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I. **Chair Term and Selection Policy**

Adopted: September 21, 2009

Revised and Approved March 26, 2012

The term of office will be four years, with the possibility of a one-term renewal at the end of that appointment. In the spring semester of the chair’s third year of service the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences will communicate the options available for departmental leadership. These options include:

1) Renewal of the current chair, if that chair has only served one term,
2) Internal Search
3) External search

All full-time members of the department except the serving department chair, will meet to review the available options and decide on a recommendation to the Dean. If the faculty supports the renewal of the current chair, the Dean will determine the willingness of the current chair to serve and will communicate this to the faculty.

The Anthropology department will make an effort to select candidates from among the current members of the faculty (renewal or internal search option). If the search committee cannot identify suitable candidates from within the faculty, an external search may be selected.

If an internal search is chosen, the Dean will invite all tenured associate and full professors in the department to apply for the Chair’s position. The current chair may apply even if he or she is not renewed under option 1, if he or she is serving a first term. Applications must include (1) a statement of administrative philosophy, (2) a statement of vision for
the department’s future, and (3) a curriculum vita. External references are not required for chair applications. The Dean will appoint a senior faculty member to act as the coordinator of the internal search. The internal search committee will consist of all full-time members of the department, except the chair. Members of the committee will choose the preferred candidate from the applicants, and communicate their recommendation to the Dean. The current chair will have a separate, informal interview with the candidate(s) and send a separate written assessment of the candidate(s) to the Dean.

If an external search is chosen, the search shall take place according to the CAS policy. The search committee shall comprise all full-time members of the department except the chair, and one member-at-large from another department but a comparable discipline. The committee shall determine the preferred candidate following the interview process, and communicate their decision, in writing, to the Dean.

II. Classroom Visitation Report/Policy

Revised: April 21, 2008
Passed: March 17, 2010

Instructor: __________________ Observer:______________

Class Number, Title, Section: ______________________________

Date of observation: ___________ Time class begins:__________
Time observation began:_________

Length of Observation: ___________

Comment on the substance and effectiveness of the faculty member’s presentation:

Substance might include: Does the instructor seem to have a good command of the material? Does he/she distinguish between factual material and opinion? Does he/she present divergent viewpoints when appropriate and explain to the class how and why such viewpoints are different? Does the
instructor include a sufficient amount of relevant material in a class period? Is the breadth of material appropriate to the level of the course?

Effectiveness might include: Does the instructor’s method of teaching seem appropriate for the material? Did the instructor answer questions appropriately? If discussions occurred, were they handled appropriately by the instructor? Did the instructor speak in a manner that could be easily heard? Is the instructor’s oral delivery too rapid, too slow? Is the language used by the instructor understandable to the students? Does the instructor’s presentation show clear signs of planning and organization? Does the instructor use alternate explanations when students do not understand? Does the instructor use handouts and audiovisual aids effectively?

Summary comments: Please provide an overall assessment. Comment briefly on particular strengths as well as areas that could be improved, if any.

______________________________________________________  __________________________
(Name of observer)                                          (Date)

______________________________________________________
(Title of observer)

III.  **Course Banking Policy**

Reviewed: April 28, 2009  
Revision Discussed: February 1, 2012  
Approved: March 26, 2012  
Reviewed October 19, 2016

A. Rationale

For several years now the College of Arts and Sciences has operated under Guidelines for Faculty Workload (accessible at http://www.uncw.edu/cas/documents/CASPolicyandProcedureManual.pdf) that provide for the assignment of additional Credit-hour Equivalents (CHEs) for "courses not taught in the standard lecture format or for courses in which content and/or pedagogy requires a different load measurement
than their published credit hours." Typically, departments may grant "credit" to faculty members for such work as supervision of internships, master's and honors theses and "classes that require more preparation than regular classes". As resources permit, the department may receive approval from the Dean to count credit hour equivalencies toward a teaching load. In Anthropology, if these courses are not counted towards the teaching load, these credits are accumulated, or "banked" until they amount to at least 3 CHEs. At this point the Dean may permit a reassignment of no greater than one 3-credit hour course per semester.

Given the fact that Anthropology faculty undertake many of the kinds of teaching outlined in the CAS policy, and that it may become increasingly desirable that the faculty undertake these kinds of assignments in the future, the time has come for the Anthropology Department to articulate its own Banking Policy, within the parameters of the CAS policy.

