

each application for tenure and promotion be complete. A complete application contains all of the elements in the College of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion application, including letters from external evaluators, up-to-date CV, narrative components, annual evaluations, course evaluations, and mid-tenure evaluations.¹ It is the candidate's responsibility to assemble additional materials necessary to document satisfaction of Department criteria for tenure and promotion. In doing so, the candidate is encouraged to seek the advice of senior colleagues, who in turn should counsel the candidate to the best of their ability.

0the candidatET36qB00000912 0 612 792 reW*nBT/F6 12 Tf1 0 0 1 117.02 248.57 Tm0 g010 G{0th

2. Department endorsement. Application for tenure and promotion must be considered at three levels within the Department: by the Executive Committee, which writes a narrative evaluation; by the eligible voting members of the Department faculty (i.e., the Tenure and Promotion Committee), who vote to approve, deny, or abstain; and by the Department Chair.
 - a. First, the members of the Executive Committee who have attained the rank of associate or full professor review and evaluate the application. They then write a narrative summarizing their evaluation of the file, which is placed into the candidate's file. If necessary, there can be a second, minority narrative.
 - b. Second, faculty members who are eligible to vote for tenure and promotion (i.e., those who hold the rank of associate or full professor and who also have an appointment of at least 51% in the Department) meet to discuss the applicant's file and the Executive Committee's evaluation. Only those faculty who listen and/or participate in this faculty discussion are eligible to vote (i.e., to approve, deny, or abstain). The vote is recorded in the candidate's file. The Department Chair does not vote.
 - c. Third, the Department Chair conducts an independent evaluation, writes a narrative summarizing this evaluation, and records it in the candidate's file.
- 3.

Other things being equal, the standings of journals and academic presses in which candidates published are considered significant indicators of quality. Assessment of research quality in sociology is a rigorous process, although primarily a qualitative one. The assessment of quality may also take into account the professional recognition of a candidate's work in the form of prizes, awards, fellowships, and grants. Having obtained external funding for one's research is not necessary for tenure and promotion. But, having received such funding from external agencies with rigorous peer- review of proposals counts as an indicator of research quality.

2. Quantitative Productivity

The quantity of articles produced will vary according to the length and depth of the articles; patterns of co-authorship, lead authorship, and solo authorship; quality of the journals or edited collections; impact of the research; and whether or not the candidate has also produced one or more high quality monographs. For example, the number of articles/chapters expected of a candidate decreases substantially if they have also published a well-reviewed, refereed, scholarly monograph during the tenure earning years. For collaborative work, the candidate's contribution should be accounted for. Overall, the body of work should represent a coherent and well-rounded program of independent research, 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. It should be recognized that quantitative measures of quality, such as acceptance ratios, citation counts, and publication counts are imperfect in the social sciences. Faculty in a candidate's area of scholarship as represented in readers' reports, external reviewer letters, and tenure and promotion committees are in the best position to judge quality and to invoke established markers that facilitate evaluation of quality. With the understanding that quality takes precedence over quantity, it would not be unusual for the successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor to present approximately 8-10 publications.

a. Peer-Reviewed Articles

A peer-reviewed article is an article in a peer-reviewed journal in sociology (or cognate scholarly field, where appropriate), or a chapter in a peer-reviewed anthology.

b. Scholarly Books and Monographs

A scholarly book or monograph is typically considered equivalent to four to six peer reviewed articles. Scholarly books or monographs are to be placed in reputable presses, i.e., ones that enforce rigorous peer-review practices in their acceptance of manuscripts.

c. Edited Books

An edited book should be considered equivalent to between two and four peer reviewed articles, depending on the extent of the candidate

receiving peer and student evaluation(s) that consistently rate the candidate's teaching as effective

engaging in instructional innovation through such activities as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, and/or interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies

mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in various ways, such as the supervision of honors theses and independent studies, graduate theses, portfolios, and/or dissertations

publishing collaborative work with students and having students who present papers at professional conferences, who receive academic awards, and so on

supervising student internships, advisement, or counseling

participating in curriculum development, for example, establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, and so forth.

Excellence in teaching is a judgment made by peers from a review of all materials provided by the candidate as evidence of his/her engagement with and effectiveness of his/her teaching contributions.

Candidates shall place in their files any materials they think provide evidence of their teaching contributions and its effectiveness. The committee views as especially compelling, evidence based on peer review and student judgments from the following types of items: peer evaluations, peer visitations to classes, observations at talks and seminars, inspections of files and class materials, student evaluations – particularly written comments that indicate the candidate's courses are rigorous but effective and provide a desirable depth of learning.

While it is not necessary that a candidacy be supported by all the items listed, as a Ph.D. granting department in a research university, substantial involvement in graduate

1. Department: Participation in department governance in the form of service on departmental committees and performance of related duties.
2. College: Participation in the governance of the School of Social Sciences and College of Arts and Sciences in the form of service on committees, attendance at

Where opportunities to work with graduate students exist, t