

## UNM DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW HANDBOOK

The Department is bound by the University's "Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure" in *The University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook* and by "Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies/Procedures" in the College of Arts and Sciences. Access to both through Arts and Sciences: <http://www.unm.edu/~artsci/faculty/promotion.htm>

The Department "Criteria for Tenure and Promotion" were adopted on January 19, 2007.

*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 [= RC]:**  
(Three appointed by Department Chair from tenured faculty at or above Candidate's rank, with RC Chair normally from the same subfield; AGSU appoints the graduate student from another subfield who participates in the teaching evaluation only.)

RC Chair is responsible for all committee work and for the final report to Department Chair.  
RC Member is from Candidate's subfield with primary responsibility for evaluating service.  
RC Teaching is from outside Candidate's subfield and responsible for the separate teaching evaluation.  
RC Grad Student from outside Candidate's subfield works separately with RC Teaching.

Each RC member receives a copy of this Handbook. If tenure is involved, faculty RC members receive copies of all Candidate's previous annual and mid-probationary RC reviews. In no case do they receive copies of or otherwise utilize any other faculty member's reports or records. This Handbook is the sole current guide.

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

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

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

**OUTSIDE REVIEWER LETTERS:**

College requirement is 8 letters. Department goal is 3 letters from reviewers suggested by Candidate and 5 letters from reviewers chosen by RC. If for some reason a 4<sup>th</sup> name is chosen from Candidate's list then there must be 6 reviewers of RC'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 RC'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 RC Report.

In designating potential reviewers RC Chair consults with RC Member. RC Chair may also confidentially solicit suggestions from other tenured faculty in the department. In no case should RC 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:**

Due Date	Responsibility	Responsible Party
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of April	List of Possible Reviewers to RC Chair, RC Member	Candidate
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of April	Reviewer Packet to RC Chair	Candidate
By Last Friday of April	Reviewer Packet approval or revisions requested to Cand.	RC Chair
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	Reviewer Packet (revised if necessary) to RC Chair, RC Member, RC Teaching,	Candidate

	Department Administrator	
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	2 rank-ordered lists of potential reviewers to Department Administrator	RC Chair
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	First 8 potential reviewers contacted (electronic)	Department Administrator
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of May	Hardcopy of materials for Reviewer Packets to Department Administrator	Candidate
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of September	Final CV, expanded statement (electronic and hardcopy) to RC Chair, RC Member, RC Teaching	Candidate
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of September	Final CV, expanded statement (electronic and hardcopy) and any revised mss., etc. (hardcopy) for Reviewer Packet to Department Administrator	Candidate
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of September	Review acknowledgment letter (electronic) to Dept. Admin.	RC Chair
By January 31	Letter about dept. decision (electronic) to Dept. Admin.	RC Chair

**Reviewer Solicitation Letters:**

*Candidate's List of Possible Reviewers:* (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 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 delivers this list (electronic and hardcopy) to RC Chair and RC Member by mid-April.

*Candidate's Reviewer Packet:* By mid-April Candidate submits electronically to RC Chair: (1) "Standard Faculty Vita" according to requirements online at Arts and Sciences "Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies/Procedures"; (2) brief narrative statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals; (3) list of published and unpublished materials for inclusion in Reviewer Packet. (Note that [1] and [2] will be revised/expanded and sent to reviewers early in the Fall semester.) RC Chair reviews the packet by the end of April and either approves it or requests revisions which must be completed by the first Friday in May, when Candidate sends the approved version to RC Chair, RC Member, RC Teaching and Department Administrator.

*Sample Reviewer Solicitation Letter:*

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 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 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 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 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

*Reviewer Solicitation Process:* By the first Friday in May, RC Chair provides Department Administrator an electronic version of the letter's text and (electronic and hardcopy) full contact particulars (name, titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone and FAX 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.) RC Chair submits two lists: one with 6 rank-ordered names from Candidate and one with 6-8 rank-ordered names from RC. 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, RC proceeds with whatever they have (or not) and does not ask Candidate 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 Candidate suggestions) RC reviewers cannot be secured, then additional names will be added to the RC list.

