Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Anthropology
Appalachian State University

This document was approved by TT department faculty on May 19, 2023

A. The Department of Anthropology expects candidates for tenure and/or promotion to demonstrate (1) effectiveness in teaching, (2) an active record of high-quality scholarship, and (3) engaged service to the department, university, and profession.

The following sections of this document outline the departmental procedures and expectations for departmental candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The timeline and criteria in section B apply to advancement to either rank. Specific information regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor can be found in section C, below. Specific information regarding tenure and promotion to 'full' Professor is located in section D.

In this document "Candidate" refers to the faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion.

All procedures and criteria in this document must conform to the policies of the current Appalachian State University Faculty Handbook, Appalachian State University, and the University of North Carolina System.

B. Departmental Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion

1. Outline of the departmental timeline and process for applications for tenure and/or promotion. (Further details can be found in the sections below and in the Faculty Handbook)

- **Early March to May 1:** Candidate works with the Department Chair to prepare and submit a written notice of intent to apply, a list of potential external reviewers (see section 2 below for more detail about external reviewers), and, following the guidelines set out in the Faculty Handbook, an indication of which version of the Department Promotion and Tenure document is to be used to evaluate their application

- **Early May:** The tenured members of the department (the APT committee) are informed of expected application(s) and asked to provide names of additional possible external reviewers no later than 3 business days in advance of the final APT meeting of the academic year

- **May-June:** APT and Department Chair meet to approve external review candidates (the final APT meeting is expected to be in early May)
- **July 1:** Candidate will submit dossier and accompanying artifacts compiled as required by the Faculty Handbook. Electronic submissions are acceptable.
- **July-August:** Department Chair solicits external review letters from list approved by APT
- **August-October:** Department Chair shares dossier and external review letters with APT no later than 15 business days in advance of the APT meeting in which an application will be considered
- **October-November:** APT meets to consider candidates for promotion and tenure, according to the deadlines set by the College and University
- **October-November:** APT Chair submits letter to the Department Chair documenting the committee recommendation
- **November-December:** Department Chair writes independent letter of recommendation
- **November-December:** Department Chair adds APT letter and Chair letter to the dossier and submits to the Dean according to the deadlines set by the College and University

2. External Reviewers

As a department with a diverse faculty portfolio, the goal of including external review letters in tenure and/or promotion dossiers is to ensure equitable evaluation of candidates by professionals with relevant experience and expertise, especially in cases when the APT membership may not include faculty with closely related work.

a. External Reviewers Process

By no later than May 1, each candidate for tenure and/or promotion will submit to the department chair a list of at least five scholars as potential external reviewers. Reviewers should meet the criteria described below (section B.2.b). Candidates are also allowed to identify specific scholars who they do not want to review their dossier. For each name submitted, candidates will provide the name, title, institutional affiliation, and a short justification that describes why the scholar is an appropriate or unacceptable choice and addresses any potential conflict of interest.

After the candidate submits their list of names, the department chair shares the list with the APT and asks the APT members to provide names of additional possible external reviewers.

The APT will then meet with the department chair to approve a list of potential external reviewers. The APT may suggest preferences for the order in which the department chair will reach out to recruit reviewers.

The expected number of external reviewers will be three for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and two for promotion to Professor. One Reviewer for each case should be a scholar not nominated by the candidate if possible.

After External Review Letters have been received, the APT may vote to direct the Department Chair to exclude specific external review letters from the candidate's application materials/portfolio based on the presence of ad hominem attacks, hostility, or lack of professionalism in the submitted review.

b. External Reviewers Criteria

Appropriate External Reviewers for tenure and promotion cases will generally be PhD Anthropologists at the rank of Associate Professor or 'full' Professor. Some exceptions may be allowed when appropriate, for example:

- Holders of other titles or degrees may be appropriate in specific cases. Justification should be documented when submitting lists of potential reviewers.
- For example, professionals with 5-10 years of relevant experience may be acceptable even though they may have alternate but substantially equivalent titles due to employment at research institutions, museums, or universities abroad. This may include emeritus/a/x professors if they have published within the last 5 years of the candidate's application.
- While PhD holders are generally considered the most appropriate reviewers, candidates may make the case for scholars with other terminal degrees (DPhil, for example) if appropriate in particular cases.
- Non-anthropologists may be acceptable as external reviewers in some specific cases (for example, linguists, biologists, gender studies academics, etc.) where appropriate to evaluate a candidate's expertise and experience.
- No more than one person in any set of external reviewers may be a non-anthropologist.
- External reviewers should not be dissertation advisors or committee members, close collaborators, or relatives.
- Close collaborators are individuals with whom the candidate has had an extended and substantial professional relationship, for example a co-project director, or a co-author writing project that has only 2-3 authors.
- Being a part of a conference session, edited volume, or large research or publication team with someone does not constitute close collaboration.

c. External Reviewers Charge

The department chair will request that external reviewers primarily review candidates' scholarship and associated scholarly service.

