

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW HANDBOOK

UNM DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

(Spring 2007 version)

The Department is bound by the University's "Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure" in *The University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook*. The electronic version of October 2003 maintains the most recent policies (<http://handbook.unm.edu/newhb.html>). It constitutes the official text for all University tenure and promotion action and the basis for appeal.

Criteria: Candidates and review committee members should familiarize themselves with the Faculty Handbook policy in sections B-1 ("Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation") and B-4 ("Faculty Reviews") and with appropriate sections of "Information for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences" (<http://www.unm.edu/~artsci/faculty/index.html>). *University of New Mexico Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, adopted on January 19, 2007, is considered a part of this handbook.

THE REVIEW PROCESS: OVERVIEW

The Department Review and Recommendation: The candidate prepares a dossier for the review committee. The review committee prepares a report that is advisory to the faculty (and ultimately the chair), and the faculty reads the committee report and the dossier. At an early December faculty meeting the candidate's case is presented and a provisional ballot cast by tenure-track faculty in attendance. The Chair subsequently notifies the candidate of the overall (non-numerical) result of that unofficial balloting. Individual, confidential ballots from all tenure-track faculty are then submitted, tabulated by the Chair, reported on the official transmittal form, and included in the dossier. The faculty votes are advisory to the Chair, whose own vote, which may differ from the majority, is recorded separately and whose report constitutes the official department recommendation. The candidate receives a redacted version of the Chair's report.

The College Review and Recommendation: The Junior Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews dossiers of candidates for tenure and for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor as well as those for mid-probationary review. The Senior Promotion Committee reviews dossiers of candidates for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. (The function, membership and process of each committee is available on-line in the 2004 "By-Laws of Arts and Sciences UNM.") Usual practice is to have each dossier read by all committee members but in depth by two, who present the case (without a committee member from the candidate's department present). The committee chair summarizes the discussion in a report to the Dean, but votes are individual and individually conveyed to the Associate Dean for Faculty, who reads all the dossiers. If there is a problem, one or both of the other associate deans (for Curriculum and Instruction, for Research) may also read the dossier. The Associate Dean for Faculty makes a recommendation to the Dean, who makes the official assessment and recommendation and forwards the dossier (without supplemental materials) to the Provost's office. The candidate receives notification of the College decision.

The Deputy Provost's Review and Recommendation: The Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs reads all dossiers (except those from their own department) and may or may not convene an advisory committee of senior faculty members for additional input and may or may not consult other associate provosts in making a recommendation to the Provost.

The Provost's Review and Final Decision: The Provost reviews the dossiers (except where there is a conflict of interest) and the recommendations of chair, dean, and deputy provost. According to the Faculty Handbook: "The Provost provides written notification of the [final] decision to the faculty member no later than June 30 of the review year, exercising the personnel authority of the Regents delegated by them for this purpose."

REVIEW COMMITTEE

Responsibility: Department Chair

Due: By the first Friday in April

In consultation with the candidate, the department chair appoints the review committee no later than the first week of April during the Spring semester before the scheduled review. The committee comprises four members: two faculty from the candidate's subfield, one faculty from a different subfield, and one graduate student from a different subfield. The committee chair is tenured (if promotion to full, a tenured full professor) in the candidate's subfield. Other faculty committee members must be tenured. The department chair notifies the president of the Anthropology Graduate Student Union (AGSU), who appoints the graduate student member before the end of April. That graduate student and the faculty member from a different subfield are responsible for the teaching section of the committee report.

The candidate is responsible for the dossier. They may judiciously consult the committee, but the ultimate responsibility is their own. For tenure and/or promotion reviews committee members do not act as mentors or advocates or close advisors. They serve as stewards and initial organizers and evaluators of the record as presented to them by the candidate (and the outside reviewers).

The review committee is responsible for the report to the faculty. They should follow the procedures herein, use the standardized forms of communication as presented below, and scrupulously document all contacts with reviewers or potential reviewers. **The utmost confidentiality is essential.**

In what follows, responsibilities are detailed using these abbreviations: RC = review committee; CA = candidate; CC = review committee chair; CM = committee member from the candidate's subfield; CT = committee member from outside the candidate's subfield, evaluating teaching; GS = graduate student member evaluating teaching only; DA = department administrator; FH = *Faculty Handbook*; IFF = on-line "Information for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences."

