

**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**  
**Rank and Tenure Procedures**  
**Departmental approval May 2012**  
**Revised April 2015**  
**Approved by UCART 6-15-2015**

- I. **PROCEDURE** responsibility of the faculty and Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology to administer the promotion process and carefully evaluate every candidate's dossier. The Department Chair will ensure that current copies of both documents are available in the Department office.

**Role of the Candidate**

It is the candidate's responsibility to inform the Department Chairperson of his or her intention to apply for promotion by April 1 of the year in which the tenure application is going to be made in order to give the Chair and the candidate's mentor(s) enough time to solicit letters. The candidate must prepare the dossier, in consultation with the Department Chairperson and his/her mentors. The candidate's part of the dossier must be submitted to the Department Chair by September 1. The candidate should be familiar with *The Faculty Manual* of Saint Louis University



responsibilities include helping the new faculty member build strengths in teaching, scholarship, student mentoring, service, and collegiality. The faculty mentors will schedule regular discussions with the new faculty member and will be available to answer questions.

The new faculty member will be made aware of their progress toward tenure and promotion at the departmental level in the form of annual evaluations, provided by the Chair, and possibly the Program Director, in consultation with the mentor(s). While satisfactory performance on annual evaluations is very important, it may not be sufficient to obtain tenure and promotion. A complete and thorough evaluation of progress toward tenure is provided through the third year review process.

### **Third Year Review Process**

During the fall semester of a faculty member's third year, the department will conduct a thorough review of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure according to previously referenced procedures. The Third Year Review Committee will be responsible for reviewing the faculty member's progress as it appears in the candidate's Third Year Dossier. The Third Year Dossier must be prepared in accordance with the above referenced guidelines pertaining to a candidate's Tenure Dossier, except that the Third Year Dossier shall not include external reviews. The candidate's part of the Third Year Dossier must be submitted to the Chair of the Department by September 1<sup>st</sup> of the candidate's third year. The Third Year Review Committee will meet and discuss the candidate's progress. Member(s) of the Third Year Review Committee will write a letter summarizing the committee's discussion and assessment of the candidate's progress. The letter will be circulated to and approved by the committee prior to being finalized. The final letter will be provided to the Chair of the Department and the candidate. In addition, the faculty member's mentors will provide written evaluations of progress to both the Third Year Review Committee and the Chair. The Chair will use the mentors' evaluations, the Third Year Review Committee's letter, as well as the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure in writing a third year review letter. After preparation of the third year review letter and distribution to the candidate and the Dean, the Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the evaluations.

## **II. CRITERIA**

### **Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

**For non-tenure track faculty, the criteria applied to evaluate quality for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are modified from that for tenure-track positions in order to fit the candidate's job responsibilities as an administrator and/or teacher.**

Time in rank should be negotiated at the time of hiring and indicated in the candidate's promotion dossier.

## *Teaching*

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology views the education and training of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels as its primary mission. Therefore, a significant emphasis is placed on teaching. The Department evaluates an individual's teaching through various methods, including, but not limited to tenured faculty and the Chair's evaluations, peer or Center for Teaching Excellence classroom visitations, student course evaluations and unsolicited letters and review of examinations, course syllabi, and other related materials.

A significant element in the evaluation of teaching is the overall judgment of students. Questionnaires designed to reflect comprehensive student judgment concerning teaching qualities will be administered at the conclusion of every class. The Chair will also solicit three evaluations from students and at least two of these students must be from the list provided by the candidate. The candidate will also be given the opportunity to veto potential student reviews on the basis that they may not be able to provide an unbiased assessment.

Good teachers may receive public recognition in a variety of ways. Students, both individually and through organizations, may seek them out more often and may nominate them for awards. Quality teachers continually update and revise their classes, try innovative pedagogical approaches, create new classes and/or independent studies where needed and appropriate, and work to improve and strengthen the whole curriculum. Dedicated teachers are often involved in student organizations and carry heavier mentoring/advising loads.

Each faculty member will have a teaching assignment that is governed by the Department's needs and the faculty member's workload distribution as determined by the Chair on an annual basis. These assignments may include consideration of (among other factors) the development of new courses, modifications to existing courses, and number of students in their courses. Faculty who teach more (or less) than the standard departmental load (based on Arts and Sciences policy, currently 3-2) will be held to commensurately lower or higher research or services requirements.

