March 22, 2006

To: David Maines  
Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

From: Virinder K. Moudgil  
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Re: Unit Review Statement

This is to inform you that Oakland approves the Department of Sociology and Anthropology Review Statement as modified and submitted by you on behalf of your unit. The changes made are consistent with the recommendations that I suggested.

Please express my thanks to your faculty for working together with the administration to prepare a document that will help to insure the reappointment, promotion and tenure of a quality faculty.

VKM

cc: Ronald A. Sudol, Acting Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
   Michelle Piskulich, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology sets forth below its criteria for reappointment and promotion, as agreed to by its full-time and tenure track faculty members.

A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology offers majors in both named disciplines leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, as well as a modified major with a concentration in Linguistics. Liberal Arts Minors in Sociology and Anthropology are also offered. In addition, its faculty members participate, by offering course work in and/or assisting in the administration of, the International Studies Program, the Women's Studies Program, the Bachelor of General Studies Program, and the following Concentration Programs in the university: Archaeology, Criminal Justice, Environmental Studies, Religious Studies, Social Work, and Urban Studies.

B. DELIMITATION AND DEFINITIONS REGARDING AREAS OF PERFORMANCE TO BE REVIEWED

1. General Considerations.

   a. The department recognizes the following areas of professional performance as being subject to review: instruction, scholarly activity and accomplishment, and university, professional and public service. It sets forth below its understandings as to what each of these implies in the context of its overall mission and the expectations commonly held in the academic disciplines to which its members belong.

The mission of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology is to generate and disseminate knowledge in the two major social science disciplines that are administratively housed within it. Its members regard the research and teaching aspects of its mission as intertwined and mutually enriching. These activities are central to the departmental mission, all members seek to be as productive and effective as they can in attending to both. The department recognizes that members may vary in their balance of teaching, research, and service activities over time. With respect to the teaching mission, the department offers a full range curriculum in both disciplines, contributes courses that satisfy the university's general education curriculum and diversity requirements, and provides core courses for several College concentrations. Departmental faculty are also expected to offer service activities as a routine phase of departmental and College citizenship, to contribute to university life, to participate as fully as possible in relevant capacities in professional scholarly societies, and to participate professionally in the university's outreach efforts in local, state, and national venues.

The various review criteria for each level described below have been developed with a sense of cross-university standards being currently applied, yet with sufficient flexibility as to allow for reviews in each individual case to be sensitive to individual’s particular mixes of accomplishment and activity. The members of this department understand, however, that the evaluation of candidates’ records of accomplishment must be broadly comparative across the university at any point in time at the relevant review levels.
2. Instruction

a. One of the primary missions of the department is undergraduate instruction. All department members are expected to be able to teach satisfactorily, at least one of the several introductory courses offered in its curricula, and to do so when so called upon, if not regularly. In addition, all department members are expected to develop and offer on a reasonably regular basis, as modified by scheduling and student enrollment trends in any given semester, courses in their specialties at the 200 level and above.

b. Department members also teach courses which are either cross-listed with or otherwise part of extra-departmental curricular programs within the university. Teaching performance in these courses is also subject to review.

c. The quality and effectiveness of the following activities will be assessed, as relevant, in evaluating the candidates' instructional performance, based on student questionnaire data, student letters solicited and received, faculty peer review of candidate syllabi and course materials, and/or classroom observations and/or student interviews (if implemented).

i. new course and/or curriculum development

ii. preparation of individual course content and structure

iii. classroom lectures and discussions, as well as accessibility to students at other than class meeting times

iv. grading practices and fairness

v. extra-classroom instruction, as in, e.g., offering independent study courses, supervising internships and field experiences, sponsoring special sessions

3. Scholarly Activity and Accomplishment

a. Department members are expected to demonstrate productive scholarly activity and accomplishment related to their disciplines and their particular interests therein. The department shall make an assessment of the scholarly quality of all work reviewed. While such factors as the prestige of the journal or publishing house in/with which it appears, etc. may play a role in the departmental evaluation, such criteria shall not be arbitrarily applied a priori to consideration of the work under review.
b. It should be noted that the department makes no a priori distinction between "applied" and "basic" research. Scholarly activity of all sorts described below shall be evaluated.

c. Where a review candidate submits in evidence jointly authored work, the extent of his or her contribution will be ascertained and made explicit in the review and recommendation.

