MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, College of Letters and Science
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: ___July 1, 2024_____

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
	DocuSigned by: Scott Myers	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
Scott Myers		
Department Faculty	Chair, Primary Review Committee	
	DocuSigned by: Cody Warner	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
Cody Warner		
Primary Administrative Reviewer	Department Head/Director	
	DocuSigned by: Michelle Miley	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
Michelle Miley		
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
	DocuSigned by: Yves Idzerda	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
Yves Idzerda		
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	College Dean	
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	
	DocuSigned by: Durward K. Sobek II	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
Durward Sobek		
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
	DocuSigned by: Robert Mokwa	5/2/2024	7:00 AM MDT
_Robert Mokwa		
Provost		

Role and Scope Document for
the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
(Revised May 1, 2024)

Article I. Role and Scope of the Unit

The research-active faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology are committed to providing excellent educational experiences to our undergraduate majors and minors as well as the general population of MSU students. We align our pedagogy within the theoretical, substantive, and methodological traditions of Sociology and Anthropology and focus on past, present, and emerging substantive social scientific issues—all embedded in the tradition of the liberal arts. The faculty, staff, and administrators in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology support the fulfillment of Montana State University's teaching, research, and service missions in the areas of Sociology and Anthropology.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology offers the Bachelor of Science degrees in:
- Sociology
- Anthropology

The Bachelor of Science degree in Sociology has two options:
- Sociology
- Criminology

The Department also offers non-teaching minors in:
- Sociology
- Anthropology

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology also contributes substantially to the **general education** of all MSU students by its participation in MSU's CORE 2.0 through numerous course offerings in Diversity (4 courses), Inquiry Social Science (7 courses), Research Social Science (7 courses), and Contemporary Issues in Science (1 course).

Scholarship and **engagement** are integral foci of the Department's mission and serve to complement our instructional role. These efforts contribute to a growing body of scholarly knowledge and enhance instruction by providing research experiences for students. Our research serves local, state, national, and international communities.

The Department equally participates in **service** and **outreach** in the following ways:
- University Service – faculty from the department regularly serve on and chair department, college, and university committees.
- Professional Service – faculty members serve and represent MSU in regional, national, and international organizations as presenters at conferences, section chairs, and journal editors and reviewers
- Community Service and Outreach – faculty members give archeology, anthropology, and sociology presentations to K-12 or local community organizations, serve on local advisory boards, taskforces, or boards of directors, provide assistance or legal advocacy for underrepresented groups, or provide student engagement opportunities.

Article II.   Appointment of Research Faculty

  Not applicable

Article III.   Annual Review Process

All tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty who are not subject to the NTT Collective Bargaining Agreement are reviewed annually using the Annual Review Form. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology uses the College of Letters and Science (CLS) procedures for annual review.

Section 3.01 Criteria for Merit Rankings

  The Department of Sociology & Anthropology uses the following criteria to rank faculty for merit increases:
  - All tenure-track faculty members in the department with annual review scores of Acceptable Performance (3.0 or higher) are eligible to be ranked for merit increases; faculty members are not required to apply to be considered for merit increases.
  - The annual review scores are used in the Department to rank faculty members for merit, with faculty members receiving the highest annual review scores at the top of the merit ranking.
  - All faculty members with the same annual review score receive the same merit ranking.
  - The annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching.

Section 3.02 Overview of Annual Review Process

Faculty members are reviewed annually by the Department Head and Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will be composed of one Sociology faculty member and one Anthropology faculty member with the rank of Associate Professor or higher. If the Department Head is an Anthropologist, both Executive Committee members can be from the Sociology Faculty. Annual reviews are used to encourage productivity, to determine annual merit raises when available, and to provide faculty clear signals regarding their progress toward retention, tenure, promotion, and professional development. If necessary, the reviews provide suggestions and guidance to faculty as they move forward their research, teaching, and service agendas. Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) faculty on teaching appointments of 0.5 or greater are only evaluated on the teaching criteria (100% of their assignment). Faculty members' teaching, research, and service activities are evaluated using the indicators outlined in Section 9.05.

Procedures for annual review: Faculty are responsible for providing the Department Head and the Executive Committee with germane information on their prior year's activities (see evidence list above) using the platform selected by the Provost (currently Faculty Success). Faculty members can provide a text summary of their scholarship, teaching, and service/administrative activities, especially if these activities are not captured well by the above categories. Faculty are also encouraged to discuss how they integrate issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access (DEIA) into their teaching, scholarship, or service.