A further goal for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology is the involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in original research projects. Therefore, junior faculty members are encouraged to involve students in their research efforts. Student involvement in faculty research may be measured by the number of undergraduate and/or graduate students supervised, the number of presentations made with students, and the number of publications with students as co-authors.

## *Mentoring/Advising/Consulting*

The candidate for tenure and promotion must provide quality mentoring/advising to students. They must demonstrate a reasonable knowledge of the policies and procedures of the Department that apply to mentoring/advising of undergraduate and graduate

students. Examples of effective mentoring may include the number of mentees/advisees (formal and informal) served per year, writing letters of recommendation, and assisting students in obtaining access to placements which offer them opportunities for intellectual, academic or professional success. Faculty members may want to document their mentoring with mentoring work sheets (Appendix A).

The candidate for tenure and promotion may also serve faculty and the community as a consultant. Given the candidate's area of expertise, he/she may be sought as a resource person by community groups and faculty across the University. Effective consulting is measured by the number of faculty, staff, and community members served per year, the number of sessions and the amount of time such consulting entails and the impact of such consulting.

### *Scholarship and Research*

A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline; that is, the research should have made a significant contribution to knowledge that is recognized by professional colleagues within the appropriate academic discipline. One common method of documenting such impact is through outside evaluations by recognized scholars within their academic discipline. The most relevant letters of evaluation usually are written by experts recognized nationally and internationally for their own achievements.<sup>1</sup> A minimum of four letters<sup>2</sup> are required from outside evaluators.<sup>3</sup> The candidate will be asked to provide a list of potential reviewers that may provide a biased assessment of their work. External reviews will not be solicited from such persons. Then, without ever seeing the complete list, the applicant is assured that those he/she sees as potentially biased are, in fact, struck from the list. The candidate should provide a list of

publication per year (5 publications).<sup>5</sup> This number will vary depending on the discipline and research area, type of publications, collaborators, impact of the publication as well as other considerations. In order to count as a publication for tenure purposes, the candidate must provide a copy of the publication or documentation indicating final acceptance by the publisher.

While quality counts more than quantity in evaluating a candidate's research record, the normal expectation is an average of one-peer-reviewed publication per year, along with two or more pieces of scholarly work during the probationary period. The fewer the peer-reviewed pieces, the higher the quality must be to merit tenure. Though there is a variation in books and articles, the department will consider a book the equivalent of three to six articles, depending on the quality of the work and the prestige of the outlet, as judged by the standards of the discipline.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of the quality and impact of their work. Evidence of favorable judgment by colleagues includes publications in journals where expert evaluation is required for acceptance; favorable review of the candidate's books, appointments or awards that require evaluation of professional competence; and receipt of fellowships or grants. Frequent citation by other scholars may also provide evidence of good research. Similarly, invitations to serve as editor, peer reviewer, member of site visit teams or other evaluative functions of the scholarly work of their peers are all examples of evidence of scholarly activity. Subventions should be explained.

*Service: University, Professional, and Community*

While service is valued and required, there is typically less emphasis on service for junior faculty. Opportunities for service contributions abound and may take many forms. Professional service may occur within a discipline, through international, national, regional, and state organizations, or in the community at large; it may also occur in an administrative unit, such as the Department, College, or on the campus. A case should be made for the impact and quality of one's contributions. There should be evidence that one's efforts and judgment are held in high regard. For example, letters from community members, committee members or students expressing appreciation for one's contributions

---

<sup>5</sup> Numerical Information for Peer Institutions that represent benchmark institutions used to justify these standards:







publications; invited lectures; conference presentations; and the number of undergraduate and graduate students advised for research purposes including membership on thesis and dissertation committees; external and internal funding and serving as an investigator and/or consultant on grants. Ultimately, to be promoted to full professor, a faculty member must demonstrate, through their research and scholarship, a significant impact on their field(s). To count as a publication the candidate must provide a copy of the publication or documentation indicating final acceptance by the publisher.