It is important to note that while the quantity of publication expected at each level of review is not necessarily specified, at the post-initial levels the rate of candidates' publication should be regular and sustained over time. The quantity of candidates' publications shall be assessed in balance with judgments regarding their quality and impact on the field of research they address.

d. At each separate review, attention will be given to the cumulative record of the candidate's scholarly accomplishment, with appropriate emphasis placed upon achievement since the last successful review.

e. The department seeks to maintain a faculty whose members are productive and recognized scholars. To that end, candidates for reappointment and promotion at all levels are expected to present evidence of growth and accomplishment in the area of scholarship. Primary evidence in this regard, especially at levels beyond the initial reappointment review, shall consist of (in no rank order):

(i) articles in peer reviewed scholarly journals. In addition, publication of books, book chapters, or monographs that have undergone peer evaluation represent scholarship. Books or monographs can be authored or edited, but should be published by established publishing institutions.

Note: formal acceptance of an item for publication will be regarded as publication.

In addition to publication as described below for each review level, additional evidence of scholarly recognition to be considered may consist of:

(ii) other published works, such as research notes and comments, published book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and technical reports as commissioned or prepared by public or private agencies.

(iii) success in attracting external funding support for candidates' research; published comments in symposium formats or in multiple book review essays requiring expert or original assessment of the work discussed; or presentation of research at scholarly venues, such as professional conferences, invited academic lectures and in similar settings.

(iv) depending on the candidates' body of work, evidence of scholarship may include miscellaneous evidence of scholarship such as films, video tapes, computer program, exhibitions and published photographs.
Where candidates' performance in any of the above activities has occurred jointly with others, the extent of the candidates' individual contribution shall be specified.

4. University, Professional and Public Service

a. The department shall review evidence of candidates' performance in the areas of university, professional and public service. In general, we take this to mean evidence of review candidates' willingness to contribute activities to university governance, administration and representation, at all levels and in both internal and external contexts, and otherwise to engage in activities which contribute positively to the life of the profession, as well as the university, its reputation, its faculty, its students and the public which the university serves. Service activities to be considered by the department may be divided into intra-university and extra-university activities, as summarized below.

b. University Service

1. Departmental service, including service on departmental committees or engaging in other activities, which contribute to the life of the department and the fulfillment of its mission. Service as an academic student adviser, either as a matter of formal assignment or as a matter of informal regular activity, shall be given special weight. So will assigned or self-assumed responsibility for the administration of any curricular programs (e.g., concentrations) for which the department has sole or primary responsibility.

2. Service on college bodies of administration and governance, or activities that contribute to the life of the college.

3. Service on university bodies of administration and governance including inter-college/school bodies, or activities that contribute to the life of the university.

c. Professional Service

1. The organization of panel sessions at scholarly conferences, the organization of scholarly conferences in entirety, or otherwise officiating in some administrative capacity at scholarly or other professional conferences.

2. Service as a member of the governing body of a professional association or as a member of a committee established by same for whatever purpose.

3. Service as an editor of a journal, newsletter or any like ad seriatum (serial) publication, directly related or of interest to the profession; service as an editor of a published volume of scholarly research reports, articles or findings.

4. Service as a reader of manuscripts for a journal or a publishing company.
Public Service

1. Any activities which the review candidate is called upon to perform, either as an official university representative or because of his/her professional/academic expertise, to serve an extra-university body or community group, in the public or private sector.

2. Other general representational activities, such as speaking on a particular topic as a departmental, college or university representative at an extra-university gathering.

In general, the department shall recognize, as evidence for a review of candidate performance, honorary or other awards received for meritorious service in any capacity, or any service designation of the sort described in 4.a.1, 2, and 3, 4, resulting from past meritorious accomplishments as a scholar, teacher or academic administrator.

Other Areas of Professional Performance

In addition to performance in instruction, scholarly activity and university service, other professional activities in which the candidate may have engaged will be given due note at all review levels. These may include remunerated consultanship or lecturing activities to extra-university bodies, insofar as these may be deemed consonant with the candidate’s professional expertise and with the enhancement of the reputation of the university and the department.

APPLICATION OF REVIEW CRITERIA AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF REVIEW

1. General Considerations. The department expects good performance at all levels of review for tenure track faculty. It will recommend all faculty members who develop and sustain good performance in all three areas of review. The unit recognizes, however, that members’ contributions to its work may vary in emphasis and quality according to individual interests and predilections. The standards set forth below at the different review levels represent what the department normally will consider adequate in this connection. Performance in each area at each level must exceed these minima to be considered good or outstanding.