- Reviewers will be charged with evaluating a candidate's scholarly activities in the context of the teaching and service load expected of an Appalachian State University faculty member and member of this department.
- A copy of the relevant departmental Promotion and Tenure document will be provided to Reviewers along with the candidate's full dossier and supporting artifacts.
- The department chair will request that a potential reviewer make a statement of any potential conflict of interest both before accepting the role of Reviewer and in the resulting review letter.

C. Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor

1. EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING may be demonstrated in several ways, including innovative syllabi covering relevant anthropological topics and a sustained record of high-quality work with students. Candidates will submit a teaching portfolio that includes evidence of teaching effectiveness (sample syllabi, handouts, exams, peer-reviews, evidence of teaching awards or award nominations, advising successes, student teaching evaluations, and/or self-assessments, and other).

2. SCHOLARSHIP. The Anthropology Department recognizes that no simple checklist can adequately convey what it means to engage in "high quality scholarship." The intent of this document is to allow for a flexible but rigorous accounting of quality scholarship. As such, the items noted below should not be considered a checklist, but rather a guideline pointing to the kinds of well-rounded portfolios expected of candidates for tenure and promotion.

Candidates are expected to sustain an active research program in their sub-discipline and specialization, one which appears likely to continue beyond tenure and promotion to associate professor. Scholarship will be evaluated based on quality and quantity of scholarly production.

Scholarly production takes a variety of forms, from successfully securing external research funding, to undertaking original research, to disseminating results of research in professional conferences, to giving invited talks, to collaborative research, to technological inventions and new applications, to applied and policy outcomes, and to, of course, publications. Some combination of these activities, and any others that fit the candidates' specialization, are part of what makes strong evidence of quality and quantity of scholarship.

The department agrees that among all of these possible activities, publication, while not sufficient alone, is indeed one necessary measure of scholarship and must be included as one part of any application for tenure or promotion. Furthermore, members of the

department agree that publications demonstrating intensive and extensive peer-review are important for demonstrating high quality scholarly contributions to the field. Publishing articles in reputable scholarly journals is one way to demonstrate quality of scholarship. There are others as well including, for example, citation counts, or multiple positive reviews of the candidates' work in scholarly journals. In addition, the department will rely on external review to evaluate the quality of a candidate's scholarship. Positive peer evaluation of one's scholarship may be more diffusely refracted in still other forms, such as invitations to give talks at other universities, to participate in scholarly collaborations or projects, to serve on editorial boards or fellowship/grant proposal review committees, to review and compose policy statements, and so on.

In reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion, the department will take into account evidence of peer- review, broadly defined, but recognizes, too, that some peer-review is more intensive and extensive than others. Among the most rigorous of peer-review processes for anthropological research are those that occur in top rated journals and those that occur in the publication of monographs. Edited volumes do not always undergo rigorous peer-review and so are not assumed to carry the same value as articles or monographs without concrete evidence to the contrary (citations, reviews, copies of the peer-reviews, etc.).

In summary, the department expects and accepts a range of scholarly—including practical or applied-- activities. While different scholars will engage in different sorts of scholarly activities, we expect all candidates to provide evidence of quality peer-reviewed publication.

a. Publication Portfolios

Here we offer a basic guideline for the expected peer-review publications required for making a strong application for promotion and tenure. Once minimal criteria for peer-reviewed scholarship are met, we think scholars should be free to take risks and engage in work that they themselves define as important to their field and their aims as scholars, scholar-teachers, public intellectuals, etc.

The minimal acceptable publication record for a candidate for tenure and promotion is four full length peer-review articles in reputable scholarly journals, or their equivalent, as outlined here. At minimum, the department will require one peer-reviewed article in a reputable scholarly journal in combination with other equivalents.

Assuming that any and all candidates will publish at least one full length article in a reputable scholarly journal, in lieu of the remaining three articles the following equivalencies are acceptable:

1. Sole-authored book = up to 3 articles depending on the length and complexity of the project and the reputation of the press.

2. Co-authored book = up to 3 articles depending on the relative contribution of the authors, the length and complexity of the project and the reputation of the press.

3. Edited or co-edited book = up to 2 articles depending on the relative contribution of the editors, the length and complexity of the project, the reputation of the press and the impact of the volume.

4. Peer-reviewed chapter in an edited volume = up to 1 article depending on the length and complexity of the project and the reputation of the press. (Co-authored chapters will be rated on a case to case basis, up to the equivalent of 1 article.)

5. Successful or highly rated proposals for external funding = 1 article.

6. Published and/or copyrighted software or other research related technologies= up to 1 article.

7. Published book review in reputable publications= 0.20 article. (Up to five may be included in application—in other words, 15 book reviews will not make an adequate tenure case.)

8. Unpublished legal, technical, or applied report to an agency = generally 0.10 article, but up to 1 article depending on length, complexity and whether or not the contribution is peer-reviewed.

9. A juried film/special exhibition or other anthropological creative product = up to 3 articles depending on the length, complexity of the project, and contribution of the faculty member.

10. Other equivalencies may be presented by the candidate, with prior agreement shaped in discussion with the department Chair.