While quality counts more than quantity in evaluating a candidate's research record, the normal expectation is an average of one-peer-reviewed publication per year, along with two or more pieces of scholarly work in rank. The fewer the peer-reviewed pieces, the higher the quality must be to merit promotion. Though there is a variation in books and articles, the department will consider a book the equivalent of three to six articles, depending on the quality of the work and the prestige of the outlet, as judged by the standards of the discipline.

In evaluating a faculty member's scholarship, quantity is a consideration but quality is an even more important consideration. The candidate is expected to provide evidence for the quality of their research and scholarship. Evidence may include demonstrations of the selectivity of the publication outlet or conference/invited talk, circulation or pertinent evaluation of the publication, significance of the audience, impact factor of the publication and citations of the work. The primary measure of quality research activity is publication in peer reviewed publications. Peer review may be demonstrated by competitive selection of the publication outlet, external reviews a of the



the Dean of Arts & Sciences, with explanation. Non-tenure-track faculty members who have been continuously employed for a minimum of three years but whose contract is not renewed will have one full academic year remaining unless circumstances indicate otherwise.

Advancement or appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Instructor with the following additions: Possession of a doctorate and evidence of ability to teach effectively on a university level.

### *Third-Year Review*

Non-Tenure-Track faculty members may elect to undergo a third-year review at any point on or after their third year of continuous full time employment.

After notification of the Chair by February 1, the faculty member submits to the Chair a dossier containing evidence of quality and quantity of contributions to the Department no later than September 1 of that same year.

The Chair of the Department should convene a Third Year Review Committee composed of all of the faculty members at or above the rank sought by the candidate no later than the first week of September. The Third Year Review Committee will be responsible for reviewing the faculty member's progress as it appears in the candidate's Third Year dossier. The Third Year Review Committee will meet and discuss the candidate's progress. Member(s) of the Third Year Review Committee will write a letter summarizing the committee's discussion and assessment of the candidate's progress. This letter will be circulated and approved by the committee before being provided to the Chair of the Department and the candidate. In addition, the faculty member's mentors will provide written evaluations of progress to both the Third Year Review Committee and the Chair. The Chair will use the mentors' evaluations, the Third Year Review Committee's letter, as well as the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate's progress in writing a separate third year review letter. After preparation of the Committee's third year review letter and distribution to the candidate and the Dean, the Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the evaluation.

### *Advancement Review*

The candidate must have served at least five years as non-tenure-track faculty with renewable appointment at SLU to be eligible for promotion.

The candidate should notify the Chair by April 1 and submit to the Chair a dossier by September 1 preceding the review for promotion, following established policies of the University and College of Arts & Sciences.

The Chair of the Department will convene an Advancement Review Committee composed of all of the faculty members at or above the rank sought by the candidate.

The Advancement Review Committee will be responsible for reviewing the faculty member's progress as it appears in the candidate's dossier. The Advancement Review Committee will meet and discuss the candidate's progress. Member(s) of the Advancement Review Committee will write a letter summarizing the committee's discussion and assessment of the candidate's progress. This letter will be circulated to and approved by the committee before being provided to the Chair of the Department and the candidate. In addition, the faculty member's mentors will provide written evaluations of progress to both the Advancement Review Committee and the Chair. The Chair will use the mentors' evaluations, the Advancement Review Committee's letter, as well as the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate's progress toward advancement in writing a summary review letter. After preparation and review by the committee of their summary letter, the Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the evaluations.

**The process of assessment of non-tenure track faculty will follow procedures similar to those for tenure track faculty members with modifications of criteria for job performance expectations appearing in the candidate's personnel file. These criteria are expected to represent continued and expanded mastery of all appropriate categories of evaluation as non-tenure track faculty members petition for promotion to higher institutional ranks.**

In those cases where NTT faculty member's position is primarily based on teaching, a set of four reviewers will be selected to evaluate the candidate's qualifications.<sup>7</sup> The candidate will submit a list of up to six potential reviewers who are working in comparable discipline areas within the Department or in other departments within or outside the University. The Chair can add up to six potential reviewers to the list, if desired. From this list, the candidate will select two reviewers and the chair will select two reviewers. All individual reviewers must be at or above the rank sought b 9romo bove the ra mbove p7

