Expired as of May 24, 2024; Per S15-7, 4.4.5:

If guidelines expire during the candidate's period of review and are not renewed, revised, or replaced with new guidelines, the candidate may include the old guidelines or no guidelines. If guidelines change—revise or replace—during the candidate's period of review, the candidate shall include their choice of the old or the new guidelines. Only one set of guidelines may appear in the dossier, and reviewers are restricted to considering only included, approved guidelines.

5.26.2017

To: Dean Walt Jacobs
        College of Social Sciences

From: Elna C. Green
        AVP/FA

Re: Approved RTP Guidelines

Please find attached the final, approved version of the RTP Guidelines for the Department of Anthropoloy. These Guidelines have been approved in accordance with University Policy S15-7.

The proposed Guidelines were submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs and were reviewed by the Professional Standards Committee of the Academic Senate in Academic Year 2016-2017. The College RTP Committee also reviewed and approved them. As the designee of the President for RTP policy matters, I approve the attached Guidelines. The implementation date for the approved Guidelines is August 21, 2017.

A copy of the approved Guidelines must be included in the dossiers of all RTP candidates from the Department of Anthropology.

c: Kenneth Peter, Chair, Professional Standards Committee

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT'S TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
ON APRIL 7, 2017
BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 7-0

This document is directed to College and University RTP committees and administrators, in order to provide those not trained in anthropology with a better understanding of the activities of faculty in our discipline. We hope that the document might also provide information that can help non-specialists assess these activities.

The Department of Anthropology offers the BA degree in Anthropology, minor degrees in Anthropology, Native American Studies, and Science, Values, and Technology, and the MA degree in Applied Anthropology. Our department also administers the Behavioral Science program, which is an undergraduate interdisciplinary program co-offered with the Departments of Psychology and Sociology. The Behavioral Science program includes a BA degree in Behavioral Science (Interdepartmental). Our department also administers the Organizational Studies program, a pilot undergraduate interdisciplinary program co-offered with the Departments of Communication Studies, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. In addition to our majors, we attract students from a variety of disciplines and fields, and contribute significantly to the University's general education offerings. Currently, three lower division courses are offered in Core GE (ANTH 11, ANTH 12, and ANTH 25), and five in SJSU Studies (ANTH 100W, ANTH 115, ANTH 140, ANTH 146, and ANTH 160). Because the department does not offer 4-unit courses, permanent faculty members typically teach a full load of four courses per semester (after their first two years of assignment). This means that permanent faculty in the Department of Anthropology generally teach a wide variety of courses including introductory undergraduate courses, upper-division major courses, SJSU Studies (General Education) courses, and graduate seminars.

Our mission is to provide high-quality education in cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and archaeology as foundations for graduate work in applied anthropology. We seek to prepare students to enter many occupations and professions in academic, non-profit, government, and business and industry settings. The department emphasizes teaching and advising, but faculty are also expected to contribute to the discipline of anthropology (and, more broadly, to the social sciences) through conducting and disseminating research and applications in the field. We also expect our tenured and tenure-track faculty to engage in service to the department, the College of Social Sciences, and the University and we believe that such service can take a variety of forms.

I. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

Effectiveness in teaching is the primary, but not the only, consideration in evaluating a candidate's performance. Tenured or tenure-track faculty normally teach four courses per semester, although the department attempts to release newly hired faculty members from at least one course per semester during their first four semesters. However, this practice is dependent upon available resources.

Effectiveness in the classroom is a primary indication of teaching effectiveness. This is demonstrated in a variety of ways, including numerical SOTE (Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness) scores and subjective student evaluations, and peer reviews of teaching effectiveness. It is department policy that SOTEs are collected for all courses taught each semester by tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and by lecturers. Assistant professors undergo peer evaluations by faculty at higher rank at least once every semester. Associate professors undergo peer evaluations at least once per academic year by faculty at higher rank. A standard form used throughout the College of Social Sciences is used in all peer evaluations. Additional peer evaluations are possible if requested by the faculty member. Based on available evidence about possible performance problems, the department chair or the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee may also request additional peer evaluations.

All faculty members are generally expected to receive SOTE scores comparable to department, college and university norms. The department recognizes that new courses or new preparations sometimes receive lower ratings than well-established courses or courses that the instructor has offered in the past, and that students sometimes find particular courses more difficult or challenging than others. The RTP Committee takes these factors into account in its evaluation so that individual SOTE scores are interpreted in light of the instructor's pattern of scores.

II. Evaluation of Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement

Most anthropology faculty will develop active careers as scholars, artists, and/or professionals. Professional, scholarly, and professional achievements may take a variety of forms and may evolve over the course of a career.