By mid-May, Candidate delivers hardcopy of manuscripts and actual copies of publications, reprints, etc. 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 RC Chair including: (1) solicitation letter on letterhead; (2) CV; (3) list of available reprints, publications, manuscripts. Thereafter, when refusals come in, Department Administrator sends 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 RC Chair. Reviewers who accept are immediately sent *signed* hardcopy of the letter. Depending on mailing costs, requested Candidate reviewer-requested materials may go in a separate package.

By the Tuesday after Labor Day, Candidate delivers (electronic and hardcopy) to RC Chair, RC Member, RC Teaching and Department Administrator: (1) final CV; (2) final, expanded statement of teaching, scholarly work, and service accomplishments and future goals.

### **Review Letters:**

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

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.

By the Tuesday after Labor Day, RC Chair provides Department Administrator with an electronic version of the acknowledgment letter. Department Administrator prints it on letterhead and RC Chair signs it before Department Administrator 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 on time. 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 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 20xx. 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, xxx

Throughout, Department Administrator keeps data required for "Arts and Sciences Promotion/Tenure Dossier – Form #1: List of External Reviewers." In its ongoing (and by mid-November finalized) form it should be available to faculty reviewing the dossier. After mid-November RC Chair and Department Administrator sign and date the final dossier version.

No later than January 31, RC Chair electronically sends Department Administrator text for a letter thanking reviewers again and notifying them of the department decision on Candidate. Department

Administrator prepares individual letters for RC Chair signature and mails them. This is the last RC Chair 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 in 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, xxx

**GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS FOR TEACHING REPORT:**

Working with instruction and oversight from RC Teaching, RC Grad Student solicits letters from Candidate's present and former graduate students and all current Department graduate students. These letters are read *only* by RC Teaching and RC Grad Student. The latter is responsible for handling these letters, which must stay with Department Administrator for safekeeping, until the separate Teaching Report has been written and signed. RC Grad Student then seals all the letters in an envelope, signs/dates the sealing, and delivers it directly to Department Chair. (Note: When necessary, use the Department office shredder machine.)

**Calendar for Graduate Student Letters:**

Due Date	Responsibility	Responsible Party
By 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday of September	List of grad students and contact info to RC Teaching	Candidate
By 3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday of September	Addresses and electronic text for letter to Candidate's grad students to RC Teaching (deadline for responses: First Friday of November)	RC Grad Student
By last Friday of September	Addresses, letter text to Department Administrator	RC Teaching
For first Friday's mail in October	Letters, signed by RC Graduate Student, are mailed/put in boxes	Department Administrator
By first Friday in October	Electronic text for letter to current grad students to RC Teaching (deadline for responses: First Friday of November)	RC Grad Student

By first Friday in October	Electronic letter text to Graduate Adviser, who e-mails Grad Student list, followed by a reminder on last Friday of October	RC Teaching Graduate Adviser
----------------------------	---	------------------------------

**Candidate's List:**

In both 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). 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 [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 postmarked by November xx, 20xx (or by 5:00 p.m. if hand-delivered). These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law. Throughout the review process, they remain in the custody of the department administrator.

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 seal the letters in an envelope and deliver them personally to Department Chair Michael Graves, 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 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] Mid-Probationary Review Committee, Department of Anthropology, MSC01 1040, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1096. Students on campus may deliver them personally to Graduate Student X mailbox. 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. Upon receipt, I will file all legitimate communications 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 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 [RC Teaching] and I very much appreciate your participation in this important review process. Sincerely, xxx.” If acknowledged by postal mail, RC Grad Student submits electronic text to Department Administrator, who produces letterhead version for signature and mails the letter.

**Graduate List Letter:**

The above letter with a changed deadline and a second paragraph added: “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.” Graduate Adviser posts this general solicitation to the anthropology graduate student list and re-sends the e-mail with a reminder of the letter’s due date one week later.

