

UARTP Committee approval: 5/17/17
Provost approval: July 10, 2017

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Department of Anthropology
College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

FOR

APPOINTMENT, RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Unit Amendment Date: October 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Basic Faculty Duties	1
2. Department ARTP Committee	1
2.1 Organization	1
2.2 General Policies and Procedures	1
3. Duties of the ARTP Committee	2
3.1 Appointments	2
3.2 Retention	5
3.3 Tenure	5
3.4 Early Tenure	5
3.5 Promotion	5
3.5.1 Eligibility for Promotion Consideration	6
4. Procedures and Criteria for Recommending for Promotion	6
4.1 General Procedures for Evaluation	6
4.2 Process for Student Evaluation of Full-Time Teaching	7
4.3 Departmental RTP Criteria	7
4.3.1 Teaching Performance	8
4.3.2 Scholarly or Creative Achievements	10
4.3.3 Contributions to the Institution	13
4.3.4 Contributions to the Community	14
4.3.5 "Satisfactory" vs "Outstanding" Performance	15
4.3.6 Right to meet with the ARTP Committee	15
5. Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty	15
6. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty	15
7. Communication with Faculty and Candidates	16
Appendix A	17
Appendix B	18

Notice: All citations to University ARTP Policy herein are to the Policy as it stood when the University last approved this document. Subsequent changes to the language and enumeration of University ARTP Policy sections may not be reflected in this document. The reader is therefore strongly advised and urged to consult the most recently adopted text and enumeration of cited sections of University ARTP Policy posted in the University Policy Manual on the University's website. Any discrepancy between the University policy and this document will be resolved in favor of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University policy.

1. BASIC FACULTY DUTIES

Effective teaching is an essential criterion for retention, tenure, and promotion. All deliberations of the Department ARTP Committee shall take into basic consideration the faculty member's ability and diligence in the teaching role.

In addition to effective teaching, it shall be considered a basic duty of all full-time faculty members to share in the advising of students, to participate in Departmental activities, and to share in administrative duties as required by election or appointment to committees or other positions.

2. DEPARTMENT ARTP COMMITTEE

2.1. Organization

2.1.1. The Department ARTP Committee shall be composed of at least three of the Department's tenured faculty (excluding emeritus faculty not on FERP, and those on leave of absence or sabbatical) including the Chair of the Anthropology Department.. FERP faculty may serve during their employment in the department, but not otherwise. In no case may the committee be composed entirely of FERP faculty. To assure this, election results shall be determined as follows:

2.1.1.1. Three or more tenured professors with the highest number of votes from among all professors shall become members of the Committee, and

2.1.1.2. The committee will comprise at least 4 members who will be elected by a normal election process. A member can recuse themselves from a single evaluation. In case there is a need for alternate members, they would be elected by a normal election process. Each of the regular and alternate members shall hold an academic rank higher than that of the faculty members being evaluated. A faculty member may not serve on the primary ARTP committee during the cycle in which he or she is being considered for promotion. The Chair of the ARTP Committee shall be elected from among its voting members. In the case of a tie, voting shall be repeated until the tie is broken. All members of the Committee shall be elected to a one-year term.

2.2. General Policies and Procedures

2.2.1. Robert's Rules of Order shall prevail, except when suspended by unanimous vote of the Committee.

2.2.2. All substantive evaluations and final recommendations by the Committee shall require the participation of all elected Committee members. This shall include reviewing the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and attending every meeting of the Committee at which substantive deliberations take place and at which final recommendations are made. (UARTP 9.012.S)

2.2.3. Balloting on all matters concerning appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion shall be secret. Each peer review evaluation Committee report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of that Committee.

3. DUTIES OF THE ARTP COMMITTEE

It shall be the general charge of the Committee to represent the best interests of the students and the faculty of the Anthropology Department. Under no circumstances may the Committee proceed with the evaluation process prior to having actively solicited information and opinions from the individual being considered, other faculty of the Anthropology Department, and students (see the specific provisions of 4 below).

3.1. Appointments

3.1.1. Procedures for probationary and tenured appointments shall follow UARTP policy Section 6.06. Procedure for appointment of external department chairs shall follow UARTP policy Section 6.08.