Credit Hour Equivalent Formula:

1. Supervision of Internship ANT 498 = 1 CHE per 3 hour internship

2. Supervision of Master’s Thesis = 1 CHE per student

3. Supervision of DIS ANT 491 = .2 CHE per student credit hour

4. Supervision of Honors Thesis ANT 499 = .2 CHE per student credit hour

5. Laboratory instruction = 1 CHE each contact hour per week

6. Courses that exceed the enrollment caps = 1 CHE per one third over-enrollment

7. Classes that require more preparation than regular classes of course level, content, and/or required pedagogy = 1 CHE
The Chair, or someone specifically delegated by the chair, is responsible for maintaining the department CHE bank, which will be distributed to each faculty member at the end of each academic year.

The faculty member is responsible for asking the Chair for a course release; the Chair is responsible for scheduling CHE buyouts and determining whether the pedagogical needs of the department will permit a buyout.

The department will reevaluate this Banking Policy within five years of its adoption.

---

**IV. Policy on Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty**

(online and face to face)

Passed March 17, 2010

I. Procedures

1. Each semester, the chair will contact the part time faculty to alert them of the upcoming evaluation of their course(s).
   a. **Online classes**: The chair will ask permission to enter the course as an auditor in Blackboard for the purposes of observing the course.
   b. **Face-to-face classes**: The chair will ask the part time faculty to submit several dates for the observation.

2. The chair will select one of the regular faculty members to conduct the observation of classes based on their expertise in the subject matter and/or their familiarity with the online format.
II. Face-to-Face Classes

The Classroom Visitation Report (adopted/revised 4-21-2008) (see below) will be used for the face-to-face classroom observation. The report will be signed by the observer; a copy will be given to the part time faculty member and another copy will be given to the chair of the department. The chair of the department will discuss the observation with the part time faculty. If recommendations for changes were suggested, the part time faculty will submit a plan for implementing those changes. Evidence of the change may include updates to the syllabus and/or the next classroom visitation report, which will note if any suggested changes were made.

Classroom Visitation Report/Policy

Revised: April 21, 2008
Passed: March 17, 2010

Instructor: __________________ Observer:_______________

Class Number, Title, Section: ____________________________

Date of observation: _____________ Time class begins:_________________ Time observation began:_________

Length of Observation: _______________

Comment on the substance and effectiveness of the faculty member’s presentation:

Substance might include: Does the instructor seem to have a good command of the material? Does he/she distinguish between factual material and opinion? Does he/she present divergent viewpoints when appropriate and explain to the class how and why such viewpoints are different? Does the instructor include a sufficient amount of relevant material in a class period? Is the breadth of material appropriate to the level of the course?

Effectiveness might include: Does the instructor’s method of teaching seem appropriate for the material? Did the instructor answer questions
appropriately? If discussions occurred, were they handled appropriately by the instructor? Did the instructor speak in a manner that could be easily heard? Is the instructor’s oral delivery too rapid, too slow? Is the language used by the instructor understandable to the students? Does the instructor’s presentation show clear signs of planning and organization? Does the instructor use alternate explanations when students do not understand? Does the instructor use handouts and audiovisual aids effectively?

Summary comments: Please provide an overall assessment. Comment briefly on particular strengths as well as areas that could be improved, if any.

_________________________________________  _______________________________________
(Name of observer)                                             (Date)

_________________________________________
(Title of observer)

III. Online classes

**Online Class Peer Evaluation**

**To be proposed and discussed March 17, 2010; passed March 17, 2010**

1 = Needs improvement  2 = Meets Expectations  3 = Exceeds expectations

1. The course homepage is laid out in a clear and logical manner. 1
   2 3

2. Pre-course materials preview course expectations. 1 2
   3

3. Course navigation tools are functionally consistent. 1 2
   3

4. Units, subunits, headings, and subheadings are logically linked. 1
   2 3

5. Course description, goals, objectives, content, and assignments are consistent. 1 2
   3
6. Content is current and up-to-date.  
   1  2

