

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON PROMOTION,
TENURE AND CONTRACT RENEWAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Promotion and Tenure	2
Criteria and Methods of Evaluation	2
A. Scholarship	2
B. Teaching	3
C. Service	4
Promotions and Tenure	5
A. Instructor to Assistant Professor	5
B. Assistant to Associate Professor	5
C. Associate Professor to Professor	7
D. Granting Tenure	8
E. Continuing Track (CT) Faculty	8
F. Adjunct Faculty and Faculty with Joint Appointments	9
Schedule, Materials and Procedures	10
3. Peer Review and Renewal of Contracts	12
4. Preparation of the Dossier	13
5. Review of the Present Document	14

I. INTRODUCTION

This document outlines procedures, criteria of evaluation and materials required for promotion, awarding of tenure and renewal of contract in the Department of Anthropology.

STATEMENT OF GOALS AND AIMS

The Anthropology Department at the University of Delaware explores what it means to be human. Integrating social science, humanities, and natural science approaches, we study the diversity of human culture and people's place in the natural world across space and over time. Our faculty engage students in interactive classes and innovative learning contexts and provide significant opportunities for collaborative, individual, intra- and interdisciplinary research. We undertake research in social and cultural anthropology, archaeology, and biological anthropology: we collect, describe, and analyze data from diverse theoretical perspectives; value engaged research, applying knowledge to serve and advocate; emphasize interdisciplinary, collaborative research at local, national, and global scales; and articulate our research, teaching, and service for their mutual enhancement. Faculty members apply anthropological perspectives to serve the discipline, university, community, state, nation, and peoples around the world.

Applications for promotion and/or tenure will follow the policies laid out in the University of Delaware's policy on promotion and tenure as reflected in the University Faculty Handbook (<https://facultyhandbook.udel.edu/handbook/44-promotion-and-tenure>) and with this policy statement. Department faculty are urged to familiarize themselves thoroughly with these documents and with appropriate statements of the College and University Promotion Committees prior to the consideration of candidacy.

2. PROMOTION AND TENURE

CRITERIA AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

The Department of Anthropology considers all available evidence relating to teaching, scholarship, and service. Each area of evaluation must first be examined and explored in its own right and in the context of the faculty member's assigned workload. The sum of the total contribution must then be assessed carefully. The Department will consider all scholarly and service activities performed at another institution at the same rank as properly part of an application for promotion at UD. For evaluation of teaching, we will normally consider only information from the University of Delaware as necessary and appropriate; candidates may choose to submit information concerning teaching at other institutions either before coming to UD or while already teaching at UD, but such information is not required and need not be solicited or considered by the Promotion and Tenure committee (PC).

A. Scholarship

An individual proposed for promotion will be evaluated by the faculty on scholarship subsequent to appointment or the last promotion after careful consideration of the following areas:

1. Written Works. These include published works, works in press, works accepted for publication, works submitted for publication, works in draft intended for future publication, papers presented at meetings, formal/technical research reports, and contributions to juried electronic journals. In the case of applied and engaged scholarship, this may also include annual reports, program evaluation reports, newspaper and magazine articles, policy briefings and white papers. In the appraisal of materials, the amount of output and the place of publication are assets but secondary to the quality of the work, its originality, and demonstrated and possible impact.

2. Unsolicited invitations to contribute to symposia in her/his specialty; organization of scholarly symposia; requests to serve as an officer of a professional association or on the editorial board of a professional journal; requests to review manuscripts for publishers, grant proposals for granting agencies, and books for journals; and professional consultation.

3. The candidate's summary of research activities, statement of research plans, and any grant proposals since appointment or last review for promotion. The scope, quality and continuity of research is assessed, as well as evidence of financial support of research, where appropriate.

4. The candidate's statement, materials such as reports, program documents, assessments and evaluations, and other testimony in support of the impact of translational and applied research for community engagement. These activities and products may include consultation with descendant communities and or/ organizations on issues relating to organizational culture, cross-cultural communication, usability analysis, and quality assurance; agency presentations; conference and forum participation; expert witnessing; strategic and marketing plans; community ethnographies; museum exhibitions; museum catalogues; documentary videos; internet web pages and website content; data sets and archived documents; systems and marketing campaigns; and other materials.

5. Outside evaluators and favorable reviews or comments on the individual's published work provide evidence of scholarship

6. Emphasis will be placed on the candidate's having made substantive contributions to the field of Anthropology and/or to the areas(s) of specialization.