2. The Initial Review for Candidates with No Prior Counted Professional Experience (41c.1).

At this review level, it is understood that candidates new to the profession may experience some difficulties of adjustment to the demands of full-time instruction, may as yet not be prepared to publish their research, and cannot be expected to be assigned or engage in significant university service. Hence, although this review will take due note of all accomplishments of candidates by the time of its initiation, it will also allow, more so than will subsequent reviews, more latitude for credit for evidence of future promise in all areas. The standards of performance at this review level will generally be as follows:
a. Instruction: At the initial level of review at the rank of assistant professor, candidates shall have offered a mix of introductory courses and courses in their specialty areas, where possible. There must be evidence of effective course preparation and classroom teaching. If any instructional difficulties are noted at this review level, the candidate will be expected to address these, and improvement should be demonstrated at the next review.

b. Scholarly Activity: At the initial level of review for reappointment at the rank of assistant professor, actual publication is welcome but not required. However, candidates must at a minimum display evidence that they are making progress toward scholarly accomplishment in their chosen field(s) of research. Such evidence should consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, manuscripts presented at scholarly conferences.

Note: Any candidate who may not have completed the Ph.D. degree or otherwise attained its equivalent by the time of this review shall normally not be recommended for reappointment.

c. Service: Candidates must have demonstrated an active interest in departmental matters and a willingness to be of assistance in the conduct of departmental business, even though they may not have been given any regular service assignment. Candidates at this level will not ordinarily be expected to have performed significant departmental, university, professional or public service, but if they have done so this will be duly noted.

3. The Pre-Tenure Review for Candidates with Prior Counted Experience (41.c.2 or c.3). At this review level there must be demonstrable professional accomplishment and the candidate's record to date should indicate such promise of continued professional development as to warrant the reasonable expectation of an award of tenure at the subsequent review. The standards of performance at this review level shall generally be as follows:

a. Instruction: Candidates for a second reappointment at the rank of assistant professor shall continue to have offered both introductory and specialized course work and demonstrated effective teaching. Creation of new courses at any level that meets department and/or college and university needs will be welcome, as will evidence of mentoring individual students. They shall also demonstrate efforts to remedy any difficulties in teaching that may have been noted at the time of their initial review.

b. Scholarly Activity: Candidates for a second reappointment at the rank of assistant professor must display evidence of some accomplishment as scholars in their chosen field(s) of research. Evidence must include success in publication and persuasive indications that sufficient publication will be forthcoming. (Note: Candidates should be aware of the requirements of tenure and promotion at the C.4 level.)

c. Service: By the time of this review, a candidate should have made regular contribution to departmental service. Contributions to university, professional and public service will also be duly noted and evaluated.
4. **Early Promotion**: Candidates who, at the time of their first or second pre-tenure review, demonstrate a level of performance far superior in instruction, scholarship and service that clearly meets the standards of the 41.e.4 review, as set forth below, can be recommended by the department for early promotion with tenure.

5. **The Tenure Review (41.e.4 or 41.d)**. This review is regarded by the department as the most important. As such, it must show demonstrated evidence of professional accomplishment, as well as the promise of future professional development. The standards of performance at this review level shall generally be as follows:

   a. Instruction: Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure shall have continued to demonstrate effective teaching and developed a range of introductory and advanced course offerings that meet departmental and/or college and university needs. They should have evidence of mentoring individual students. Candidates at this level should also have to some extent integrated their own scholarship into their course content, as relevant. Difficulties in teaching noted at earlier levels of review should have been substantially resolved.

   b. Scholarly Activity: Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure must display consistent accomplishment in their chosen field(s) of research. Evidence must include a pattern of consistent scholarly activity that results in regular publication (as designated in list i, page 3, this document) and scholarly accomplishment and recognition (as designated in lists ii, iii, and iv, page 3 this document). Ordinarily, the department would expect, on average, at least one publication (list i) per year, and regular and continuing scholarly accomplishment and recognition (lists ii, iii, and iv). In addition, the candidate must show promise of continuing future success in publications (list i) and scholarly accomplishment and recognition (lists ii, iii, and iv). The candidate's commitment to high standards of scholarship would be confirmed by outside peer evaluation.

   c. Service: Regular service in the department is continued to be expected. At this level it is expected that the candidate will have contributed some extradepartmental university service, and/or professional service, and/or public service, or else significant departmental service.