3.1.1.1. "Initial probationary appointments and subsequent probationary appointments may be for a period of one (1) or more years. Initial probationary appointments commencing at a time other than the beginning of the academic year (i.e., winter or spring quarter or spring semester) shall last until the end of the succeeding academic year." (CBA 12.21)

3.1.2. Establishment and operation of search committees

3.1.2.1 The Department will select either the search committee model described in UARTP Policy Section 6.06 (B) (1) or Section 6.06 (B) (2). After the selection of one of these two models below, the search committee shall be composed and shall operate in accord with UARTP Policy 6.06.

3.1.2.1.1. Search Committee: A minimum of three faculty members who are elected by the tenured and probationary (i.e. tenure-track) faculty in the department, one of whom may be the Department Chair. The Department may elect an alternate or alternates at its discretion. The members of the Search Committee shall elect a Search Committee Chair who has the responsibility for acting on behalf of the entire Department and who makes a recommendation or provides a ranked list of candidates directly to the Dean. The Department Chair may not be the Chair of the Search Committee. If the Department Chair is elected to the Search Committee, the Department Chair shall not make an independent recommendation to the Dean. If the Department Chair is not elected to the Search Committee, the Department Chair may make an independent recommendation to the Dean.

Department policy regarding AAEOR follows UARTP 6.06 C and D

3.1.2.1.2. Search Committee and Department Chair: A minimum of three faculty members, not including the Department Chair, who are elected by the tenured and probationary (i.e. tenure-track) faculty in the department. The Department may elect an alternate or alternates at its discretion. The members of Search Committee shall elect a Search Committee Chair who has the responsibility for acting on behalf of the entire Department and who makes a recommendation or provides a ranked list of candidates directly to the Dean. The Department Chair is an ex officio, non-voting member of the

Search Committee. The Department Chair shall make a separate and independent recommendation to the Dean. The Chair's recommendation shall be shared with the members of the Search Committee who will share their recommendation or ranked list with the Department Chair.

3.1.2.2. Part-time Faculty

3.1.2.2.1. Part-time faculty shall be appointed from the applicant pool that is established on an annual basis.

To apply to the part-time pool, each applicant must submit to the Department by the University-approved deadline, a current *vita* and a letter of intent stating all the courses for which the applicant wishes to be considered.

The Department Chair shall provide to the Committee a ranked list of the courses for which part-time hiring is anticipated. This list shall reflect the priority order in which the Department Chair will staff the courses that need to be filled.

A separate candidate pool shall be established for each course that requires a part-time faculty appointment. Should it be determined that the pool is not sufficient for the entire year, additional advertising will be done as necessary, in consultation with the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs.

Applications to the part-time pool that are received "out-of-cycle" will be acknowledged and held until the next recruitment period.

Incumbent employees are responsible for reapplying in writing by the specified date in order to be included for consideration as part of the next year's applicant pool. It is the responsibility of the ARTP Committee to review the applicant files and based on qualifications, determine which applicants shall be included in the pool for each course.

3.1.2.2.2. Once a pool of qualified applicants has been established for each course, it is the responsibility of the ARTP Committee to rank the members of each pool.

3.1.2.2.3. Criteria to be used in both determining which applicants shall be included in each course's pool and in the ranking of applicants in each course pool shall include:

- a. degrees earned in relevant disciplines
- b. relevant teaching experience
- c. relevant professional experience
- d. recommendations or other documents including student and peer evaluations of teaching and performance.

3.1.2.2.4. Except in unusual circumstances, a part-time faculty member shall be hired at a range and step equal to that which would apply if s/he were being hired for a regular full-time position. The normal guidelines for determining the range of part-time faculty are:

Lecturer L: Bachelor's degree in the discipline

Lecturer A: Master's degree in the discipline or equivalent educational experience; Bachelor's degree plus the equivalent of either at least five years of teaching experience or relevant professional experience

Lecturer B: Doctorate in the discipline

Lecturer C: Doctorate in the discipline plus either at least five years of relevant teaching experience or relevant professional experience

Lecturer D: Doctorate in the discipline plus either at least ten years of teaching experience or relevant professional experience.

3.1.2.2.5. Part-time faculty are eligible to advance to the next higher step of the salary range after they have taught 24 units at a particular step or after they have met additional specified Departmental requirements for a higher classification. Advancement is not automatic, but depends upon evaluation of performance and the budgetary constraints of the University. A salary increase requires the recommendation of the Department Chair and the concurrence of the College Dean.