Given these equivalencies, examples of profiles that meet the minimum expectations for publication for promotion and tenure at the level of associate professor are as follows:

1. Two peer-reviewed articles in professional journals, one chapter in an edited book, and one highly rated or successful proposal for external funding.

2. Two peer-reviewed articles in professional journals and one major, full-length edited book.

3. One peer-reviewed article and one high quality sole-authored book.

4. Three peer-reviewed journal articles and a highly rated or successful external funding proposal.

5. Three peer-reviewed journal articles and one minimally reviewed edited book.

6. Four peer-reviewed articles in reputable professional journals.

7. Two peer-reviewed articles, five book reviews in significant journals, and one chapter in a peer- reviewed edited book.

8. One journal article, 10 technical reports or applied policy statements, and one edited book.

9. One juried/special exhibition or creative scholarly product and one peer-reviewed article or one successful or highly rated grant proposal.

10. Etc., as discussed and noted in writing during annual review meetings with the Department Chair.

These publications must be completed during the candidates' time at ASU unless otherwise negotiated with the Dean upon hiring. Articles and manuscripts completed and formally accepted for publication but not yet in print will count.

We recognize that co-authorship or group authorship resulting from collaborative scholarly projects is the norm in some anthropological specialties, while uncommon in others. Candidates may submit a statement as part of their portfolio explaining their role in publications that are not first or sole-authored.

3. SERVICE. All candidates for tenure must demonstrate sustained and responsible service to the department, university, and/or profession. Service can take many forms.

The candidate may request that the Department Chair solicit letters to document other aspects of the candidate's qualifications and experience. These letters may be written by administrators, staff, or faculty members at Appalachian State University, community partners, or members of other academic institutions. Such letters may be especially useful to highlight forms of "invisible" service such as informal mentoring of students with marginalized identities, DEI contributions requiring high emotional labor input, or other forms of extraordinary or high-commitment service outside of the department.

D. PROMOTION to the rank of Professor

The following criteria for promotion to Professor assume that the faculty member regularly received ¼ reassigned time for scholarly activity. If that is not the case, criteria will be modified on a case to case basis by the chair and the DPC. Applications will include a letter outlining accomplishments, evidence as noted below, and two letters from external reviewers evaluating the candidate's qualifications, including the quality of their scholarship. The criteria for promotion to full professor are:

1. TEACHING. Sustained record of teaching effectiveness to be demonstrated by a teaching portfolio. Courses and course content should reflect some updating and change relevant to development in the candidate's field of study.

2. SCHOLARSHIP. Candidates shall demonstrate continued development of their research and scholarly reputation as evidenced by participation in professional conferences, invitations to speak, participation in workshops and symposia, funding proposals, applied or participatory research, and/or a continued record of research including a sustained record of peer-reviewed scholarship. From the time candidates are accepted as Associate Professors to their application for promotion to Professor, their continued publication record will demonstrate high quality and significant quantity of research. Assuming application is made in the eleventh year of employment at ASU (five years after promotion to Associate Professor), examples of profiles that might meet the minimum expectations for promotion and tenure at the level of professor in regard to quantity of publications are as follows (works accepted for publication but not yet in print will count):

Four peer-reviewed articles in professional journals or their equivalent, as set out in the equivalencies table above. Examples of profiles that meet the minimum expectations for publication for promotion and tenure at the level of full professor are as follows:

   1. Four peer-reviewed articles in professional journals.

   2. Two peer-reviewed articles in professional journals and two chapters in edited books.

   3. One peer-reviewed article and one full-length monograph.

   4. One peer-reviewed article, one chapter in an edited book, and one edited book.

   5. One monograph and one edited book.

   6. Two chapters in edited books, one minor edited book, and one successful or highly rated external funding proposal.

7. One juried/special exhibition or scholarly product and one peer-reviewed article or one successful or highly reviewed grant proposal.

8. The equivalent as determined in discussion with Department Chair and as evident in a range of activities such as successful or highly rated external funding proposals, demonstrable outcomes of applied work or policy work, juried scholarly films, book reviews, review articles, exhibitions, and other creative or scholarly output as appropriate to the candidate's particular specialization and/or contract.

If candidates come up later than five years after promotion to Associate Professor, the required publication profiles will reflect the following guidelines, which echo the Arts and Sciences minimal expectations for securing continued release time for research. Examples of profiles that meet minimal expectations for each of every three years of employment with ¼ release time for research include two peer-reviewed articles in professional journals or their equivalent, as set out in the equivalences table noted above.

3. SERVICE. All candidates for Professor must have provided sustained, responsible, and significant service to the department, university, and profession. Professional service includes but is not limited to community outreach, serving as external reviewer on grant proposals, publishing book reviews in professional venues, serving on editorial boards, serving as committee members for professional organizations, and other activities.

The candidate may request that the Department Chair solicit letters to document other aspects of the candidate's qualifications and experience. These letters may be written by administrators, staff, or faculty members at Appalachian State University, community partners, or members of other academic institutions. Such letters may be especially useful to highlight forms of "invisible" service such as informal mentoring of students with marginalized identities, DEI contributions requiring high emotional labor input, or other forms of extraordinary or high-commitment service outside of the department.