Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
INTRODUCTION

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism of insuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to insure accurate assessments and proper outcomes. It is not the intention of the guidelines to enumerate every detail for the promotion and tenure process. Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the process that will be followed in the Department. Candidates are directed to both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure and/or promotion and for details of the University and College expectations. The Department of Anthropology will evaluate all candidates in three areas: professional development, teaching and service. The Department values all three highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its faculty in each one. It should be noted, however, that the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual states that for a candidate to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, s/he must be judged at least excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least good in the area of service. The College Manual also specifies that candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor must be judged at least excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least very good in the area of service.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Anthropology views professional development as encompassing any activity that advances the discipline by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research, professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance research in the discipline. The Department of Anthropology recognizes that scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic vs. applied research, theoretical vs. empirical work, scholarship of discovery vs. scholarship of integration, qualitative vs. quantitative methods, and primary vs. secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false choices. Each research topic, method, and approach produces a valuable product that advances scholarship. We believe, therefore, that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach is inherently superior to another. For example, a person who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who publishes his/her work in books whose publication process has comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books) will be evaluated on the contribution to scholarship of the whole body of work. Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and we will consider published work that was not refereed as less significant. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to teaching unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to the scholarship of the field. Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued professional development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as
evidence of scholarly reputation. While we expect all tenure-track and tenured faculty to have active research agendas and to pursue funding that supports those activities, we also recognize that the availability of such funding varies significantly across subdisciplines and, more specifically, according to topics of research and the resources particular projects demand. Therefore, while grant support is no substitute for published research, external grant support is highly valued by the department. Individual candidates for tenure and promotion will be evaluated with holistic attention to the vitality and productivity of their ongoing research agendas, as judged by funding pursued and/or received as well as publications and external reviews of scholarship. Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are important and expected activities for any scholar. Although no specific type of such activities is required for promotion and tenure, we recognize that significant professional roles (such as editing a journal, holding an office in a professional organization, or planning a conference panel or event) involve substantial intellectual labor, enrich an individual’s research agenda and reputation, and therefore also contribute to the scholarly profile of the department and university. Hence our evaluations for promotion and tenure will give value to professional service activities that significantly complement a candidate’s record of publication and funded research.

The Department recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does exist within the field of anthropology. Many scholars disagree about such rankings, however, and the inclination to assign status value to specific journals is pointless and potentially harmful. The problem of ranking journals is most apparent with “specialty” journals, where specialists in one sub-field may find it difficult to draw comparisons between their own journals and those of another sub-field. In fact, as in many other disciplines, very valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may be published in the lesser-known “specialty” journals. The Department further recognizes that important contributions to scholarship may appear in non-traditional forms of refereed media such as internet journals. The Department’s goal, therefore, is to foster the creation and dissemination of high-quality scholarship, and we will expect every candidate to meet that standard. The quality of the candidate’s publication record will be assessed on several factors: 1) the work’s impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, or other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal (even for a sub-field when it applies) in which an article appears or the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the committee’s independent assessment of the work.

The Department of Anthropology recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship. While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of determining the relative contributions of several co-authors, anthropological research in some subfields is increasingly a team effort, and often of an interdisciplinary nature. This necessarily results in publications with multiple authors, and we do not assign higher intrinsic value to either single-authored or jointly authored works. We also recognize that the order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work. We will, however, give proportional credit based upon the nature of the candidate’s contribution as established in the dossier. In all cases, the Department will take into account the methodological and intellectual specificities of the candidate’s research agenda as well as the nature and scope of his or her contribution to each co-authored publication. We do expect that a portion of each successful
candidate’s publication record will be single-authored or first-authored. As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. We recognize that anthropologists can and do regularly make scholarly contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in professional publications of other disciplines.

Finally, perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The Department of Anthropology strongly resists the idea that qualitative evaluations (e.g., “excellent” and “very good”) can be defined solely by numbers of publications or other scholarly activities. We expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their publications and other research activities. For example, it is possible that a smaller number of works of outstanding quality will be evaluated as equal or superior to a much greater number of publications of lesser quality.