3.1.2.2.6. Part-time faculty are eligible to advance to the next higher salary range after they have taught 24 units at the top step of their current range or after they have met additional specified Departmental requirements for a higher classification. Advancement is not automatic, but depends upon evaluation performance and the budgetary constraints of the University. Recommendations should be made by the Department Chair and forwarded to the Dean of the College. Recommendation for advancement in range for part-time faculty is a separate process from that followed for promotion recommendations for full-time tenure-track faculty.

3.1.2.2.7. "Temporary faculty unit employees employed during the prior academic year and possessing six or more years of prior consecutive service on that campus shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment, following an evaluation conducted pursuant to provisions 15.20(d) and 15.28 where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a temporary faculty unit employee has performed the duties of his/her position in a satisfactory manner; and absent documented serious conduct problems." Refer to 6.04 A 9 of the University UARTP Policy Manual for further applicable special conditions for temporary faculty 3-year appointments.

3.1.2.2.8. The decision to award three-year appointments is made by the College Dean. The Department ARTP committee is required to provide a file to the office of the Dean containing a departmental evaluation and recommendation for a three-year appointment for a temporary faculty member.

3.1.2.2.9. "Temporary faculty holding three-year appointments shall be reappointed to a subsequent three-year appointment following an evaluation conducted pursuant to provisions 15.20(d) and 15.29, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a temporary faculty unit employee has performed the duties of his/her position in a satisfactory manner; and absent documented serious conduct problems." [6.04 A 10 UARTP Policy Manual]

3.1.3. Under unusual conditions, when it is incumbent upon the Department Chair to make a decision regarding temporary appointments, and where conditions are such that it is not possible to convene the ARTP Committee (e.g., during University holidays or during the summer), the Department Chair may act at his/her own discretion.

3.2. Retention

Any probationary member of the Department who performs his/her duties to the satisfaction of the ARTP Committee shall be recommended for retention as a member of the Department. The Committee shall judge satisfaction on the basis of the following criteria and their allotted weights:

51%	Competent teaching performance*
30%	Scholarly or creative achievement
10%	Contributions to the institution
9%	Contributions to the community

All candidates shall also be notified in writing of their obligation to submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) to the Department with information relevant to the four specified criteria. In addition, each candidate shall be notified of his/her right to informally address the Committee. Before voting, the Committee is obligated to examine the WPAF of each candidate. The Department Chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate evaluation.

* Student evaluations of probationary faculty will be conducted in all sections of all courses taught each semester.

3.3. Tenure

Any probationary member of the Department who performs his/her duties to the satisfaction of the ARTP Committee shall be recommended for tenure at the end of the normal waiting period. The Committee shall judge its satisfaction on the basis of the following criteria and their allotted weights:

51%	Competent teaching performance
30%	Scholarly or creative achievement
10%	Contributions to the institution
9%	Contributions to the community

All faculty shall also be notified in writing of their obligation to submit a WPAF to the ARTP Committee with information relevant to the four specified criteria. In addition, each candidate shall be notified of his/her right to informally address the Committee. Before voting, the Committee is obligated to examine the WPAF of each candidate. The Committee will then vote for or against recommending the candidate for tenure. The Department Chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate evaluation.

3.4. Early Tenure

Probationary faculty seeking early tenure, or tenured faculty seeking early promotion, shall demonstrate outstanding performance in teaching. In addition, outstanding performance shall be demonstrated in at least two of the remaining three university criteria for retention, tenure and promotion. Refer to UARTP 5.06 A thru E for standards on outstanding performance.

3.5. Promotion

The ARTP Committee shall evaluate and recommend all eligible faculty for promotion following procedures and criteria described below under 4. The Department Chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate evaluation.

3.5.1. Eligibility for Promotion Consideration

Faculty shall be subject to a performance review for the purpose of promotion. Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review.

4. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING FOR PROMOTION

4.1. General Procedures for Evaluation

4.1.1. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty member prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. There shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty during the evaluation process. The Department's ARTP Committee may recommend timelines for conducting periodic evaluation and performance reviews. All reviews shall be conducted and completed within the period of time specified by the President. The separate WPAF shall be forwarded in a timely manner to the next level of review, to an appropriate administrator, or to the President.