This requirement to complete an annual review occurs annually, and a call at the start of the calendar year (by the Department Head) notifies faculty of this responsibility. The Department Head and the Executive Committee use these reports as the basis of the annual review.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee -- Composition and Appointment
The Department of Sociology and Anthropology Primary Review Committee (i.e., Retention, Tenure and Promotion [RTP] committee) is composed and appointed consistent with the University Faculty Handbook. The Department Head appoints three *tenured* faculty members from the department to the RTP committee, with the majority of members of the committee being from the candidate's discipline, if possible. The RTP Committee evaluates all cases of retention, tenure, and promotion occurring within a given academic year. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on review committees. Ideally, at least one half of the members will have attained the rank of professor. The RTP Committee membership selection process will promote inclusion of protected categories identified by MSU whenever possible, attending to the dual goals of valuing diverse perspectives and promoting access to decision-making committees for individuals from protected categories.

If committee composition is restricted due to limitations within the Department, the Head will request approval from the CLS Dean to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment. Before beginning their work, all RTP members will complete required orientation and training sessions as described in the Faculty Handbook. Emeritus faculty and Faculty on leave are ineligible for service.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator
The Primary Review Administrator is the current Department Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the CLS Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities
- Establish the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the appointment of the members as described: **Primary Review Administrator**.
- Select external reviewers and solicit review letters: **Primary Review Committee**.
- If internal Reviews are part of the unit's review process, selecting and soliciting Internal Reviews: **Primary Review Administrator**.
- Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
    - Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer shall be included in the Dossier: **Primary Review Committee**.
    - Applicable Role and Scope Document: **Primary Review Administrator**.
    - Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU: **Primary Review Administrator**.
    - Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review: **Primary Review Administrator.**
- Maintaining copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal, (if applicable), and external review letters after the review: **Primary Review Administrator**.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Letters & Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee – Composition and Appointment
The Intermediate Review Committee is the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, with composition and appointment as described in the CLS Role and Scope.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator
The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Section 5.03 Level of Review Following Intermediate Review Administrator
The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials
Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," and the CLS Role and Scope document. Additionally, candidates in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology must follow the requirements below.

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate
Materials for external review must include:
- A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- A personal statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship, as well as a brief description of other roles/responsibilities of the faculty member.
- Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represent their scholarship.

Materials for the Dossier must include:
- Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
- A personal statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
- Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represent their scholarship.
- Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation includes a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.

- The candidate's CV should separately indicate:
  - refereed books or book chapters
  - refereed journal articles
  - invited book chapters or articles

- o invited conference presentations
- o contributed conference presentations
- o seminars and/or colloquia
- o grant proposals submitted, and grants funded
- o non-refereed publications

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the discipline and the candidate's record. On papers, grants funded, and other scholarly products, full author lists must match the publication or grant funded. This list is a general requirement for all dossiers. For further details including evidence of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activity, see Articles VIII-XI of this document.

Section 6.02. Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions
The Department of Sociology and Anthropology recognizes the importance of collaborative scholarly contributions. In complying with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Retention, Tenure and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities," Article 1, Paragraph e, on the requirement to detail scholarly collaboration, candidates in the College of Letters and Science will include this information in a single document in a format recommended by the department. In order to document the contribution of the candidate, the Department requires providing either: a) percent effort estimate for each publication; or b) a description of the contributions made to each publication in areas such as but not limited to conception of the problem, data analysis, data coding, and approving of final draft.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure
The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 6.

Evaluators should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. Departments should elaborate how these guidelines apply to their disciplines. External evaluators can be members of Sociology departments, Anthropology departments, or departments in fields closely related to Sociology or Anthropology. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

Guidelines regarding who may and may not serve as referees are elaborated in the Faculty Handbook on "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities" as follows:

> *3.c. No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent.*

External review letters must be requested by the party specified in Sec. 4.03 and must <u>not</u> be solicited by the candidate. Confidential external letters of evaluation of research (from outside of Montana State University) are required for all candidates, regardless of the area of emphasis. A minimum of four such letters are required. All letters of evaluation received must be included in the candidate's file.

Letters of evaluation shall address the candidate's professional potential and accomplishments rather than personal qualities. Specific assessments of scholarship are essential. Evaluators shall be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. Letters from mentors, former colleagues, close collaborators, or personal friends have less credibility and shall not be solicited. At least two of the reviewers will come from the list prepared by the Department Head/department RTP committee, and up to two of the reviewers will come from the list submitted by the candidate. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators in order to protect the confidentiality of the review process. The external review letters must be requested by the department head or RTP committee chair, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The department report shall state clearly how external referees were chosen and shall include a brief statement of their status in the field. A copy of the letter soliciting outside reviewers must be included in the candidate's file; referees shall also state either knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if any.