B. Teaching

In evaluating a candidate's teaching, the PC should consider the material in the dossier substantiating the teaching record. This may include:

1. course syllabi and outlines; examinations, worksheets, study guides; course assignments - papers, problems, digital projects, lab reports, etc.
2. evidence of originality in the preparation and organization of courses;
3. productivity in organizing new courses;
4. Department supervised student evaluations, properly tabulated and summarized, with sample of student comments;

5. performance at public lectures and/or lectures given in other classes in the University;
6. classroom observation;
7. evidence documenting and assessing the impact of community engagement educational programs;
8. self-evaluation;
9. long-term follow-up of students;
10. formal written evaluations from current and former students and advisees of the candidate solicited through the Head of the PC;
11. peer evaluations that attest to the candidate's pedagogical competence, knowledge of the subject matter, organization and preparations, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative capacity and the like.

C. Service

In judging a person's service contribution, the quality and efficiency of service are of greater importance than the status of the committee or assignment. Demonstrated and documented failure to render service in an efficient and cooperative manner may be sufficient grounds to recommend against promotion.

The following are among the subjects for the evaluation of service:

1. Departmental, College, and University service assignments. This category includes committee memberships and chairpersonships; service as senators; faculty advisors to thesis students, student groups or clubs; etc. The Head of PC should solicit information on the candidate's record from the Department Chair, heads of relevant outside committees, and from faculty administrators and others who have knowledge of the candidate's contributions in these areas. Individuals whose names have been supplied by the candidate may be asked for written comments when thought appropriate.
2. Special lecturing activities within the University-e.g., participation in University or College fora, lectures to University clubs or other University groups, etc.
3. Special lecturing activities and consultancies outside the University-e.g., lectures to community groups; talks to high school or elementary school classes; active involvement with community to achieve educational goals.
4. Community, state, national, international service-e.g., consultation and special assignments, professional board memberships, community mentoring, appointments to boards and commissions, assisting in the development of pre-collegiate curricula, representing the Department and University in public media.
5. Service to the profession-e.g., professional association committee participation, reviewing manuscripts for academic journals and/or publishers, reviewing applications to funding agencies, University promotion cases, department reviews.

PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

A. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

Instructors receive a one-year contract, usually contingent on completion of all requirements for the Ph.D. within the first year. For an Instructor who acquires the Ph.D. during the contingency period, appointment as Assistant Professor may be routine. If the contingency is not satisfied during the first year and a second one-year contract as instructor is granted, the Ph.D. must be completed during the second year for any further contract to be granted. An instructor who is granted a second year must prepare a dossier and proceed through the regular promotion process. Major criteria for evaluation will be viewed in light of the candidate's limited experience in teaching and service and the practical limitations imposed by completion of the dissertation on the candidate's research and publication; close examination of the quality of the dissertation will be an important element in the evaluation.

B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must take place within the guidelines established by the University. Whereas teaching, service, and ongoing research activities are all significant, particularly important is the record of publication of juried essays, book chapters and books. The primary considerations are: 1) the ability of candidates to conduct excellent research and disseminate the findings, and 2) the candidates' promise as productive scholars in the future. Work submitted and accepted for publication deserves special attention. Clear evidence is necessary about continuity, effort, potential, and quality in research and commitment to publication. At a minimum, the individual should show excellent achievement in scholarship or teaching and high-quality performance in all areas.

Scholarship:

Excellence:

The hallmark of excellence shall be clear evidence of sustained productivity. To be judged excellent, most of a candidate's publications should appear in well-respected, peer-reviewed journals and presses that report original research or reviews/ analyses of research areas. Candidates are advised to direct their scholarship toward outlets with solid reputations, but there is also recognition that new journals (including electronic) will emerge, particularly in association with new fields of research. Excellent research has a substantial impact on the field, as evidenced through external reviews, commentaries, and/or citations (appropriately interpreted in the subdisciplinary context).

In the case of translational, engaged or applied research, the criterion for excellence is demonstrable, meaningful impact (see 2.A.1, 4).

Excellent scholars may receive unsolicited invitations to organize and/or contribute to scholarly symposia, review manuscripts and/or grant proposals, serve as an officer or editorial board member of a professional association, or contribute to a translational, engaged, or applied research project or organization. Excellent scholars seek internal and/or external funding for projects as appropriate.