Scholarship typically includes refereed journal articles, books, textbooks, monographs, funded research applications and reports, published reviews, and presentations of papers to academic and professional organizations. In the field of anthropology, scholarship also includes reports and documents on the results of field work and applied projects with clients or partners.

All scholarship subjected to peer review is considered to be of acceptable quality. Scholarship published in venues other than peer-reviewed professional journals (e.g., book chapters, technical reports, book reviews, workbooks, manuals, or other types of scholarly publication) is also acceptable; in such instances, the type of review to which such work has been subjected should be documented in the dossier.

In addition to peer-reviewed scholarship, it is also common in anthropology for faculty to produce reports and documents on the results of their field work or applied projects. While such materials may be required or requested by clients and/or partners as project deliverables, they are often substantial scholarly works that meet existing professional standards in our field so their contributions can be shared with colleagues, students, and the wider public. We consider such reports and documents to be acceptable scholarly achievements, even though they may not be have been subject to conventional peer review.

Unpublished research, unfunded grants, and works in progress may also be considered in the RTP review process, but they are of less importance than peer-reviewed research that has either been accepted for publication or published. Newspaper and magazine articles, and published material in non-refereed journals, books, or monographs or presented papers not subject to thorough review should be evaluated on an individual basis. Peer evaluations of unpublished materials are typically included in the dossier.

The primary consideration in the evaluation of an article or chapter is the quality of the work, not the reputation of the journal or book in which it is published. However, works that survive a more competitive process (e.g., a journal or book that rejects a high percentage of submissions,) or that are frequently cited in the literature (as noted in cross-citation indices) are given more consideration in the evaluation of faculty performance. The relative prestige of the journal or book is generally noted in the dossier.

Co-authored works (articles, chapters, books, reports, etc) are common and acceptable, although single-authored works are generally weighed more heavily than multiple-authored works. When the faculty member is not the first or sole author, his or her contribution is generallly described and documented. Interdisciplinary research and the inclusion of student co-authors is highly valued.

In our Department, the RTP Committee takes a holistic approach when weighing the originality, quality, consistency, and importance of a faculty member's scholarly contributions. We recognize that a small number of high quality publications may be of a greater contribution than a large number of lower quality publications. As noted above, involvement of students in faculty research and scholarship is also viewed with favor in RTP deliberations.

Professional achievements that are considered in the RTP process include research based on service learning, significant activities in professional organizations (such as holding office or chairing special task forces), serving as an editor or peer-reviewer for professional journals, sharing scholarship in non-scholarly venues (e.g. providing expertise to media, non-scholarly journals), organizing conferences, or professional activities such as consulting to businesses and other organizations.

As mentioned earlier, most anthropology faculty will be active scholars, artists, and/or professionals throughout their careers, but each case is considered on its own merits. We assume that faculty have both the right and responsibility to develop their own distinct mix of scholarly or artistic or professional work, however, based upon their own particular interests and opportunities, unless specific expectations have been expressed by the Department as part of their appointment or agreed to during the RTP process.

Appendix 1 of this document outlines hypothetical examples of scholarly, artistic, and professional achievement.

III. Evaluation of Service

Performance in this area includes service to students, the college, the University, the community, and the profession or discipline.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are generally active in departmental meetings and committees. For tenure and promotion to associate or full professor, service on college and University committees is important. While there is no formal evaluation of committee activities, exemplary work (for example, being elected committee chair or serving on a committee that is exceptionally demanding) is considered by the RTP Committee, and is often documented by letters from committee chairs and/or descriptions of work done. The Department also recognizes service in the form of membership on college and University committees and task forces. It is important to note that because the Anthropology Department is a relatively small one (with fewer than 10 tenure-track faculty members), the demands of departmental and college committee service are comparatively greater than those experienced in larger departments.

The department chair is elected by the faculty and appointed by the President. The graduate coordinator is elected by the faculty and appointed by the chair. The department chair is formally reviewed by the department, college, and University, following current University policy and procedure. The performance of the graduate coordinator is informally reviewed by the chair and is addressed in the RTP process. All permanent faculty members advise undergraduate majors in anthropology, behavioral science, and organizational studies as part of

their required office hours. In addition, they serve on graduate committees (project or thesis) as needed and appropriate.

The graduate coordinator position requires skills in program development and building the infrastructure of the graduate program, as well as facilitating discussions with students and faculty about the program. The coordinator generally receives a reduction in teaching load in recognition of the demanding nature of the position, but this workload compensation should not detract from the value of the coordinator's academic assignment during RTP deliberations.

Other areas of service include major assessment, new course development, creating and supervising service learning activities, developing and directing archaeological field schools, and other forms of curricular innovation. Still other areas of service include maintaining or strengthening departmental relationships with Native American descendant communities, outreach to local community colleges or high schools, pursuing collaborative ventures with regional or museums and parks, and organizing special events (such as speaker series or fund raising events). In addition, service to the University includes serving as the department's NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) coordinator, whose role is to ensure University and department compliance with this important federal law.

Coordinators of GE courses (ANTH 011, 012, 025, 100W, 115, 140, 146, and 160) maintain GE certification of the courses they coordinate, including monitoring syllabi, collecting assessment data and writing up periodic requests for recertification. All faculty contribute as requested to the department's five-year reviews and program planning. All such activities are typically documented in the dossier and considered in RTP deliberations. Appropriate documentation includes letters from the chair, other faculty members, or others outside of the department who may be in a position to comment on the candidate's contributions. In addition, faculty members may serve as advisors to student organizations as part of their service.

Faculty may also supervise independent studies, honors projects, or serve as chairs or readers of graduate student theses or project reports. Such service is typically done by all faculty, but extraordinary work in this area (for instance, an unusual number of theses supervised to completion) is valued highly.

IV. Resources

Anthropological research and scholarship has become increasingly dependent upon resources. Because research in cultural, physical, and archaeological anthropology is often conducted in foreign countries, faculty members often must travel to their research sites for a summer or a semester. Some of the subdisciplines may require access to specialized equipment. For example, in archaeology, XRF (X-ray florescence) analyzers, ground penetrating radar, drones for surveying field sites, and other technologies may be required to realize projects. Physical

anthropologists may need access to laboratories for aDNA (ancient DNA) analysis of human remains. Cultural anthropologists may need software packages for transcribing interviews or coding data. Consequently, candidates seeking promotion and tenure generally seek resources including assigned time (course release), internal and external grants, and other forms of support to facilitate high levels of achievement in the area of research and scholarship.

Appendix 1. Hypothetical Examples of Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Good	Excellent
• Candidate has produced no peer-reviewed articles, books, research reports, films, or other forms of scholarship or creative activity. • Candidate never presents papers at academic conferences or invited speaker series. • Candidate has failed to develop a research agenda beyond his or her doctoral research. • Candidate has not been awarded grants.	• Candidate has periodically (but inconsistently) produced peer-reviewed articles, books, films, or other forms of scholarship or creative activity. • Candidate presents papers at academic conferences or invited speaker series every other year, or attends conferences regularly but does not present research. • Candidate has begun to develop a research agenda beyond his or her doctoral research.	• Candidate has produced a stream of peer-reviewed articles, research reports, films, or other forms or scholarship or creative activity. • Candidate presents papers at academic conferences, some of which might include students. • Candidate has a well-developed research agenda beyond his or her doctoral research. In addition, the candidate has accomplished one of the following: • Candidate has been awarded grant(s) or contract(s) or award(s) for small-scale research projects, or has successfully submitted such grants with positive reviews. • Candidate produces non-peer reviewed publications, such as commentaries, that reach a wide audience. • Candidate has several peer-reviewed articles in significant journals linked to major professional associations, such as *American Anthropologist*, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, or *Human Organization*. • Candidate has a forthcoming book (or book contract) published by a University or scholarly press. • If candidate is an applied cultural anthropologist, he or she presents evidence of application, such as a report or article reflecting an applied project. • If candidate is an archaeologist, he or she presents evidence of archaeological application (project reports, field school reports, etc.), perhaps with peer-reviewed articles in journals such as *American Antiquity* or *Historical Archaeology*. • If candidate is a physical anthropology has a robust portfolio of peer-reviewed articles and abstracts in journals such as the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*.	• Candidate has published a peer-reviewed book (either sole-authored or edited) OR several peer-reviewed articles accepted annually. • Candidate is recognized in the field (e.g., Candidate is asked to be a peer evaluator or asked to serve on an editorial board). • Candidate presents paper at more than one academic conference or invited speaker series annually. • Candidate has written research reports or reports for clients and included documentation from independent scholar(s) endorsing the work. • Candidate has won national or international award recognizing outstanding publication. • Candidate has been awarded competitive internal or external grant(s) or contract(s) or award(s) for major research project, or has successfully submitted such grants with positive reviews. • Candidate produces non-peer reviewed publications related to his or her research that reaches a wide general audience and influences public policy.

Note: These examples assume that the hypothetical candidate is undergoing the 6th year full review. The examples should not be interpreted as requirements, nor as a checklist of accomplishments that must be met, but instead as a means of providing candidates with guidance and models of excellence. A candidate might still reach excellence by following other models.