External reviewers will be sent the Department Role and Scope document, a copy of the candidate's CV, a brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship, and a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, along with other materials, as appropriate and selected by the candidate. Reviewers will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and productivity during the review period, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field, using appropriate criteria, indicators and standards from the department's Role and Scope Document.

In accordance with 8.03.1(e), internal letters of teaching observation will form part of the teaching dossier and uploaded into the internal review folder. Other internal review letters are optional and solicited at the discretion of the Department RTP Committee or the Department Head based on the need for an assessment of an aspect of the candidate's performance that may not be assessed fully through other indicators.

Article VII.   Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review
Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review
Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope document by notifying the primary review administrator and indicating it on the dossier cover sheet.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review
The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion or more recent.

Article VIII.   Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review
Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard
The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:
- Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period.
- Integration of no fewer than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

As defined in the Faculty Handbook, the review period for retention begins on the first day of employment in a tenurable position and ends on the deadline established by the Provost for submission of dossiers.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting
Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations
The Department values quantitative and qualitative factors, where the assessment of quality takes precedence.

Effectiveness in scholarship is judged primarily by the ability to generate and maintain a research program in which the faculty member is the source of original contributions and to publish peer-reviewed research products such as but not limited to journal articles, books, book chapters, and presentations. *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research specialty that is in the candidate's discipline and developing a record of scholarly contributions that is consistently of high quality and sustained over time (see Section 9.03) throughout the review period.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated or related discipline(s), and result in a record of scholarly products at the time of retention. These products shall represent both Group I and Group II indicators (see Section 9.03), and publications may be submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

In Sociology and Anthropology, co-authored and co-edited publications are normative. Candidates will receive differentiated credit for such work, depending upon the extent of their effort. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Effectiveness in Teaching is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in Service is as described in Section 9.04, except that there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU at the time of retention review.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators is listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 8.05.

Article IX.   Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:
- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- Sustained integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Accomplishment in scholarship during the review period.

As defined in the Faculty Handbook, the review period for tenure begins on the first day of employment in a tenurable position at the university and ends on the deadline established by the Provost for submission of dossiers.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied. These performance indicators apply to all departmental faculty regardless of specialty or sub-discipline. The *weighting* of each indicator may vary across and within the groups. Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Performance indicators in scholarship

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Group I are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Group II also contribute to performance but carry less weight. Further weighting of each indicator may vary across and within the groups and takes into consideration (a) author order and contribution in multiple-authored works; (b) journal prestige; and (c) book press prestige. Evidence of research impacts is also considered, such as but not limited to citation indices, h-index, awards, other recognitions, and extent and placement of dissemination. All items from Groups I and II are referred to as "scholarly products."

Group I

- Peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and books
- External grants funded
- Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote)

Group II

- Non-peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and books
- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings
- Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- External grant proposals submitted
- Grant-related letters of intent
- Internal grants funded
- Invited talks and/or colloquia
- Non-refereed proceedings and technical reports
- Creation or continuation of research partnerships or community-based research

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter. In addition, the weight of indicators will be determined and described by the RTP Committee, based on varying disciplinary norms for scholarship outcomes.

Performance Indicators in Teaching
The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- *Student evaluations of teaching based on University-approved instruments
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Academic advising and mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research and teaching assistantships, honors theses, and independent studies)
- New course development
- Instructional innovation
- Adoption or development of Open Education Resources
- Participation on graduate theses, portfolios, and dissertations
- Participation in curriculum development such as but not limited to establishing study-abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing-intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, and other curriculum innovations
- Honors and awards for teaching

*Student evaluations are an important element of performance in teaching, but student evaluations are vulnerable to bias to the extent that evaluations can be based on criteria other than instructional quality. As a result, student evaluations should be viewed with caution and supplemented by other indicators (e.g., peer evaluations of teaching). Departmental expectations regarding the number of reviews and if they should be internal or external to the department are outlined in Section 9.04.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The

Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance Indicators in Service
In addition to the requirements in the University Faculty Handbook, the dossier shall include the candidate's professional service activities to the University, College, and Department as well as to the profession, and local, national, and international communities. This includes information about committee assignments, offices held, editing duties, service to professional organizations, outreach, and other professional tasks relevant to the candidate's defined role. The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.
- Active participation in professional societies.
- Leadership roles in professional societies.
- Service on University, College, and Department committees, where serving as Chair is weighted more than serving as a member.
- Review of grant, book, journal, and conference manuscripts and proposals.
- Outreach and other forms of public service activities such as task force membership, advisory board membership, membership on boards of directors, or activist activities associated with one's discipline.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance Indicators in Integration
As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate sustained integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integration of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development for K-12 teachers or special programs for K-12 students.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations
The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge as key characteristics of scholarship. *Accomplishment in scholarship* involves both qualitative and quantitative factors, and is judged primarily by the ability to generate and maintain a research program in which the

faculty member is the source of original contributions and where peer-reviewed research products are the most commonly used performance indicator. It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure.