High Quality:

To be judged high-quality, a candidate's record should include publications in top peer-reviewed journals and well-regarded regional and national journals. A high-quality research record is one that reports the accomplishments of a team in which the candidate plays a role. Impact is noticeable, but modest. High quality scholars present their work at conferences and professional association meetings. High quality scholars may also undertake translational, engaged or applied research.

Teaching:

In measuring teaching performance, the Department assesses a candidate's record in effectively planning and delivering a course of study to students.

Excellence: Excellent teachers are extraordinary, contributing significantly and meaningfully to the teaching mission of the department. Their teaching reflects current knowledge and practice, and is characterized by innovation, inclusive pedagogies, and critical engagement. Excellent teachers use technology well and uniquely in the classroom and participate in training opportunities. Excellent teachers are available to their students regularly outside of class and office hours for review, enrichment, and guidance. They are involved to a large degree in mentoring students, which may include directing independent studies, teaching honors students, and supervising undergraduate and/or graduate research and publication. Excellent teachers regularly provide enrichment opportunities (e.g., field trips, campus guests, community service programs, work with student organizations).

High Quality: High-quality teaching contributes significantly and meaningfully to the teaching mission of the department. Teaching should reflect current knowledge and practice. High-quality teachers are available to their students outside the classroom at regularly scheduled office hours and at additional times for review, enrichment, and guidance. High-quality teachers attend teaching workshops to keep current with pedagogical practices and technology. High-quality teachers are involved at a modest level in independent studies, teaching honors students, and the supervision of undergraduate and graduate student research.

Service:

Excellence: To achieve excellent service, Assistant Professors would perform service at a level above and beyond the criteria for high quality service. For example, a candidate may engage in public or community service beyond the University campus or may engage in national service to the profession.

High Quality: To achieve high quality service, Assistant Professors participate in (and contribute to) all Departmental committees to which the candidate is either appointed or elected during the academic year.

C. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Unlike other steps in the promotional process, that from Associate Professor to Professor is not bound within a fixed number of years after assumption of the previous rank. At a minimum, the individual should show continued excellent achievement in scholarship or teaching and high-quality performance in all areas. The nature, quality and quantity of published work since the last promotion should be at least comparable to that required for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

Scholarship:

Excellence: The quality and continuity of research and publication (rather than simply the quantity) must be considered in assessments of excellence. The hallmark of an excellent scholar at the full professor level is an international reputation in one's field in the context of the candidate's geographic research area. Special attention will be given to indicators of the candidate's scholarly reputation such as the external evaluation letters; scholarly awards; publication outlets; citation indices (appropriately interpreted in a subdisciplinary context); funding awards; unsolicited invitations to present lectures, contribute to and organize national and/or international conferences, symposia, or workshops; professional association leadership; multilingual publication; editorship; manuscript and grant reviews; and/or other indicators. Excellent translational, engaged, and/or applied research has a demonstrable, meaningful impact.

High Quality: In addition to meeting the benchmarks for publications required for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates should have demonstrated steady scholarly productivity. A high-quality publication record may also include invited articles, research review/analyses, book chapters, and products relating to translational, engaged, and applied research.

Teaching:

The primary consideration is evidence of teaching performance beyond that presented for promotion to Associate Professor. The instruments for the measurement of teaching performance for promotion to Full Professor are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.

Excellence: Excellent performance requires that a candidate demonstrate extraordinary performance, using the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. Excellent teachers have also formed strong bonds with students and alums so that these relationships persist after graduation (e.g., advocacy, job mentoring). They may lead and contribute to teaching workshops

to share current pedagogical practices and technology. Excellent teaching may also include demonstration of leadership and high visibility in the pedagogy of the relevant field.

High Quality: High quality performance directly parallels that for promotion to Associate Professor. Teaching success should be sustained, not isolated, and reflect a measure of versatility, i.e., contribute to multiple facets of the Department and/or University's teaching mission.

Service:

Excellence: To achieve excellent quality service, candidates for Professor shall have met several of the following commitments on a regular basis during the period of review, with distinguished service in at least one: 1) contribute to Departmental committees to which the candidate is either appointed or elected during the academic year; 2) member or chair of at least one significant College and/ or University committee during the period of review; 3) community service; 4) service to the profession; 5) service at the state, national, and international level; or 6) receive the College of Arts and Sciences Excellence in Service award (see also 2.C.1).

