Committee Chair's January letter to reviewers (see above) and submitting individual confidential ballots, Review Committee has no further involvement in the review process.