The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average between 1 and 2 scholarly products per year during the review period. That said, the quantitative expectations for meeting the performance standard of *accomplishment in scholarship* include a minimum of five (5) Group I scholarly products during the review period. For these purposes, while a book is also a Group I product, it may be considered as the equivalent of up to four (4) peer-reviewed articles. The department RTP committee will consider factors such as book publisher prestige, methodological approach, and overall length/depth of book products to determine their total Group I count. Publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of the review. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department (i.e., sociologists and anthropologists), expectations may vary across disciplines and the department RTP committee will make a judgement about quality/prestige in cases where the output is less than five Group I products.

Having obtained external funding for one's research is not necessary for tenure and promotion. However, having received such funding from external agencies with rigorous peer-review of proposals counts as an indicator of research quality, and is also considered a Group I scholarly product.

The *qualitative expectations* for meeting the standard of *accomplishment* are assessed by professional sociologists and anthropologists, and, for faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary research, by qualified scholars in cognate fields. For purposes of tenure and promotion recommendations, the department gives substantial weight to judgments of quality by a candidate's external reviewers.

Other things being equal, the standings of journals and academic presses in which candidates published are also considered significant indicators of quality. Some evidence of quality and impactful research includes impact factors of publishing journals and journal rankings with disciplines. Quality of scholarship can also be assessed by citation indices including the h-index and i10-index. Furthermore, the assessment of quality may also take into account the professional recognition of a candidate's work in the form of prizes, awards, and fellowships.

In determining if a candidate has met the quantitative and qualitative expectations in scholarship, it should also be recognized that the Department of Sociology & Anthropology is a two-discipline department that is comprised of faculty who conduct research in distinct fields and with different methodologies. Therefore, the ultimate evaluation of quantity and impact of research is best judged by experts in each discipline and area of research. Further, the quantity of research produced varies according to the length and depth of the research process and product, and evaluations of productivity consider such elements as but not limited to: patterns of co-authorship, lead authorship, and solo authorship; extent and depth of contributions on multi-authored works; quality of the journals, book publisher, or edited collections; impact of the research; and quality of monographs.

For collaborative work, the candidate's contribution must be accounted for, as per Section 6.02. Overall, the body of work shall represent a coherent and well-rounded program of independent research, primarily indicated by publications on which the candidate is the sole author or first author. Work published prior to the tenure-earning years can be considered evidence of such a program but does not substitute for the record indicated above.

Teaching Expectations

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses and mentoring students. There are both quantitative and qualitative expectations for meeting the performance standard of *sustained effectiveness* in teaching.

The quantitative expectations include that, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for "Average." For example, 3.0 is the "average" evaluation score for "Overall Effectiveness" on an instrument with 5 categories (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent). Quantitative expectations also include a minimum of four (4) peer-evaluations of teaching during the review period. Two (2) of these will be internal peer-evaluations during the retention review period. One additional internal evaluation and one external evaluation shall be completed between the retention and tenure reviews. External evaluators will be university faculty outside of the department, and will complete the review using the standardized form created by the department for evaluations of teaching. Finally, quantitative expectations for teaching include maintaining an advising load of undergraduate students consistent with departmental norms and expectations. Faculty are also expected to maintain a full schedule of advisees where advising includes the provision of academic, professional, and other forms of information and advice. The standard expectation is that faculty meet with their assigned advisees once per semester.

The *qualitative expectations* for *sustained effectiveness* in teaching go beyond student evaluations, which may only reflect student satisfaction, and working with assigned advisees. *Effectiveness* in teaching is a qualitative judgment made by peers from a review of all materials provided by the candidate as evidence of their engagement with and effectiveness of their teaching contributions. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as one form of evidence to evaluate effectiveness. Further qualitative evidence of effectiveness in teaching includes engaging in pedagogical development and course improvement to achieve course or program learning outcomes, and contributing to course development through the development of new courses. The performance indicators and forms of evidence in Section 9.05 are aligned with these quantitative and qualitative indictors.