Categories of Professional Development

The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of professional development organized according to the categories outlined in the college manual (section V.E.). In addition to the lists described, the candidate must provide copies of all publications and grant proposals listed. For multiple-authored works and collaborative projects, the candidate should provide the names of all authors as they appear in print and explain in detail the nature and degree of his/her own contribution to the work. Clear documentation must be provided for works accepted for publication. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for publication should not be included.

Evaluation of Professional Development

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor requires that a faculty member be recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has contributed to the advancement and development of the discipline and seems likely to continue doing so. As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only to those who are judged to be excellent in both professional development and teaching and at least good in service.

The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee’s general impression is that the candidate is an externally recognized scholar in the process of achieving a national reputation. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (5-7) of refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality; or a book and a smaller number (2-4) of articles and chapters, all of excellent quality; or a larger number of refereed articles and/or books of very good quality; or a book and a significant number of articles and chapters, all of very good quality. Quality will be judged with balanced attention to a journal’s standing in the field, where relevant, as well as external reviewers’ comments and other
measures provided by the candidate, such as citations or reviews of the candidate’s work.

Recognizing that anthropological research often involves extended and/or intensive periods of fieldwork, and that this work is time-consuming but absolutely central to the anthropological enterprise, the committee will take into account the nature and scope of an individual’s research commitments when evaluating his or her publication record. To qualify as excellent, a candidate also should also be very active in some of the following research activities, such as active grant submission, success in obtaining external and internal research grants, participating in or organizing conference sessions, journal refereeing, grant reviewing, or book reviewing.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor is recognition by the Department and the University that a faculty member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that s/he has achieved a national reputation as a leading scholar in his/her field. As stated in the College Manual, promotion to and/or tenure at this level is available only to those whose professional development and teaching are judged as excellent and service as very good. The candidate will be judged excellent in professional development if the committee’s general impression is that the candidate is a superb scholar with an established national reputation. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a book and a significant number (3-4) of articles and/or chapters, all of excellent quality; or a larger number (7-9) of refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality. Quality will be judged with balanced attention to journal rankings, where relevant, as well as external reviewers’ comments and other measures provided by the candidate, such as citations or reviews of the candidate’s work. Recognizing that anthropological research often involves extended and/or intensive periods of fieldwork, the committee will take into account the nature and scope of an individual’s research commitments when evaluating his or her publication record. To qualify as excellent a candidate also should demonstrate achievements in some of the following: success in obtaining extramural funding for research, participating in or organizing conference sessions, journal refereeing, grant reviewing, or book reviewing.

TEACHING

Categories of Teaching

The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the department and the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories outlined in the college manual (section V.F.).

Evaluation of Teaching

The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of teaching based on the evidence submitted. The committee will recognize the problems inherent in student evaluations; the student evaluation averages mentioned below are given as general guidelines rather than to verify the numbers. The committee will consider the qualitative comments in conjunction with the average scores. The committee will emphasize the quality of the content of the courses and
the effort of preparation. Additionally, the committee will consider factors such as the level and size of the courses, the nature of the courses, general character of students, and the limitations or constraints of the teaching environment.

The candidate will be judged to be excellent in teaching if the general impression of the committee based on the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is superb. For instance, the course material presented must show impressive preparation; the content of most courses is appropriate and up to date; the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (the overall average may be in the mid-4 range and there should be strong qualitative comments); and the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students. The candidate may also have published a textbook or a peer-reviewed article on teaching or received one or more teaching awards.

SERVICE

Service to one’s colleagues, to our department, to the College, and to the University is very important elements in judging faculty’s contributions and performance. Faculty also owes service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. Any discipline-relevant forms of community service are highly valued by the Department. Neither the College nor the Department of Anthropology asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information given below indicates what we consider important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality when evaluating a candidate’s work in the area of service.

Categories of Service

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to his/her areas of professional competence in accordance with the categories outlined in the college manual (section V.G.).

Evaluation of Service

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service. A candidate will be judged good if s/he has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks that are assigned to him or her.

Promotion to and/or Tenure at the Rank of Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor the candidate must be evaluated as at least very good in service. To be judged very good, a candidate must not only perform departmental service tasks willingly and responsibly, but must also show leadership in service in one or more of the following ways: 1) serving on the Executive Committee and as the
chairperson of at least one departmental standing or major ad hoc committee; 2) serving on one or more college, university, or system committees; 3) serving as Undergraduate Director or Graduate Director; or 4) performing significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations. Typically, successful candidates will have served effectively in two or more of these areas, but it is understood that those who have held major positions such as Undergraduate or Graduate Director or Chair may not have performed other service tasks during their tenure in those roles.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Department of Anthropology is governed by the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. Applications for promotion to assistant professor will be evaluated by a committee of all departmental faculty of assistant professor rank or above. Applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for tenure at the rank of associate professor will be judged by a committee composed of all tenured faculty in the Department. Applications for promotion to the rank of professor and for tenure at the rank will be judged by a committee composed of all tenured professors. Each committee will elect its own chair and, after deliberation, report its evaluation and recommendation by letter to the department chair.

An important part of the departmental evaluation is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials by scholars outside Georgia State University. The candidate must submit with his/her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate’s specialty area who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s performance in the area of professional development and his/her reputation within the discipline. The departmental chair, together with the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will, without input from the candidate, prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the College Manual (section V.H.). Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will select from them five persons to perform an outside review. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

**Poor:** The faculty member is inactive in professional development.

**Fair:** The faculty member is minimally active in professional development. Activities may include participation in local and regional conferences and invited lectures to other colleges or universities.

**Good:** The faculty member is active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions may be involved in activities that include presentation of research papers at local or regional academic conferences, or publications of anthropological content in popular outlets, e.g., newspapers or blogs. However, the scope and impact of the faculty member’s scholarly work are limited.

**Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however, there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future, including a peer-reviewed scholarly article, book chapter, or grant/fellowship application under review.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research, which may include a book or published peer-reviewed articles based on empirical or theoretical scholarship. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications, as scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential to many of the social sciences. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Further evidence for a rating of excellent includes documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation and the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the scholarly reputation and significance of the candidate’s research. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when s/he comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria described above for a rating of excellent, the faculty member has achieved or is on her/his way to achieving scholarly eminence in his or her field as evidenced by attainment of a substantial research grant, national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, and invited lectures in prestigious venues.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and prominent involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of undergraduate and graduate student research papers, honors and master’s theses, and dissertations. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his or her assigned courses. Such a faculty member may receive invitations to lecture that are based upon his or her reputation as a teacher, and may also be involved in leading workshops, providing consultation to colleagues on teaching effectiveness, and showing innovation and creativity in teaching.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member has produced pedagogical publications, won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

**Poor:** The faculty member may attend general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

**Fair:** The faculty member attends general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

**Good:** The faculty participates actively in faculty meetings, executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities thoroughly and ethically and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department, and participates in professional associations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member is not active in professional development.

Fair: The faculty member is minimally active in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is active in maintaining a program of professional development and may be involved in activities that include presentation of research papers at local or regional academic conferences, or publications of anthropological content in popular outlets, e.g. newspapers or blogs. However, the scope and impact of the faculty member’s scholarly work are limited.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of a major body of work. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed in the period under review.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles of the faculty member judged as excellent are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work attest to this reputation. Other important evidence includes securing a fellowship or research grant from external agencies.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, or invited lectures at prestigious venues, and/or a high volume of high quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of excellent. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, external grants, special grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national or international agencies.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little or no involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Fair: The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through student evaluations and reports by faculty observers, little involvement in departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, ineffective pedagogical techniques and inadequate effort as an instructor that results in the deficient transmission of the course content to students.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall somewhat below the mid 4-out-of-5 range.

Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and involvement with individual student work as demonstrated by, for example, the successful direction of honors and master’s papers, theses, research practicums, and/or dissertations to completion. The faculty member’s student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member evaluated as excellent also will have demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative pedagogy. Such a faculty member will also have a good track record of his or her students finishing their programs in a timely fashion and advance into subsequent academic programs or into gainful professional employment. Other criteria of excellence include presenting/publishing work with students and securing fellowships or sponsorships for pedagogical work. Such a faculty member advises and guides students diligently, and these students regularly conduct and complete significant work.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member will have won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, published highly regarded pedagogical studies, e.g., a text book or laboratory manual, or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may attend general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments.

Fair: The faculty member may attend general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as participating in professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.