**CALENDAR FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

Due Date	Responsibility	Responsible Party
Mid-October to mid-November	Classroom observations	RC Teaching
Mid-October to mid-November	Research Colloquium	Candidate, RC Chair, Department Administrator
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Monday of November	Dossier finalized	Candidate with Dept. Admin.
By 1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday of November	Faculty notified dossier open	RC Chair
By noon, last Monday of November	RC Report to Dept. Admin.	RC Chair
By noon, last Monday of November	RC Teaching Report to Department Administrator	RC Teaching
By end of day last Monday of November	RC Reports to faculty	Department Administrator
1 <sup>st</sup> Friday of December	Special Faculty Meeting	
By 5:00 Monday after Faculty Meeting	Revised (if necessary) RC Report and RC Teaching Report to Department Administrator	RC Chair, RC Teaching

**CANDIDATE DOSSIER:**

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

Department Administrator helps with procedural questions. Candidate is responsible for the dossier



contents and their timely placement in the file. Candidate notifies RC Chair when dossier is complete. Thereafter, Candidate has no further access to the dossier and must submit any changes to Department Administrator.

RC 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, RC 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. (For example, confidential reviewer letters may be kept separately and available for inspection under different regulations than supplemental materials.)

### **CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS:**

Between mid-October and mid-November, by prior arrangement, RC Teaching 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 RC 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.

RC 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 RC Report is written during November. Responsibilities: (1) RC Chair – Scholarly Work, final document, separate signature page, incorporating any revisions specified during the special faculty meeting; (2) RC Member – Service; (3) RC Teaching, working with RC Grad Student – separate Teaching Report.

*By noon on the Monday before the first-Friday in December special faculty meeting:* RC Chair submits the signed, original RC Report to Department Administrator (and electronically to RC Member and RC Teaching). RC Teaching submits the signed (by RC Teaching and RC Grad Student), original Teaching Report to Department Administrator (and electronically to RC Chair, RC Member, RC Grad Student). Department Administrator 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 Candidate's report) in appropriate faculty mailboxes. If possible, Department Administrator mails copies to faculty not in residence during the review semester; otherwise, such copies are transmitted electronically. **Note:** All reports must be returned to Department Administrator 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 clearly and uniformly informed by College and Department criteria, policy and procedure.

**RC 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) [this is RC Teaching]  
*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.]

**RC Teaching Section Format:**

**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. Modify as appropriate.

**RC 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)

RC Chair'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. Modify as appropriate.

### **RC 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)

RC Member'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. Modify as appropriate.

## RC Concluding Section Format:

### 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 [RC Chair, RC Member, RC Teaching] and the date for each.

### Scholarly Work Section:

RC 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.

### **Service Section:**

RC 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.

### **Teaching Report:**

RC Teaching and RC Grad Student base this evaluation on: (1) the CV; (2) expanded statement of achievements/goals; (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) RC Grad 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 RC Grad Student *does not have access to those documents*.

RC Teaching has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report. RC Chair and RC Member should review this only after it is written. RC Grad Student writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to RC Teaching for review. Either RC Grad Student or RC Teaching may raise confidential questions about the letters directly to Department Chair only. RC Chair and RC Member have no involvement with the RC Grad Student report in any way; its wording remains as agreed upon between RC Teaching and RC 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 expanded statement on 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 student comments. Other evaluation forms should be treated similarly.

(3) Classroom Observations by Professor xxx [RC Teaching]: 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 RC Grad Student, is not subject to any further revision. In writing this evaluation from the confidential graduate student letters, RC 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.

RC 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 RC Teaching and RC Grad Student recommendations and is co-signed and dated.

#### **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 RC 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). RC Chair introduces the case, followed by separate presentations on teaching (RC Teaching), scholarly work (RC Chair), and service (RC Member). RC Chair concludes the presentation and moderates subsequent discussion, which may include suggestions for revisions to the RC document (except the RC 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: RC Chair and/or RC Teaching 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 Department Administrator by 5:00 on the Monday following the special meeting. Except for RC Chair's January letter to reviewers (see above) and submitting individual confidential ballots, Review Committee has no further involvement in the review process.