High Quality: To achieve high quality service, candidates for Professor shall have met some of the above commitments on a regular basis during the period of review.

D. Review of Associate Professor for Purpose of Granting Contract Tenure

An Associate Professor hired on a two-year contract must be reviewed by the spring of the first year of the contract. The procedures shall be the same as those used for promotion of resident Assistant Professors to the rank required. Outside referees may be brought in at the request of the Head of the PC, of the candidate, or when a majority vote of the PC requires it.

E. Promotion of Continuing Track (CT) Faculty

The promotion of continuing-track faculty to the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor without tenure will be based on the candidate's predominant role: teaching, service, or scholarship as determined by the nature of their appointment and their assigned workload. The minimum criterion for promotion for CT faculty is excellence in their predominant role.

The promotion process for CT faculty follows the same calendar and guidelines as for tenure-track (TT) faculty. Department standards of quality of scholarship are the same for CT faculty as for tenure-track or tenured faculty. Five external review letters are required for promotion to the rank of either associate or full professor for CT faculty whose primary workload assignment is scholarship. Five review letters are also required for CT faculty whose primary workload assignment is teaching or service. These letters, however, may be internal to the University of Delaware but external to the candidate's primary academic unit.

Excellence in teaching will be assessed on the basis of a detailed teaching portfolio, which may include such documentation as syllabi and other course materials; numerical and descriptive

student evaluations and testimonials from former students; peer evaluations; teaching grants and awards; new course development; course revisions; innovations or new teaching approaches and/or technologies; the range of courses taught; a statement explaining the candidate's instructional goals and methodologies and their impact on student learning; and any other material that attests to the quality of the candidate's teaching or to its recognition in and beyond the university. Additional evidence on teaching may be submitted as is appropriate, including supervision of undergraduate honors theses, independent study courses, and participation on M.A. or Ph.D. thesis committees.

Promotion to full professor on the basis of excellence in teaching requires a continued demonstration of excellence in teaching, which may include further improvement in all of the criteria described for promotion to associate level, and may include such activities as increased mentoring of students, supervision of student theses and research, earning teaching awards, contributing to curriculum development and teaching innovation, and other activities that demonstrate the candidate's continued contribution to teaching.

While candidates at all ranks are expected to serve in faculty governance, the internal affairs of the department, the college, and the university, a CT faculty member whose primary workload is comprised of service and who is seeking promotion to associate or full professor must receive a rating of "excellent" in service. Excellence in service for a candidate promoted to associate professor requires significant service contribution above and beyond department norms, which may include such activities as providing leadership in improving, updating, or revising department programs; management of department programs such as internships, advisement, or field placement; contributing to department-state collaborations; participation in policy-making task forces; conducting workshops and seminars for the university, the community and/or state organizations; involvement in community organizations that reflect his or her professional interests; involving students in community projects that reflect his or her professional interests.

Promotion to full professor on the basis of excellence in service may include such activities as demonstration of office-holding or leadership in professional state, regional, national, or international organizations including chairing or serving on committees or organizing conferences; consultancy to an organization or holding board memberships in organizations that reflect his or her professional interests; initiating and/or undertaking special assignments; holding journal editorial board membership; serving on granting agency review boards.

F. Promotion of Adjunct Faculty and Faculty with Joint Appointments

Members of the university community who have primary appointments in other parts of the university (administrative positions, appointments in other departments or other units) and adjunct appointments or joint appointments in Anthropology, may seek promotion through the Anthropology Department if that promotion cannot be accomplished through their primary appointment. The procedure is the same as that for regular members of this department, but with the following crucial differences:

1. The unit in which the candidate for promotion has his or her primary appointment (i.e., his or her budget line) would be under no obligation to give the candidate the raise in pay which normally accompanies a promotion. Likewise, tenure, which normally accompanies the promotion to Associate Professor, would not be granted to a candidate promoted in this way, nor would he or she automatically lose his or her position if the promotion were denied. It is crucial that the candidate understand these limitations from the beginning of his or her application, and thus it is desirable that he or she include acknowledgement of these conditions in the initial application for promotion.
2. Since a promotion of this sort involves two units of the University (or this Department and some organization outside the university), it is most desirable that the candidate discuss his or her possible promotion first with the person in charge of the unit housing the primary appointment. That person may wish to submit his or her own evaluation of the candidate's performance to the PC, which will include it among the confidential materials in the dossier.
3. If teaching is part of the candidate's responsibilities, evaluation of that teaching will follow the pattern of candidates with primary appointments in Anthropology.