6. **Promotion to the Rank of Professor (41.i)**. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must display evidence of significant and continuing scholarly and instructional accomplishment as delineated in paragraphs a. and b. below. Overall, evidence also must include outstanding achievement and recognition in either: (1) teaching, or (2) publications (list i) and scholarly accomplishments (lists ii, iii, and). Evidence of leadership and regular participation in service related activities must also be demonstrated, but it will not be recognized as a substitute for outstanding accomplishment in scholarship or teaching. In addition, candidates must display a pattern and expectation of continuing future success in scholarship, instruction and service.
a. Instruction: Depending on the evaluation of instructional performance at the time of the previous review, further instructional improvement is expected at this level. At a minimum, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must demonstrate that they have maintained over time the standards or performance operant at the c-4 level. This minimum level of performance will be assessed as an indicator of future teaching competence and effectiveness. Candidates must demonstrate that they have kept their courses current with ongoing standards of knowledge and scholarly interpretation in their fields. They should also have further integrated their scholarship in their course content. In order to be recognized as outstanding, candidates will have taken some leadership in processes to improve overall teaching effectiveness. In addition, candidates will have evidence of significant mentorship with students such as, writing papers with students, helping students obtain scholarships and fellowships, and assisting them in applying to graduate school or other programs.

b. Scholarly Activity: Candidates must demonstrate substantial and sustained post-tenure achievement in publications (list i) and other scholarly accomplishments (lists ii, iii, and iv). Evidence of outstanding scholarly achievement must be confirmed by outside peer evaluation.

c. Service: Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor shall demonstrate service leadership in activities at the department level. In addition, regular activities in extra-departmental college, and/or university, and/or professional and public service is also expected.

Initial appointment at high ranks: Candidates for initial appointment in the department at the rank of professor must meet the standards of scholarly performance set forth above for internal promotion to those ranks.

7. Review for Special Instructor. In addition to tenure track faculty, the department may also hire Special Instructors who, while holding non-tenure track positions, are eligible for job security and must also come under review. Normally, Special Instructors have unique credentials to teach courses in specific areas deemed important by the department but which the department would otherwise not be able to offer on a regular basis. In general, therefore, reviews of Special Instructors will emphasize teaching performance in the specialty area(s) for which persons at this rank were initially hired. If, in addition, particular service and/or scholarly activities are also specified as aspects of expected performance in Special Instructors’ most recent letter of hire, these activities will be evaluated with correspondingly appropriate emphasis in reviews. Accordingly, candidates’ most recent letter of hire must be included in their dossiers and be available for inspection.

a. First and/or Second Reappointment

i. Instruction: Special Instructors are expected to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, as measured by the methods described in the departmental procedures. In the absence of additional hiring stipulations, teaching effectiveness
will be weighted more heavily than any other consideration in the review.

ii. Service: Special Instructors are expected to have made effective contributions to any service activities that may be specified in the most recent letter of hire. The relative weight of these service contributions in the overall review will reflect the importance assigned to them in the letter of hire. As full time faculty members, Special Instructors may also be called upon from time to time to participate in various other service activities within the department, college, or university. Such additional service contributions, which might also include community and professional service, will be taken into account in the review.

iii. Scholarship: Special Instructors are expected to have made satisfactory progress towards fulfilling any scholarly projects that may be specified in the most recent letter of hire. The relative weight given to such scholarly work will reflect the importance assigned to it in the letter of hire. As full time faculty members, Special Instructors are generally expected to contribute in some measure to the overall research activity of the department. Therefore, any additional scholarly activity engaged in by a Special Instructor will be valued and taken into account in the review.

These reviews will be done in accordance with C-1 procedures.

b. Re-employment with the Granting of Job Security

i. Instruction: Special Instructors shall continue to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, as measured by methods described in the departmental procedures. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will normally receive greatest emphasis relative to other areas of performance.

ii. Service: Special Instructors must continue to demonstrate effective performance of service activities that may be specified in the last letter of reappointment. Additional service contributions within the department, college, or university will continue to be taken into account.

iii. Scholarship: Special Instructors must have successfully completed scholarly projects specified in the initial letter of hire and/or have demonstrated continued scholarly accomplishment reflecting additional scholarly projects that may be specified, recognized, or encouraged in the last letter of reappointment.

These reviews will be done in accordance with C-2 Procedures.

c. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure:

According to the Faculty Agreement (VII, 42d) a Special Instructor may be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Should the Department of Sociology and Anthropology initiate a review of a Special Instructor with job security under this provision, he or she must fulfill all requirements for a C-4 review in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service.