Service Expectations

Sustained effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU during the review period. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

Typical evidence of meeting the performance standard of *sustained* effectiveness in service includes active service on multiple service capacities to the department, college, university, profession, and community. Candidates need not be equally active in all categories of service; some may choose to focus their efforts in one or two capacities. Quantity of activities must be commensurate with commitment to the institutional and service role of a professional sociologist and anthropologist in a public land-grant university and based on department-specific norms.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators
Applicable performance indicators and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier.

In addition to the listed evidence of performance indicators, properly documented nominations for and receptions of competitive awards for scholarship, teaching, or service will be considered as evidence of peer recognition.

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Scholarship
The list of evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review. Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through University databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

Table 1. Group I Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Group I: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and books	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
External grants funded	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote)	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.

Table 2. Group II Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Group II: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Non-peer reviewed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and books	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.

Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
External grant proposals or Letters of Intent (LOI's) submitted	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Internal grants funded	Brief description (title, source of funding, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Invited talks and/or colloquia	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Non-refereed proceedings and technical reports	Full citation for the publication or report, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials):	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.
Creation or continuation of research partnerships or community-based research.	Description of the partnership, program, or community-based research including (but not limited to): creating or holding meetings of a local advisory board, direct engagement with citizens, dissemination of knowledge through partnerships.

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Teaching
The list of evidence presented in Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Table 3. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Student evaluations of teaching based on University-approved instruments	Student evaluation scores for all courses taught during the review period. Full set of student evaluations of teaching (scores and comments). Description of changes made in response to student feedback.
Peer teaching evaluations	Written report by peer observer. The Department Head may serve as a peer observer. Description of changes made in response to peer feedback.
Engaging in instructional innovation	Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials with supporting evidence. Description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.

Adoption or development of open educational resource (OER)	Description of the OER adopted or created with full citation and either a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form or a digital copy of the work in published form.
Academic advising	Average number of range of advisees assigned during review period. Description of practice for facilitating face-to-face meetings with advisees.
Mentorship of undergraduate students	Description of mentorship/assistantship project, funding (if any), and accomplishments/outcomes.
Participation on graduate theses, portfolios, and dissertations	Description of project, role in project (e.g., chair v. member), funding (if any), and progress to date.
Participating in curriculum development.	Description of the developed products, implementation process, audience, and outcomes.

Evidence of Performance Indicators in Service
The list of evidence in Table 4 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Table 4. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.
Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the Sociology, Anthropology, or related disciplines	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities (i.e., taskforces, advisory boards, boards of directors)	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.
Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.
Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.

Article X.   Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01. University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI.   Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

15

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of at least five (5) years of service in the rank of Associate Professor. However, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they "meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank."

Section 11.02 University Standard
The university standards for promotion to the rank for Professor are:
- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- Integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period.
- Excellence in scholarship during the review period.

As defined in the Faculty Handbook, the review period for promotion to professor is the period of employment at MSU in the rank of Associate Professor plus the time that the candidate's MSU tenure dossier was under review until the deadline established by the provost for submission of the dossier for promotion to professor.

Section 11.03   Performance Indicators and Weighting
The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations
The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge as key characteristics of scholarship. The Faculty Handbook defines excellence as sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products.

The *quantitative expectations* for meeting the standard of *excellence in scholarship* include producing a body of scholarly productivity that is consistent with that produced during the tenure review period. There is no set quantitative expectation (e.g., five Group I products for tenure review) because the timing of the promotion review is not set. That said, quantitative evidence of meeting the standard of excellence would include averaging one (1) Group I scholarly product per year and two (2) total scholarly products per year during the review period. Given the definition of excellence, it is expected that scholarship be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. These products may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

The *qualitative expectations* for meeting the standard of *excellence in scholarship* is a judgement based primarily on the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. *Excellence* also includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. Evidence of this would be awards or other recognition, publishing in international journal, presenting at international conferences, or

pursuing research topics of interest to international audiences. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

Having obtained external funding for one's research is not necessary for promotion to professor. But, having received such funding from external agencies with rigorous peer-review of proposals counts as an indicator of research quality.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Although the candidate's complete body of work is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed based on the candidate's performance during the review period.

Teaching Expectations
The expectation for this review is sustained effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04. Candidates for promotion shall have one (1) internal and one (1) external peer evaluation completed within the five (5) years leading up to the review period (at a minimum).

Service Expectations
The expectation for this review is sustained effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators
Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII.   Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document
Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. Review committee members or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the Department's Role and Scope may submit the request for changes to the chair of University Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC). The URTPC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the URTPC chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the URTPC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

Article XIII.   Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
- Tenurable faculty and primary review administrator of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
- College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee and dean

- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
- College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee and dean
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost