

# Middle Tennessee State University

## DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

### I. INTRODUCTION

These policies and procedures are for the guidance of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (hereinafter "Department"). This policy may not be interpreted in conflict with official Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts, Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), or Board of Regents and in the event of any conflict later discovered is subordinated to those policies.

This policy will be provided to faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology upon their initial appointment and will be available in the department office and the Office of the Dean of Liberal Arts.

### II. DEFINITIONS

The following are definitions of words and terms used in this policy that are not hereinafter specifically defined; however, the words and terms are subject to further qualification and definition in the subsequent sections of this policy.

A. **Academic Program Units.** The Department of Sociology and Anthropology consists of two Academic Program Units:

**1) Anthropology Academic Program Unit.** This program unit includes all department faculty with primary curricular responsibilities for the Bachelor of Science in Anthropology and Bachelor of Arts in Sociology with concentration in Anthropology; Hereinafter, these faculty are referred to as the "Anthropology Program Faculty."

**2) Sociology Academic Program Unit.** This program unit includes all department faculty with primary curricular responsibilities for the Bachelor of Science in Sociology, the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, and the Master of Arts in Sociology. Hereinafter, these faculty are referred to as the "Sociology Program Faculty."

B. **National Recognition.** National recognition for sociology and anthropology in the areas of service/outreach and research/scholarship/creative activity will be determined by the Promotion Review Committee's assessment of the individual's record of accomplishment. Examples of documentation of national recognition for research/scholarship/creative activity may include but are not limited to evidence in the form of peer-reviewed publications in major disciplinary journals or by recognized academic presses, significant citation of the candidate's work in the scholarly literature, external letters of evaluation from recognized authorities in the discipline, documented sharing of expertise with colleagues at the national

level, local achievements recognized at the national level in the form of awards or other recognition, and/or significant professional activities beyond simple membership in national organizations. Examples of documentation of national recognition for service/outreach activity may include but are not limited to evidence in the form of leadership positions in organizations beyond the region, editorships of significant publications, review of significant articles and grant proposals, invited lectures, significant outreach to the community and society at large involving the application of professional expertise towards the solution of problems, and other similar activities.

### **III. Election of Department Representative to College Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.**

During the Spring Semester of the third (final) year of the term of the Department representative to the College Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department will elect a representative to the College Committee. In the event that a department representative is unable to complete a three-year term, the same procedure will be followed to elect a replacement.

### **IV. Department Tenure Review Committee**

A. **Establishment and Membership.** Beginning with the Fall 2005 term, the Department will annually establish a Department Tenure Review Committee consisting of all tenured faculty excluding the department chairperson. The Department Committee will be co-chaired by the elected chairs of the academic program unit sub-committees.

B. **Academic Program Unit Sub-Committees.** The Department Tenure Review Committee will be divided into two subcommittees:

- 1) Anthropology Program Unit Tenure Subcommittee consisting of all eligible anthropology program faculty; and
- 2) Sociology Program Unit Tenure Subcommittee consisting of all eligible sociology program faculty.

In the event that there are less than three tenured members of either program faculty, subcommittee membership will be supplemented from the other program faculty upon recommendation from the tenured members of the appropriate academic program unit.

The members of each subcommittee will annually elect a subcommittee chair, who will also serve as co-chair of the department committee.

C. **Purpose.** The purposes of the Department Tenure Review Sub-Committees are to: 1) review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning candidates for tenure from their respective academic program units, 2) conduct the Annual Review of Tenure-Track Faculty for faculty within their respective academic program units; and 3) review and evaluate the progress toward tenure of tenure-

track faculty from their respective academic program units in a pre-tenure review as specified in MTSU Policy II:01:05a.

- D. **Quorum.** For the purposes of deliberation and voting, the Academic Program Unit Subcommittee requires a quorum of one more than 2/3 of the subcommittee membership. For the purposes of deliberation and voting, the Department Tenure Review Committee requires a quorum of one more than 2/3 of each subcommittee membership. In the event of a tie vote at the subcommittee or committee level, that vote will be regarded as a negative recommendation.

## V. TENURE PROCESS

In the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, the tenure process consists of: 1) an on-going mentoring process throughout the probationary period; 2) an annual review; 2) an intensive (mid-point) pre-tenure review; and 3) a final review for tenure.

### A. GENERAL GUIDANCE THROUGH THE TENURE PROCESS

**1) Faculty Mentor.** A member of the Tenure Committee designated annually to coordinate mentoring for a specific tenure-track faculty member.

- a. Each tenure-track faculty member may submit to the co-chairs of the Tenure Committee the name of a tenured faculty member to serve as Faculty Mentor during the review process. If no request is submitted or the requested mentor is unwilling or unable to serve in that capacity, the Tenure Committee will appoint a member of the committee to serve as mentor.
- b. The designation of Faculty Mentors is not intended to limit mentoring activities or responsibilities on the part of other tenured faculty, but rather to provide a formal point-of-contact to ensure that the mentoring process is on-going.
- c. Responsibilities of the Faculty Mentor are to:
  1. Monitor, encourage and support activities of the tenure-track faculty member that will address areas deemed deficient by the Tenure Committee and/or to monitor, encourage and support activities that will maintain future evaluations of adequate or better performance.
  2. Meet jointly with the department chair and tenure-track faculty member after receipt of the annual review letter and at other times as deemed necessary.

**2) Classroom Observers.** Two members of the committee designated annually for each probationary faculty member. Responsibilities of the Faculty Observers are:

a. In coordination with the tenure-track faculty member, attend and evaluate instruction in one (or more) classes during the academic year.

b. Submit a written evaluation following the approved Observation Guidelines to the co-chairs of the Tenure Committee within one week of the review.

## **B. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

Tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated in writing annually and separately by the department chairperson and the department tenure review committee. Separate copies of these evaluations will be provided to tenure-track faculty, placed in their department personnel files, and sent to the faculty member's dean and to the provost.

In early September of each year, the chair of the appropriate academic program unit sub-committee will contact tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent year of appointment and request that the following materials be made available for review in the department office: (a) Outline of Faculty Data (or similarly organized and comprehensive current vita); (b) copies of their most recent student evaluations of teaching; (c) the annual statement of activities submitted to the department chair; (d) a self evaluation covering the three evaluative areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service/outreach; and (e) copies of all publications, grant proposals, manuscripts in progress, manuscripts submitted, and other documentation of activities over the preceding twelve months. Tenure-track faculty may also provide other materials they deem relevant. The committee will also provide tenure-track faculty with copies of the approved evaluation forms that will be used in the process. Tenure-track faculty in the first year of appointment are not required to go through the annual review process, since the hiring process is generally similar in scope to the annual review. However, tenure-track faculty members in their first year of appointment may, at their option, submit materials for review.

Members of the appropriate academic program unit Tenure Sub-Committee shall review the materials and complete the approved evaluation form. Reviewers should use the following guidelines for completing the form:

**A.** Scoring includes a range from one (1) to five (5) with the following suggestions: (1) Unacceptable - little or no documented activity in this area; (2) Less than adequate - some activity, but either not enough or outcomes are not acceptable; (3) Adequate - activities in this area are sufficient and acceptable; (4) More than adequate -activities above that expected; (5) Exceptional - activities are numerous, well above adequate performance, and generally meritorious.

**B.** Evaluation and scoring shall follow the presumption that the tenure-track process is a five-year process. For example, a score of three (adequate) for a tenure-track faculty member in the second year of the tenure process denotes an evaluation that the level of activity is considered adequate for an individual *at that*

*stage of their career development* (2/5 of the way through the tenure process). A score of five (exceptional) during any review should not be construed to indicate that a tenure-track faculty member is considered tenurable. Evaluation and scoring reflects only progress towards formal tenure evaluations in the fifth year.

**C.** Written comments are required. Forms submitted without written comments explaining/supporting the scoring will not be used in the determination of final range and medians. A lack of scoring in any category accompanied by comments such as "don't know" or "can't evaluate" is also unacceptable. Each member of the subcommittee is responsible for review of submitted materials and formulation of an evaluation for each category.