SCHEDULE, MATERIALS, AND PROCEDURES

1 April: Candidate submits written request for promotion to Department Chair
Candidate's written request for promotion and/or tenure must be accompanied by:

- 1) a complete curriculum vitae and selected publications (to be sent to external reviewers)
- 2) a list of potential external reviewers
- 3) a list of service and teaching commentators

Names submitted by the candidate shall constitute only a part of the panels from which evaluations are sought.

7 April: Department Chair calls meeting for faculty to constitute the Promotion (and/ or Tenure) Committee (PC)

- 1) The PC will consist of all permanent full-time resident faculty, with a simple majority made up of members at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. On occasions when the latter cannot be met, the resident faculty in consultation with the Chair, shall meet to select replacement(s), (qualified extra-Departmental judges at the appropriate rank). Insofar as possible, intra-University panel members should be persons in closely allied fields able to judge professionally, fairly and comprehensively the candidate's scholarly and general academic qualifications. The candidate should retain the right to object to outside-of-department panel members, and the PC will make the final decision. University policy permitting, the Department may select panel members from outside the University. The PC shall consult regularly with the Anthropology faculty.
- 2) The PC chooses a Head and Secretary, and subcommittees for evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work, teaching and service.

3) The PC shall designate 5 external reviewers to evaluate the candidate's scholarly abilities. The referees must be closely familiar with the candidate's area of research and topical interests. In constituting this panel, at least two names must be taken from the candidate's list. The candidate shall be informed in advance of potential solicited evaluations and shall have the opportunity to comment on potential referees' qualifications. The final selection of external reviewers will be the responsibility of the PC.

15 April: PC contacts external reviewers

After consultation with the PC, the Head will contact the outside scholars. A subsequent letter to them, which will be included in the candidate's dossier, must ask for a substantive and broad evaluation of the candidate's published work and a clear assessment of the candidate's potential. Outside evaluators will be requested to complete and submit their evaluations by 15 August.

August 15: External review letters to Department Chair and PC Head

September 1: Candidate submits dossier online; dossier delivered to Department Chair and PC

September 7: Reports of PC Subcommittees due

September 15: PC meeting to complete its evaluation of the candidate

- 1) The members of the Scholarship, Teaching, and Service Subcommittees present their reports and answer questions on their content.
- 2) A general discussion and question period follows. Each member of the PC may make a succinct statement about the evidence for and/or against promotion.
- 3) Final deliberation and a confidential vote is taken. The Head shall give each PC member a ballot with one of three options to mark: approve, disapprove, abstain. The Head of the PC shall announce and record the ballots accordingly. A favorable vote of a simple majority of the members of the PC is required for nomination by the PC. A text of the PC's decision will be drafted at the same meeting by the Secretary. The statement will indicate the numerical vote and explain the reasons for the decision.

September 17: The Head of the PC shall give the candidate written notification of the PC's numerical vote and explain the reasons for the decision. The Subcommittee reports signed by the members, and summaries of the PC's perspectives on scholarship, teaching and service shall be made available to the candidate at this time.

September 19-23: Candidate has 5 working days to appeal PC decision regarding promotion and/or tenure, and request a new meeting of the PC, following University policy. At this meeting the candidate may express his/her points of view before further deliberations are held. The PC must give a definite response within two working days of receiving the appeal.

September 25: Promotion Committee delivers to candidate written response to any appeal

October 1: Promotion Committee delivers its final written evaluation online, including any possible decisions in relation to an appeal, and the complete dossier that now includes all additional pertinent data (external peer reviewers' letters, and other written evaluation materials), and the dossier and recommendations are delivered to the Department Chair.

October 7: Chair makes an independent evaluation and delivers written evaluation report and recommendation in writing to candidate and PC.

October 9-11: Candidate has 2 working days to appeal Department Chair's decision regarding promotion and/or tenure, following University policy.

October 11: Department Chair delivers to candidate written response to any appeal.

October 15: Department Chair submits final written report online, including any responses to an appeal, and the dossier is transferred to the Dean of Arts and Sciences Office.