4.1.2. At all levels in the periodic evaluation or performance review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the faculty member shall be given a copy of the recommendation, which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendations. The faculty member shall have the right to respond or submit a rebuttal statement in writing no later than seven (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to any previous levels of review. Upon request, the faculty member may be provided an opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the recommending party. This provision shall not require that the timelines be altered.

4.1.3. The materials for evaluation submitted by the faculty member shall be available for review by the appropriate administrator. The appropriate administrator shall consider all materials, recommendations, and rebuttal statements and responses submitted.

4.1.4. Materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty member shall be deemed incorporated by reference in the Personnel Action File (PAF), but need not be physically placed in the file. An index of such materials shall be prepared by the faculty member and submitted with the materials. Such an index shall be permanently placed in the PAF. Materials incorporated by reference in this manner shall be considered part of the PAF. Indexed materials may be returned to the faculty member.

4.1.5. During the time of periodic evaluation and performance review of a faculty member, the WPAF, which includes all information, materials, recommendations, and rebuttals, shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF.

4.1.6. Personnel recommendations or decisions relating to retention, tenure, promotion, termination, or any other personnel action shall be based on material contained in the PAF.

Should the President make a personnel decision on any basis not directly related to the professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes of an individual faculty member, those reasons shall be reduced to writing, entered into the PAF, and

immediately provided to the faculty member in question. Details pursuant to this provision are found in UARTP 9.01.R.

4.1.7. Deliberations pursuant to this section shall be confidential. Recommendations shall be confidential except that the affected faculty member, the appropriate administrator, the President, and the peer review committee members in a performance review or a periodic evaluation shall have access to written recommendations.

4.1.8. "If, during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the file should be returned to the level at which documentation should have been provided.. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner" (CBA 15.12.b; UARTP 9.01.B).

4.2. Process for Student Evaluation of Full-Time Teaching

4.2.1. Faculty members may choose to utilize electronic online student evaluations, in-class paper evaluations, or a combination of electronic online student evaluations and in-class paper evaluations evaluate all courses they teach. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's PAF. All classes must be evaluated (UARTP 5.05.e.1.c.1)

4.3. Department RTP Criteria

In evaluating the individual for retention, tenure and promotion, the utmost consideration is to be given the role of the individual as a teacher, his/her command of the subject, and his/her overall capacity to transmit relevant information and to awaken students to the discipline of anthropology and its relationship to other fields of knowledge. Due attention should be paid to the individual's growth and improvement. Emphasis is also to be placed on related achievements in anthropological research and the candidate's demonstrated commitment to the discipline evidenced in relevant contributions to the community and the institution. In all cases, the appraisal of a candidate's merit shall be based on tangible sources of evidence. Such evidence may include input from professional colleagues both on and off campus, such as letter of evaluation and recommendation.

In evaluating the individual for retention, tenure and promotion, four criteria are considered: (1) instruction and instructionally related activities, (2) scholarly and creative activities, (3) contributions to the Institution, and (4) contributions to the Community. The evaluation of each specific criterion is based on two distinct, yet related, attributes: (1) essential attributes; and (2) enhancing attributes. Whereas the essential attributes describe the nature and level of performance required of the faculty, the enhancing attributes extend performance in quantity and in diverse directions, depending on the faculty member's academic assignments and interests.

4.3.1. Teaching Performance (51%)

Teaching is the primary and most essential academic responsibility of the university professor. Instruction and instructionally related activities include: teaching in the classroom setting; advising; supervision of student teaching, fieldwork and research; the development of curriculum; and, related activities involving students. The focus in the evaluation of instruction and instructionally related activities should be on the overall teaching performance of the candidate over time, rather than his/her performance in a few classes or over a brief period.

Essential Attributes

Teaching will be evaluated in terms of three dimensions: (1) Pedagogical Approach and Methods, (2) Student Evaluations, and (3) Maintaining Currency in the Discipline.

1. Pedagogical Approach and Methods: Course content should be up to date and consistent with the catalogue course description. Grading practices, standards, and criteria should be articulated clearly. Course materials should clearly convey to students the learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education. Course requirements, including the semester schedule, assignments, and grading policies should be included. Grade distribution statistics may be examined.

Student Evaluations: For ARTP purposes, all classes taught must be evaluated, unless the President grants exception. Faculty members may choose to utilize electronic student evaluations, paper evaluations, or a combination of electronic and paper evaluations.

The overall average of student ratings for the majority of courses evaluated should be at or above the median of the scale (i.e., *good* or better, along a scale of “excellent–very good–good–fair–poor”). These ratings reflect the students’ perception of the instructor’s:

- (a) conveyance of the objectives of the course (questions 1-3);
- (b) organization and choice of relevant lectures/readings (questions 4-6);
- (c) choice and evaluation of assessment materials (questions 7-9);
- (d) respect for their opinions and needs (questions 10-13); and,
- (e) providing them with long-term benefits (questions 14-16).

Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness may be submitted if the faculty member has been provided a written copy of each statement at least five days before the review.

Maintaining Currency in the Discipline: All candidates are expected to keep abreast of disciplinary developments through participation in conferences, reading of discipline-appropriate materials such as journals and books, interactions with practitioners in the field, electronic communications with colleagues, and/or other activities.

List of Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

The following list of instruction and instructionally related activities serves as a guideline for the type of activities to be considered when evaluating instruction and instructionally related activities; it is not intended to be an exhaustive list. Please note that some of these activities are required.

1. Direct Instruction
 - a) Student evaluations (required every semester)
 - b) Syllabus (required)
 - c) Course outline (enhancing)
 - d) Instructional materials (required, select from the following):
 - i. Study guide materials
 - ii. Student packet of lecture notes
 - iii. Slide presentations
 - iv. Student assignments (e.g., papers, exams)
 - v. Information technologies (e.g., email, software, web page, presentations software [e.g., multimedia instructional modules])
2. Demonstrations of practical applications of course materials (e.g., practicals)
 - a) Student organizations (related to instruction)
 - b) Curriculum development (i.e., assigned courses)

3. Advising

Enhancing Attributes

There are many ways that faculty may go beyond the essential attributes for teaching effectiveness to enhance their achievement; the following are illustrative, not exhaustive, of the possibilities.

1. Efforts made to improve direct instruction may include:
 - a) regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits and consultation on course development;
 - b) involvement in programs at the Center for Teaching and Learning;
 - c) participation in teaching development seminars organized by the department, college, university or professional organizations;
 - d) giving or receiving informal pedagogical coaching; and/or
 - e) other activities that contribute to professional development of teaching effectiveness.
2. Efforts made to improve instructionally related activities may include:
 - a) Developing innovative approaches to teaching or exemplary ways of fostering student learning in the classroom;
 - b) Involved outside of the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, thesis supervision, support of student organizations and/or recruitment and retention activities;
 - c) Developing new curricular instructional programs or materials, including electronic or multimedia software or new advising materials or programs; and/or Conducting assessment of one's instructional effectiveness in order to improve instruction (e.g., varied classroom evaluation techniques) can be a particularly appropriate method for improvement of instructional effectiveness.

4.3.2. Scholarly or Creative Achievements (30%)

The Department recognizes that continuous growth in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity is essential to the teaching effectiveness of all faculty members, to their own professional stature, and to the stature of the University. Scholarly and creative activity represents efforts and evidence whereby the faculty member establishes professional status by contributing to his/her discipline and being active professionally. This activity must be relevant to the candidates' assignment and support the mission of the department, college, and the university.

Scholarly and creative activity is considered a critical component of the instructional process. Therefore, it is important for faculty not only to disseminate knowledge but also participate in its creation, integration, and/or application. Evidence of scholarly and creative activity includes: publications of merit; presentations of scholarly papers; awards, grants, and honors received; active participation in professional organizations; participation in seminars and institutes; research and development activity; and, other activities or performances of a scholarly and creative nature appropriate to the candidate's area of specialization.

The following considerations are used for determining scholarly and creative activities in professional growth:

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the significance of the activities s/he

- presents for the RTP review;
2. The candidate should explain the review process involved for each scholarly activity and to provide evidence. This can be accomplished in the candidate's narrative essay section of the WPAF;
 3. Consistent with the emphasis on professional growth and development that underlies the evaluation process, the candidate's documentation of scholarly and creative activities and the evaluation review of that documentation should focus on the concept of progressive professional development (i.e., a sustained and focused area of scholarly and creative activity). This consideration should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative;
 4. In the evaluation of publications, manuscripts, and other creative works, quality is the primary criterion;
 5. Joint authorship or participation in scholarly and creative activities is normally valuable and creditable, but is often difficult to evaluate. Candidates shall identify the specific extent of their participation in jointly authored activities;
 6. Consistent with the objective of obtaining the best and most thorough evaluation possible of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, external evaluations of the candidate's contributions to his/her academic field may be solicited, presented and considered.

Unsolicited evaluations in the form of published reviews of the candidate's work (or unpublished unsolicited evaluations if they are included in the file) may be considered. It is also appropriate to consider the quality of the journal or other context within which the work is published or otherwise disseminated to the scholarly and creative community, as well as citations to the candidate's work in other publications.

Essential Attributes

Faculty members are expected to remain engaged in an ongoing program of scholarship or creative activity that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time. All faculty are expected to produce scholarly and/or creative achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline (or interdisciplinary studies), which are disseminated to appropriate audiences, receiving favorable review from professional peers prior or subsequent to dissemination.

Enhancing Attributes

Faculty may enhance their scholarly and creative achievement with substantial records of peer reviewed professional activities and products, as follows:

1. With activities and products may include books, articles in professional journals, scholarly presentations, software and electronically published documents, and exhibits, especially if these receive favorable notice or reviews from professional peers;
2. With editorial assignments with recognized professional publications, including journals, some edited books, newsletters, or electronic media;
3. With appointments to selection panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, conference presentations, and other adjudication assignments calling for professional expertise;
4. Applied research or professional activity may use theory and knowledge of one or more disciplines to address practical problems of importance to the discipline and to society; such applied professional activity may include research on instructional processes and outcomes;
5. Additional activities may be judged to enhance faculty scholarly and creative activity provided these are peer-reviewed, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences,

appropriate to the mission of the Department, College and University, and make significant contributions to the discipline or to interdisciplinary studies.

List of Scholarly and Creative Activities

The following list of scholarly and creative activities serves as a guideline for the type of scholarly and creative activities to be considered; it is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Scholarly and creative activities are divided into two categories: 1) refereed; and, 2) non-refereed. The activities in Category 1 are given higher priority than the activities in Category 2, because they require external evaluation and documentation (i.e., they are refereed). The activities within each category are not ranked in any specific order, rather it is the responsibility of each candidate to demonstrate the significance of his/her contribution to scholarly and creative activities.

Category 1: Refereed Works

Published works or in press (accepted for publication):

- Articles in scholarly journals
- Books and textbooks
- Monographs
- Book chapters

Presentations

- Presentations to professional organizations (international to local)
- Presentation with abstract

Grants

- Internal grants
- External grants

Computer and Network Technology/Educational Technology

- Computer software programs*

Category 2: Non-refereed Works

Published works or in press (accepted for publication)

- Articles
- Books and book chapters
- Articles in the popular press (e.g., magazines and newspapers)
- Teaching/curriculum guides
- Teaching and laboratory manuals
- Thesis chair

Presentations

- Workshops or presentations with no formal or refereed paper
- TV or radio appearances
- Keynote speaker for conferences
- Invited speaker at colloquium or seminar
- Formal presentation at other colleges and universities
- Workshop master teacher

Computer and Network Technology/Educational Technology

- Computer and network applications*

Editorial Work/Professional Organizations

- Editor-in-chief or section editor of a professional journal
- Editorial board membership of professional journals
- Regular reviewer for professional journal
- Panel membership of a grant review board
- Reviewer for a granting body (e.g., NSF, Wenner-Gren, LSB Leakey Foundation.)
- Guest reviewer for professional journal
- Guest reviewer for professional meeting program abstracts
- Professional Service: committee member or officer of international, national, state, and local organizations (e.g., AAA, AAPA, SAA, SWA, Sigma Xi); external reader of Ph.D. dissertation committee, etc.

*Computers and network technology provide alternative modes of professional activity and new media for dissemination; such contributions must be evaluated even though the methods are still evolving. The following guidelines are suggested:

- 1) Appropriate methods of evaluation must be identified on a case-by-case basis;
- 2) External evaluators used in compliance with university policy may prove to be particularly effective for these assessments;
- 3) The training effort involved in technology-related professional activity needs to be credited appropriately; and,
Categorization of such work as research and instructional-related activities may need to be determined on an individualized basis.

The candidate bears the responsibility for demonstrating the significance of activities that employ new technology.

4.3.3. Contributions to the Institution (10%)

The size and complexity of CSUS places enormous demands on its governing bodies. While a central administration is responsible for directing some of the University's academic and business affairs, the faculty must direct others, thereby ensuring that the goals of the University are grounded in an academic rather than administrative philosophy.

The responsibilities of the faculty include participation in university governance such as serving on Department, College, University and CSUS system committees. Faculty members must be active at each level for the university to function properly. Faculty participation is also important to ensure that certain rights and privileges unique to the academy (e.g., academic freedom) are protected.

The following considerations are used in determining the candidate's contributions to the institution:

- 1) The quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University; and
- 2) The extent and level of the candidate's involvement.

Assessment of a candidate's service to the University shall be based on the information described in the self reflective statement (if provided), as well as on supporting evidence that may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, printed programs, and other appropriate documentation.

Essential Attributes

- 1) All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the collegial processes of faculty governance.

Enhancing Attributes

Faculty may enhance their service achievements with active involvement on committees at all levels of the University and the University system, with emphasis upon the Departmental and College levels for assistant and associate professors. Whatever the level of service within the University, the quality of the service is the primary consideration. Authorship of documents, reports and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or Department missions or procedures may comprise a service contribution. Sponsoring student groups and participating in educational equity programs are also service contributions.

List of Contributions to the Institution

The following list of service activities to faculty governance serves as a guideline for the type of activities to be considered; it is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

- 1) Department-level committees
- 2) College-level committees
- 3) University-level committees
- 4) System-wide committees

4.3.4. Contributions to the Community (9%)

CSUS is a large, urban, taxpayer-assisted comprehensive university. The University has an obligation to provide service that results in tangible benefits in the community, fostering a positive relationship between it and the University. Faculty members, as citizens of the community, should contribute to the community (e.g., greater Sacramento area) in some substantial way that is directly related to their professional expertise. The following considerations are used for determining the candidate's contributions to the community:

1. The quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University; and
2. The extent and level of the candidate's involvement.

Assessment of a candidate's service to the community shall be based on the information described in the narrative, as well as on supporting evidence that may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, printed programs, and other appropriate documentation.

Essential Attributes

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in activities that contribute to the broader community.

Enhancing Attributes

Service to the community may include consultant-ships to public schools, local government, and community service organizations. Service contributions based on consultations, whether paid or unpaid, shall be evaluated on the basis of their contributions to the missions of the University, College and particularly to the Anthropology Department. The candidate must show evidence of meaningful service that is clearly related to his/her academic expertise.

List of Contributions to the Community

The following list of service activities serves as a guideline for the type of activities to be considered; it is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Community Service: service that is clearly related to his/her academic expertise (e.g., consultant to public schools and business organizations; judge science fairs; presenter at GATE programs, serving on the Board of Directors at the Zoo, presenting to scouting organizations, etc.).

In all cases, documentation must be submitted to the ARTP Committee.

4.3.5 "Satisfactory" vs "Outstanding" Performance

Faculty *minimally* meeting the criteria set out above in each of the four performance categories can be assumed to have achieved a level of performance that is "satisfactory". Refer to UARTP 5.06 A thru E for standards on outstanding performance.

4.3.6 Right to meet with the ARTP Committee

The individual candidate shall be provided the opportunity to meet with the Committee under informal conditions to discuss any questions either the candidate or the Committee may wish to raise.

5. EVALUATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY

5.1. Part-time faculty members may choose to utilize electronic online student evaluations or in-class paper evaluations, or a combination of electronic online student evaluations and in-class paper evaluations to evaluate all courses they teach. Part-time faculty holding semester or academic year appointment shall be evaluated towards the end of each academic year. In addition, part-time faculty possessing six years of prior consecutive service in the department shall be evaluated in the sixth year for a three-year temporary appointment. Part-time faculty holding a three-year temporary appointment shall be evaluated towards the end of the third year in the three year appointment cycle. Evaluations will be conducted independently by the Department Chair and a committee of two other faculty members designated by the Primary ARTP Committee. The Department Chair shall write a separate evaluation. The evaluation is a performance evaluation only; consequently only evidence of competent teaching performance will be used in the evaluation. The evaluators will use the same criteria of competent teaching criteria used for full-time faculty. Student evaluations of part-time faculty will be conducted each semester in all Department classes taught by the faculty member.

5.2. Part-time faculty shall have the same rights regarding their personnel files as full-time faculty.

5.3. The employee shall be responsible for updating his/her vita and personnel file so that adequate records of experience and training are available for those evaluating the applicant pool candidates for subsequent employment and salary advance. Employees are to be informed of this responsibility and offered the appropriate assistance by the Department Chair

6. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

6.1. Tenured faculty shall be evaluated at least once every five years. An evaluation for purposes of retention, tenure, or promotion shall fulfill the requirement.

6.2. For the purposes of post-tenure review, the peer review committee ("Post-Tenure Review Committee") shall be composed of three tenured full-time anthropology faculty. The three members of the Committee shall be elected and assume their respective duties according to the system of rotation approved by the Department on February 11, 1985.

6.3. The Department shall evaluate its tenured members according to the schedule of evaluations as determined by the dean.

6.4. Substantive deliberations by the peer review committee shall be open only to Committee members.

6.5. The peer review committee shall consider the following subject matter in conducting the review:

6.5.1. Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member's teaching effectiveness only if the faculty member has been provided a written copy of each statement at least five days before the review.

6.5.2. Copies of syllabi, exams, and handouts from courses taught over the period being evaluated.

6.5.3. Other material submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. This may include, but not be limited to:

- Additional teaching materials
- Evidence of curriculum development work
- Evidence of participation in professional meetings
- A record of professional lectures, seminars, workshops
- A record of consultant work
- Lists or copies of publications
- Accounts of leave activities.

6.6. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the peer review committee prior to the submission of the committee's report.

6.7. The Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Department Chair shall each prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. Written copies of their respective reports shall be given to the faculty member at least five (5) days prior to their placement in the file.

6.8. The Department Chair and the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.

6.9. The evaluation statements shall be placed in the PAF. The faculty member has the right to submit written rebuttals. These rebuttals shall also be placed in the PAF.

7. COMMUNICATION WITH FACULTY AND CANDIDATES

All requirements of the University that may bind the peer review committees to confidentiality in their deliberations and voting shall be respected. However, so that faculty and candidates may have the benefit of timely recourse, as well as the benefit of knowing their strengths or weaknesses as perceived by the peer committees, all efforts will be made to maintain channels of communication that do not violate rules of confidentiality.

APPENDIX A

PROFILES OF ACADEMIC RANKS

Candidates for retention and promotion shall be evaluated based upon specific criteria. While each candidate is considered on his/her own merit, the following is an example of the expectations used when evaluating candidates.

MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR:

- Earned doctorate
- Acceptable teaching evaluation by students
- Scholarly and creative activities such as published article(s), funding proposal(s), presenting papers, or other such activities
- Service on Department committee(s)
- Membership in relevant professional organizations

MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

- Normally 5 years of satisfactory performance as Assistant Professor, or equivalent
- Acceptable teaching evaluations by students
- Record of curriculum development
- A record of scholarly and creative activities with an ongoing identifiable direction through such activities as grant proposal(s), articles in refereed journals, conference papers, software, and other comparable activities
- Service on Department, College and University committees beyond that at the Assistant level

MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR:

- Normally recommended after 5 years of satisfactory performance as an associate professor
- Acceptable teaching evaluations by students
- Evidence of regular course revisions or the development of new courses
- Evidence of ongoing scholarly and related activities evidenced by articles in refereed journals, book chapters, conference papers, funded grant proposals, texts or other books, published research reports and other creative activities.
- Contributions to Department, College and University through active leadership position(s)
- Active continued service on Department, College and University Committees, beyond the Associate level.

APPENDIX B

Department of Anthropology College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

Amendments Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Adopted: November 1978
Unit Amendment Date: February 1986
Unit Amendment Date: February 1998
Unit Amendment Date: September 1998
Unit Amendment Date: October 1999
Unit Amendment Date: December 1999
Unit Amendment Date: September 2000
Unit Amendment Date: September 2002
Unit Amendment Date: May 2004
Unit Amendment Date: May 2016