The Tenure Subcommittees will meet in early October to evaluate each tenure-track faculty member's progress toward tenure. During this meeting the committee shall:

**A.** Discuss each tenure-track faculty member individually, focusing on their strengths and weaknesses in each of the following areas of scholarship: (a) teaching; (b) research/scholarship/creative activity; and (c) service/outreach;

**B.** Vote by secret ballot whether to recommend the retention of each tenure-track faculty member individually. Faculty may either vote: (1) retain, without reservations; (2) retain, with reservation; or (3) do not retain. A vote of "retain, without reservations" means the faculty member's current progress toward tenure is satisfactory and it is recommended that he/she be retained. A vote of "retain, with reservations" means that while the faculty member's current progress toward tenure falls short of expectations, it is recommended that she/he be retained and given the opportunity to improve. A vote of "do not retain" means that the faculty member's current progress toward tenure falls short of expectations and it is recommended that he/she not be retained. The vote is strictly a recommendation and is non-binding on the chair or to future votes.

**C.** Approve one Faculty Mentor and two Faculty Observers for each tenure-track faculty member.

**D.** Submit completed evaluation forms to the subcommittee chair or a designated representative.

Within one week following the meeting, the sub-committee chair or designated representative shall review the evaluation forms and draft a letter incorporating the following: (a) a table summarizing the range and mean for each category; (b) the strengths and weaknesses of the tenure-track faculty member in each of the areas as identified by the committee, (c) recommendations for improving the tenure-track faculty member's progress toward tenure; and (d) the outcome of the committee vote on retention. The Tenure Committee shall subsequently review,

amend as necessary, and approve a final letter. Upon approval of a final letter, original evaluation forms will be destroyed.

By the end of October, the letter shall be directed to the tenure-track faculty member and copied to the department chair for placement in the faculty member's personnel file. The Faculty Mentor and tenure-track faculty member will subsequently meet with the department chair to discuss the evaluation. The tenure-track faculty member may respond to the evaluation in writing to the chair of the Tenure Committee with a copy to the department chair. If she/he chooses to respond in writing, that letter will also be placed in his/her personnel file. The chair will consider the committee's letter a recommendation when deciding on the retention of tenure-track faculty.

### **C. PRE-TENURE REVIEW**

The pre-tenure review process will follow the same procedures as the annual review process, with the following exceptions:

- 1) the Outline of Faculty data is required for the pre-tenure review (vita is not acceptable)
- 2) the recommendations of the committee and department chair will be forwarded to the Dean and Liberal Arts Tenure and Promotion Review committee for consideration pursuant to university policy.

### **D. FORMAL REVIEW FOR TENURE**

The formal review for tenure will follow the university and college policies.

## **VI. Department Promotion Review Committee**

**A. Establishment and Membership.** Beginning with the Fall 2005 term, the Department will annually establish a Department Promotion Review Committee consisting of all tenured faculty excluding the department chairperson and any tenured faculty under consideration for promotion. The Department Committee will be co-chaired by the elected chairs of the academic program unit sub-committees.

**B. Academic Program Unit Sub-Committees.** The Department Promotion Review Committee will be divided into two subcommittees:

- 1) Anthropology Program Unit Promotion Subcommittee consisting of all eligible anthropology program faculty; and
- 2) Sociology Program Unit Promotion Subcommittee consisting of all eligible sociology program faculty.

In the event that there are less than three tenured members of either program faculty, subcommittee membership will be supplemented from the other program

faculty upon recommendation from the tenured members of the appropriate academic program unit.

The members of each subcommittee will annually elect a subcommittee chair, who will also serve as co-chair of the department committee.

- C. **Purpose.** The purposes of the Department Promotion Review Sub-Committees are to: review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning candidates for promotion from their respective academic program units,
- D. **Quorum.** For the purposes of deliberation and voting, the Academic Program Unit Subcommittee requires a quorum of one more than 2/3 of the subcommittee membership. For the purposes of deliberation and voting, the Department Promotion Review Committee requires a quorum of one more than 2/3 of each subcommittee membership. In the event of a tie vote at the subcommittee or committee level, that vote will be regarded as a negative recommendation.
- E. **Review for Promotion.** The review for promotion will follow the university and college policies.

Approved by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology: September 28, 2005.

Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts: September 28, 2005.

Approved by the Provost: September 28, 2005.