- 1) If the PC and Chair agree in recommending promotion, or if either or both recommend against promotion, but the candidate chooses not to withdraw, the application goes forward to the College Committee and the Dean, together with the Committee's and the Chair's recommendations, and if any exist, the candidate's written appeals and departmental response.
- 2) Administrators or committees requesting further information about the candidate should contact the Chair and Head of the PC.
- 3) After the dossier has left the Department no additional materials will be added to it without permission of the candidate. Such materials must also be sent to the Department Chair and PC, who will make written acknowledgment and comments when appropriate.

3. PEER REVIEW and RENEWAL of CONTRACTS

The Anthropology Department procedures for Peer Review apply to: 1) 2- and 4-year reviews of tenure-track faculty for contract renewal; 2) all reviews of CT faculty for contract renewal; 3) all post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty; and 4) contract renewals for instructors.

Reviews are conducted by a committee of at least 2 faculty members above the rank of the member under review, except Professors who will be reviewed by a minimum of 3 Professors. If necessary to meet these minimum requirements, the department chair will ask peers in related departments to serve on the review committee.

The faculty member under review shall prepare the following materials, as is appropriate for her or his workload, for the committee:

- 1) Written statement on research, teaching, and service. Focus of these materials should be on the past 5 to 7 years or period between reviews, at the faculty member's discretion.
- 2) CV

- 3) Research: Sample of publications representing the range of expertise of the faculty member in terms of topics and themes. This selection should support the faculty member's research statement
- 4) Teaching: Materials should be presented at the faculty member's discretion. Examples include self-evaluations for each course, selections of student evaluations, among others
- 5) Service: List of activities carried out

The committee shall evaluate the evidence and the faculty member's abilities in each of the three major areas, as is appropriate for his or her workload, and prepare a report to be circulated to the faculty for comments and voting; the report will be approved by simple majority vote. The Department Chair shall conduct an independent evaluation. The reports will be submitted to the Dean. Upon completion of the review, the faculty member will be apprised of the results by the Department Chair. Faculty members are fully entitled to the rights of appeal.

4. PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER

The following is a suggested format to guide the candidate in constituting the dossier. Final decisions concerning the dossier are entirely the rights and responsibilities of the candidate. The contents of the dossier comprise:

- 1) a table of contents; 2) the Department of Anthropology's Statement of Policy on Promotion, Tenure and Contract Renewal; 3) the Curriculum Vitae and annexes to it.

The Contents of the Curriculum Vitae and Annexes

1. Standard biographical information (advanced degrees, Ph.D. dissertation title employment record, etc.)
2. Areas of specialization.
3. Research activities:
 - a. A statement reviewing scholarly activity and research subsequent to attainment of current rank; and a statement covering immediate and long-range research plans.
 - b. Fieldwork - funded, non-funded, duration, place, topic.
 - c. Special awards, honors, etc.
 - d. Community engagement
 - e. Writings –
 - (1) Publications: identifying peer-reviewed and differentiating between books, articles, and reviews.
 - (2) Works accepted and in press.
 - (3) Works accepted but not in press.
 - (4) Works submitted but not yet accepted for publication.
 - (5) Manuscripts.
 - (6) Translational, engaged, and applied anthropology materials.
 - (7) Papers presented at scholarly meetings.
 - (8) Statement including references to reviews of published work or references to use by others of published work.

- (9) An annex with materials arranged in chronological order and by category.
4. Teaching
 - a. A statement of teaching philosophy and activity including immediate and long-range plans.
 - b. Special awards, honors, etc.
 - c. A list of courses taught, by year.
 - d. Portfolio of sample course materials, which may include syllabi, reading lists, exam questions, assignments, and other course materials. These will be synthesized by the Teaching and Service Subcommittee for the course portfolio evaluation.
 - e. Sample of Department supervised student evaluations.
 - f. Other evaluative materials.
 5. Service
 - a. A statement of service philosophy and activity including future plans.
 - b. Department Committees and Assignments.
 - c. College Committees and Assignments.
 - d. University Committees and Assignments.
 - e. Public Performance or Lectures.
 - f. Service to Professional Organizations.
 - g. Service to Government.
 - h. Service to Educational Institutions.
 - i. Service to local, state, national, and international Communities and Non-Governmental Agencies.

5. REVIEW of the PRESENT DOCUMENT

This document and its provisions may be reviewed at any regular departmental meeting, but not more than once a year. Any proposed changes require approval by the Provost and by the University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure. The revised document shall be filed with the Faculty Senate.