Responsible parties must themselves fulfill their responsibilities as detailed and not impose on staff or other faculty members. In no case, except for the teaching section, should any student (GA, TA, RA, work-study, whatever) be involved in any way during this highly confidential faculty matter. Photocopying not done by the faculty member should be routed through DA.

Exact due dates will be issued by the department chair on a separate sheet. **Except for some limited aspects of the outside reviewer process, the CC, and not the DA, is responsible for timely completion of all requirements and/or making sure all deadlines are met.**

Previous materials available to CA and RC:

(a) CA must request and receive permission from faculty member(s) who have undergone a similar review before DA will photocopy that person's CV, brief statement, and/or expanded statement of accomplishments and goals. CC will make no recommendations about which documents CA should consult in seeking exemplary or cautionary models. Any RC comments to CA about other faculty review processes are inappropriate.

(b) In the case of tenure reviews RC faculty (not GS) receive copies of all CA's previous annual and mid-probationary reviews. For both tenure and promotion reviews RC members may *not* request copies of any other faculty member's committee report or other records. This Handbook is the current guide.

OUTSIDE REVIEWER LETTERS

The present College requirement is 8 letters. Our goal is 3 letters from reviewers suggested by the candidate and 5 letters from reviewers chosen by the review committee. If for some reason a 4th name is chosen from the candidate's list then there must be 6 reviewers of RC's choosing, so that there are 2 more than from CA's list. If there are only 3 from the candidate's list there should be no more than 6 of the 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) tenured (if academic); (3) neither from the dissertation committee nor former/current research/writing collaborators during the three previous years; 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 the RC report.

In designating potential reviewers CC consults with CM. CC may also confidentially solicit suggestions from other tenured faculty members in the department. In no case should CC seek suggestions from UNM faculty or staff who are not voting members of the Anthropology Department or from scholars and professionals not affiliated with UNM.

Reviewer Solicitation Letters

Responsibility: CA

Due: By mid-April

(A) CA to CC, CM, electronic and hardcopy: (1) 6 names of possible outside reviewers with their current titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone and FAX numbers; (2) optional, without penalty or rationale: 1 or 2 names and affiliations of reviewers unacceptable to CA; (3) a listing of the name and current affiliation of all members of CA's dissertation committee; of all editors and the date of volumes/collections in which CA's work appears as a chapter; and of all non-student co-authors, co-

editors and co-PIs during the three previous years; (4) current CV in College form (A&S “Standard Form” for Vitae, IFF); (5) brief narrative statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals; (6) list of published and unpublished materials for the reviewer packets. [Note that (4) and (5) will be revised/expanded and sent to reviewers early in the Fall semester.] CC reviews (4), (5), and (6), and CA must revise them before the first Friday in May.

(B) CA to CC, CM, CT, DA, electronic: CC-approved versions of (4), (5), and (6), by the first Friday in May.

Responsibility: CC

Due: By the first Friday in May

(A) CC to DA, electronic and hardcopy: full contact particulars (name, titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone and FAX numbers) for each potential reviewer. (Note that the DA will not fill in any missing contact information; each entry must be complete when submitted.) The reviewers are on two ranked lists, one from CA and one from RC, together with instructions as to how to proceed with contacts. RC rank-orders the 6 CA names and the 6-8 RC names. The first 3 CA names are contacted, then the next one, and so on until 3 reviews are promised. If 3 CA-suggested reviewers cannot be secured, RC proceeds with whatever they have (or not) and does not ask CA for further names; the complement of 8 is filled with RC names. The first 5 RC names are contacted, then the next one, and so on until 5 reviews are promised. If 5 (more if required due to insufficient CA suggestions) RC reviewers cannot be secured, then additional names will be added to the RC list.

(B) CC to DA, electronic: the text for the reviewer solicitation letter, written freshly and specifically for CA. Sample letter text:

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 Professor xxx for tenure/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 and a list of reprints, publications and manuscripts available to each reviewer. If you agree to serve as a reviewer, we will follow with hardcopy of same, together with the Department guidelines for tenure and promotion and xxx’s brief narrative of her/his research, teaching, and service accomplishments and goals. Our practice is to request reviewers’ commitment early in the summer, when some but not necessarily all publications and manuscripts will be available. At this time, everything on Professor xxx’s list is available except for xxx, so if you are able to do a review you may now request copies of any materials you do not have at hand. The most current version of xxx manuscript [if such is the case], the long version of xxx’s narrative statement, and her/his final-version vita will be sent to you by September x, 20xx. Your review will be due by November x [date should be November 1 or nearest weekday].

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

following points [list them on separate lines]: (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 communication, 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, jgeorge2@unm.edu) since she will be sending out 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

Responsibility: CA

Due: By mid-May

CA to DA, hardcopy of manuscripts and actual copies of publications, reprints 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.)

Responsibility: DA

Due: By the second Friday in May

DA to first 8 potential reviewers, with copies to CC, electronic: (1) solicitation letter on letterhead; (2) CV; and (3) list of available reprints, publications, manuscripts. Thereafter, when refusals come in, DA sends to the next on the list until the full complement of 8 is reached.

DA acknowledges receipt of acceptance or refusal electronically, with copy to CC. Reviewers who accept are immediately sent *signed* hardcopy of the letter. Depending on mailing costs, requested CA reviewer-requested materials may go in a separate package.

Responsibility: CA

Due: By the Tuesday after Labor Day

CA to CC, CM, CT, electronic and hardcopy: (1) final CV; (2) final, expanded statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals. Any revisions based on RC input already will have been done over the summer.

CA to DA, electronic: (1) final CV; (2) final expanded statement; and hardcopy/print copy: the final

version of manuscripts and/or publications promised but not available earlier. DA forwards the CV and statement electronically, noting that these are the final review versions and saying that we look forward to your review by November xx. The reprints/manuscripts are mailed within the week.

Review Letters

Responsibility: CC and DA

Due: Throughout summer and fall up to (and past) the deadline for receipt

When the review letter arrives, DA acknowledges electronically and indicates CC will officially acknowledge by mail. If the review letter arrives in the mail then this will be done right away. If it arrives electronically the CC letter will not be mailed until after the hardcopy is received.

DA handles logistics of this acknowledgment process, including timely electronic reminder(s) in October about the impending November deadline. Each reviewer is contacted separately.

CC provides DA with an electronic version of the acknowledgment letter. DA prints it on letterhead and CC signs it before DA mails it. A sample text for a standard letter follows, but there may also be specifics added in a given reviewer's case. For example, they may have been in the field or abroad and still found time to complete the review or they may have had some other "impersonal" obstacle(s) to overcome in writing the review. There should be *no* personal interjections.

This is official acknowledgment that I received the hardcopy of your review of xxx's scholarly record for tenure/promotion xxx at the University of New Mexico. I would like to thank you for your thoughtful and well considered assessment. Your confidential evaluation forms a crucial part of our deliberations and will be most helpful indeed.

The review committee's confidential report will be submitted to the faculty in advance of the special December xx, 20xx, meeting to evaluate candidates for tenure and/or promotion. Following that discussion confidential faculty ballots go to the department chair (Michael Graves), who writes and submits the final department recommendation to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences by mid-January 2007. When the chair informs me of the department's recommendation I will notify you.

Be assured that we will make every effort to reciprocate in the future. Again, our deep gratitude, Sincerely,

Responsibility: DA and CC

Due: Throughout summer and fall until finalized by mid-November

The DA keeps data required for "Arts and Sciences Promotion/Tenure Dossier – Form "1: List of External Reviewers" (IFF): reviewer name, CA or RC designated, date review requested, date review received, date review declined, no response. In its ongoing (and by mid-November finalized) form it should be available to faculty reviewing the dossier. After mid-November CC and DA sign and date the final dossier version.

Responsibility: CC

Due: As soon as recommendation known, no later than January 31

CC to DA, electronic: Letter thanking reviewers again and notifying them of the department decision on the CA. DA prepares letters for CC signature and mails them. This is the last CC obligation. Sample letter text:

To My Colleagues who evaluated xxx's tenure/promotion case:

Once again let me thank you for your participation in this important evaluation. Preparing the review committee report to the department faculty was not difficult when it came to the section on scholarly work. The range of critique both negative and positive and the carefully considered outside evaluations were tremendously helpful.

The report went to the faculty with a/n un/favorable recommendation for tenure/promotion xxx. Chair Michael Graves sent the department report and candidate dossier to the College of Arts and Sciences with a/n un/favorable recommendation. Departmental decisions are rarely overturned in either the College or the Provost's office, but xxx will not know the final disposition of her/his candidacy until the Regents' official decision by June 30, 20xx.

Again, let me express the review committee's deep appreciation for your guidance during this critical evaluation process. Sincerely,

TEACHING REPORT GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS

The Teaching Report is a separately signed document which is the responsibility of CT, who instructs and oversees GS and who coordinates with DA. CC and CM are not involved in this process.

Graduate student letters are read *only* by GS and CT. GS is responsible for handling these letters, which must stay with DA for safekeeping, until the separate teaching report has been written and signed. GS then seals all the letters in an envelope, signs/dates the sealing, and delivers it directly to the department chair. (Note: When necessary, use the department office shredder machine.)

Responsibility: CA

Due: Friday after Labor Day

CA to CT, electronic and hardcopy: 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). In the case of students who have received their degree, indicate their current or last known position/whereabouts.

Responsibility: GS
Due: By last Friday in September

GS to CT then DA, electronic: Addresses and text for letters to CA's present and former graduate students. DA prepares letters for GS signature and mails them. Sample letter text:

The Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico is considering Professor xxx for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology/promotion to the rank of Full Professor of Anthropology/tenure at the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology/tenure at the rank of Full Professor of Anthropology. As part of the review process, the tenure and promotion/promotion 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 [list them on separate lines]: (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 by November xx, 20xx (by 5:00 p.m. if hand-delivered or so postmarked). These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law. Throughout the process, they remain in the custody of the department administrator. For the review committee report they 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 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 seal the letters in an envelope and deliver them personally to Department Chair Michael Graves, the only other department member to read your letter. He will use them in his confidential report to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and they will be included in confidential files that go to the college review committee, designated for their eyes only (excluding any Anthropology Department members of that committee).

Please send written, signed statements addressed to me: xxx, Student Representative, xxx [last name] Tenure and Promotion/Tenure/Promotion Review Committee, Department of Anthropology, MSC01 1040, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1096. Indicate CONFIDENTIAL on the envelope. Students on campus may deliver them to Graduate Student X mailbox. Please put the sealed, confidential envelope addressed to me inside a manila campus mail envelope also addressed to me but not marked confidential. E-mail statements and unsigned statements will not be accepted; any such received will be deleted or shredded immediately. Do not send FAX statements. I will file all legitimate communications immediately with the department administrator. Please indicate either an e-mail or a postal address where I may send an acknowledgment of receipt.
Thank you for your assistance. Sincerely, xxx

Sample GS acknowledgment: “I received your confidential evaluation of Professor xxx’s teaching and mentoring on xxx [date]. It has been delivered to the department administrator for safekeeping. Professor xxx [CT] and I very much appreciate your participation in this important evaluation process. Sincerely, xxx” If acknowledged by postal mail, GS submits electronic text to DA, who produces letterhead version for signature and mails the letter.

Responsibility: GS

Due: By the second Friday in October

GS to CT to Graduate Advisor, electronic: The above letter with a second paragraph reading: “Personal letters have already been mailed to Professor xxx’s present and former graduate students. In this e-mail I invite comment from any other current department graduate students.” The graduate advisor will post this general solicitation to the anthropology graduate student list. The graduate advisor will re-send the e-mail with a reminder of the letter’s due date one week before that date.

Graduate student letters are read *only* by GS and CT. GS is responsible for handling these letters, which must stay with DA for safekeeping, until the separate teaching report has been written and signed. GS then seals all the letters in an envelope, signs/dates the sealing, and delivers it to the department chair. (Note: Use the department office shredder machine.)

CANDIDATE DOSSIER

Responsibility: CA with DA guidance

Due: By November 1 or nearest weekday

Specifications for the “Arts and Sciences Promotion/Tenure Dossier” are in IFF. Basically, CA is responsible for assembling Part B (Materials reviewed by the Department), numbers (1) “CV, complete and in College format (*including brief narrative description of research, teaching and service goals*)”; (2) “Candidate’s expanded statement of scholarly professional achievements and future goals” (note that Anthropology requires teaching and service as well); (4a) “Summary of ICES evaluations (College form #2)”; and (5) “List of supplemental materials (College form #3) (*All documents and materials in this section have been provided by the candidate to the [Dept.] Chair. This list should be signed by the [Dept.] Chair, indicating that all items have been received and placed in the file.*)” The List of Supplemental Materials divides these into Books, Articles, Research Grants, ICES summary analyses of individual courses, Course syllabi and exams, Letters, Student Comments on ICES forms, Reviews of proposals or manuscripts, and Other.

DA will help with procedural questions. CA is responsible for the dossier contents and their timely placement in the file. CA notifies CC when dossier is complete. Thereafter, CA has no further direct access to the dossier and must submit any changes to DA.

Responsibility: CC

Due: As soon as CA’s dossier is ready for viewing

CC determines that the dossier is ready for viewing after CA attests that her/his part is completed and after the deadline for reviewer letters has passed. CC notifies the faculty and instructs them to follow the viewing procedures set up by DA, who is responsible for maintaining the files' integrity and confidentiality. (For example, reviewer letters may be kept separately and available for inspection under different regulations than supplemental materials.)

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Responsibility: CT

Due: Between mid-October and mid-November

By prior arrangement, CT visits one session of each department course and/or seminar taught by CA during the review semester. CT writes up a two/three-paragraph report on each visit.

CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM

Responsibility: CA, CC, DA

Due: Between mid-October and mid-November

The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on CA's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Department faculty and graduate students attend, and it is announced only through e-mail to them. Faculty members initially comment and pose questions after the presentation, then graduate students (and faculty who may later be prompted to raise additional points and questions) join the discussion.

CA notifies CC of the title and works with DA to set up the time. DA sends the e-mail announcement to faculty and graduate students. No flyers are posted. CC introduces CA and afterward sets out the terms of the question period, which is then turned over to CA.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Responsibility: CC, CT, GS, CM, DA

Due: By noon on the Monday before the first Friday in December

During November CC, CM, CT, GS write and finalize their reports. CC is responsible for the Scholarly Work section and for the final RC report with CC, CM, and CT signatures. (The signature page should be a final, separate page in order to accommodate changes suggested in the special faculty meeting without re-signing the document.) CM is responsible for the Service section. CT, working with GS, is responsible for a separate teaching report.

CC submits the signed, original RC report to DA (and electronically to CM, CT) by noon on the Monday before the first-Friday-in-December faculty meeting to discuss tenure and promotion candidates. CT submits the signed (by CT and GS), original teaching report directly to DA (and electronically to CC, CM, GS) by that same noon. DA appends the teaching report to the RC report, photocopies the entire document, and by 4:00 that afternoon puts confidential, sealed envelopes (each containing a single CA's report) in appropriate faculty mailboxes. If possible, DA mails copies to faculty not in residence during the review semester; otherwise, copies are transmitted electronically. **Note:** All reports must be returned to DA following the special faculty meeting.

The RC 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 readily informed by the same presentation and accounts of current FH/IFF/departmental criteria, policy and procedure.

Overall Structure/Editing of Review Committee Report

Responsibility: CC

- The introductory section of the report is framed thus:

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 xxx (X subfield)
Associate Professor/Professor xxx (X subfield – this is CT)
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 coming to UNM. Also include any significant time spent in visiting faculty or temporary research/fellowship positions away from UNM after assuming the 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 other 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.]

- The teaching section of the report follows and is presented thus:

Teaching:

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.

- The scholarly work section of the report follows and is framed thus:

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 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)

[The CC’s report on scholarly work (see below) begins here.] 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.

- The service section of the report follows and is framed thus:

Service:

Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and teaching.... Untenured assistant professors.... or 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*)

[The CM’s report on service (see below) begins here.] Sample first sentence: Professor xxx’s service record is excellent with respect to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community.

- The concluding section of the report is framed thus:

Recommendation:

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 [CC, CM, CT] with the date for each.

Scholarly Work Section

Responsibility: CC

This evaluation is based on the outside reviewer letters and CA'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. Department faculty and graduate students attend, and it is announced only through e-mail to them."

Following is a paragraph about outside reviewers. Sample text:

The review committee solicited letters of evaluation from xx [no.] scholars/professionals with expertise in 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) tenured (if academic); (3) neither from the dissertation committee nor former/current research/writing collaborators during the three previous years; and (4) preferably from institutions which are UNM's peers or 'betters.'"] A total of xx outside reviewer letters are in the file, xx [no.] from a list submitted by Professor xxx and xx [no.] from names proposed by committee members and other knowledgeable senior faculty members.

Following are four sets of numbered names. Each 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 Committee, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise, are:

- (1) xxx
- (2) xxx

Those from the Committee'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

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 short 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: xxxxxxxxxxx [profile of research interests and geographic areas] (AAA Guide). *Or* xxxxxxxxxxx [profile of research interests] (dept. website). *Or* xxxxxxxx [brief characterization of research]; xxxxxxxx [title of book], editor, xxxxxxxx [title of book]. [If the reviewer has declined, add:] Reason(s): xxxxxx [ill health; overbooked; on sabbatical; in the field; etc., using short quotes from the letter if needed, e.g.: "Xxx is a wonderful person but I have to teach 3,000 core curriculum students this semester."]

A paragraph with a version of the following text follows:

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 xxxxxx [list the 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.

Service Section

Responsibility: CM

This evaluation is based on the CV, expanded statement of achievements/goals, and dossier materials. 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.

Teaching Report

Responsibility: CT, GS

This evaluation is based on (1) the CV; (2) expanded statement of achievements/goals; (3) ICES, 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 CT; (5) CA's record of student advisement and individual instruction; (6) GS-solicited letters from CA'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 GS *does not have access to those documents*.

CT has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report. CC and CM should review this only after it is written. GS writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to CT for review. Either GS or CT may raise confidential questions about the letters directly to the department chair only. CC and CM have no involvement with the GS report in any way; its wording remains as agreed upon between CT and GS (and if necessary the department chair).

The introductory paragraphs of the report constitute a summary of CA'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) CA's expanded statement on their teaching accomplishments and goals.

(2) Course Evaluations: (a) ICES, including a chart presenting the Form #2 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 the student comments. Other evaluation forms should be treated similarly.

(3) Classroom Observations by Professor xxx [CT]: CT visits one session of each CA class/seminar taught during the current review semester. Two/three-paragraph evaluation reports on each are

included verbatim here.

(4) Student Advisement and Individual Instruction: a chart presenting the number of students in 497, Honors, 597/598, MA committee, MA 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 GS, is not subject to any further revision. In writing this evaluation from the graduate student letters, GS 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. (a) GS begins by identifying her/himself as an x-year graduate student in x subfield. Also indicate any previous association with CA, e.g., taking a class from CA or serving on a committee with them. (b) Then in a list indicate how many review letter solicitations were successfully mailed (not how many could not be delivered) from CA'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 CT and GS recommendation and is co-signed and dated.

SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON TENURE/PROMOTION CASES

Responsibility: CC overall and for own section, CM and CT for their sections

Due: Special faculty meeting on the first Friday in December

Both tenure-track and research faculty participate in this special, highly confidential meeting, but only tenure-track faculty vote on tenure/promotion cases. No visiting faculty or presenters from outside the department attend. DA attends and takes notes for the 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 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). CC introduces the case, followed by separate presentations on teaching (CT), scholarly work (CC) and service (CM). CC concludes the presentation and moderates subsequent discussion, which may include suggestions for revisions to the RC document (except the GS report on the graduate student letters).

The 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 the department chair (with DA help) conducts a secret, provisional yes/no/abstain ballot and announces the results (afterward conveying them non-numerically to the candidate). 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 CA's dossier. (CA will learn the final department recommendation when they receive the redacted version of the chair's report to the dean.)

Responsibility: CC and/or CT

Due: By 5:00 on the Monday following the December first-Friday special faculty meeting

CC and/or CT make any revisions called for during the special faculty meeting. Signature pages remain the same but a full, new hardcopy of the text (if necessary) must be delivered to DA. Except for CC's January letter to reviewers (see above) and submitting individual confidential ballots, the RC has no further involvement in the review process.