7. Web links are relevant to course content.  
   1  2

8. Course content is comparable in rigor to face-to-face classes.  
   1  2

9. Discussion forms are separated and categorized by common themes.  
   1  2

10. Instructor interacts with students in timely fashion online, by email, by phone, by video conference.  
    1  2

11. Written assignments include clear instructions.  
    1  2

12. Grading is clear and fair.  
    1  2

13. There is a clear relationship between learning outcomes, evaluation strategies and course assignments.  
    1  2

14. Honor code expectations are clear and links available for students.  
    1  2  3

After the online classroom observation is completed, the faculty member will sign and date the bottom of the form and send it to the part time faculty member. The chair will also receive a copy. The chair will discuss any aspects of the evaluation that may require some changes in the online course. If so, these changes will be targeted for evaluation the next time the course is offered.
V. Policy on External Review

First discussed at Anthropology Department Meeting: December 7, 2006
Text drafted and submitted to Department for review at Anthropology Department Meeting: January 25, 2007
Reviewed: April 27, 2009
Revised: March 15, 2017

1. External Review is not required for reappointment or retention and promotion.

2. The senior faculty (by majority vote), chair, and/or the junior faculty have the option to request an external review. If requested, the following guidelines and procedures will be followed.

3. Guidelines and Procedures for Optional External Review:

   • The candidate will provide the chair the names of four potential reviewers, as well as a list of reviewers who should not be chosen, if any.
   • The Senior Faculty, working with the Chair, will develop a list of four more potential reviewers.
   • The Senior Faculty, by vote, will select four reviewers, two from each list, and send them the candidate’s vita, publications, and RPT criteria.
   • The identity of reviewers will remain anonymous and only the content of the review will be revealed to the candidate.
   • The identity of reviewers will be made known to the senior faculty via a cover letter submitted by each reviewer that will include their identity, institutional affiliation and any personal or professional connection to the candidate.
   • The senior faculty will not reveal the identity of the reviewers.
   • The Chair and senior faculty will take the comments of the external review under consideration in their deliberations on reappointment, retention, and promotion as appropriate.
VI. Faculty Workload Policy

Reviewed: April 28, 2009
Reviewed: February 8, 2017
Revised: March 15, 2017

Faculty workload within the Department of Anthropology consists of the following professional activities: teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Under almost all circumstances, full-time department members are expected to carry 100% annual workloads in which all of these components are reflected.

Teaching

The Department of Anthropology regards teaching as its primary mission. Therefore, it is expected that between 60-80% of the faculty workload during a typical academic year will be committed to teaching activities. A typical three-credit course involves preparation, teaching, grading, and advising and represents 10% of a department member's annual workload. At UNC Wilmington, the standard teaching load per semester is four three-credit courses (eight courses per academic year). Recognition (including peer review) will be given for other teaching responsibilities such as Directed Individual Studies, Honors Projects, and supervision of internships and graduate theses. Faculty not classified as research-active [see below] and who have no course releases approved by the Dean’s office, will teach the standard load each semester (Fall and Spring).

Research and Scholarship

Research and scholarly accomplishments of faculty members are essential components of quality teaching and advance knowledge in the discipline of Anthropology. In addition, such accomplishments enrich society and bring recognition to the department, college, university, profession, and the public. It is expected that faculty preparing for a personnel action (reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review) will engage in research and scholarship activities during a typical academic year (such activities are defined as projects leading to professional presentations and
peer-reviewed publications or exhibitions within the discipline of Anthropology. Scholarship maintains and enhances a faculty member's professional competence and is considered a component of research. Research-active faculty, as determined by departmental policy and the chair, will teach three, three-credit/contact hour courses every semester they continue to be engaged in such projects.

Service

Service responsibilities of department members are defined as formal and informal professional activities on behalf of the department, college, university, profession, and for the public. It is expected that faculty members will initiate service activities and accept such assignments as appropriate at the request of the chair, the dean, the faculty senate, the provost, and/or the chancellor.

Policy on Deviations from the Standard Full Workload
Reviewed: April 28, 2009

Definitions:
- Standard full workload is the sum of a faculty member’s total teaching, research, and service activities. It is the equivalent of four-three credit hour courses per semester, in addition to other faculty professional obligations.
- Teaching Faculty teach the equivalent of four courses and will have a lower research and service expectation.
- Research Active Faculty teach the equivalent of three courses and have research and service expectations accordingly.

Teaching Less Than Standard Full Workload

A Reduced Teaching Load is one course below the full load, including equivalents. A reduced teaching load must be approved by the Department Chair. To qualify, activity is required above and beyond normal expectations in one or more criteria.

Criteria for Reduced Teaching Load:
Instructional Research/Service

a. course/curricular concerns
b. heavy academic advising
c. accreditation program
d. technology training leave
e. co-curricular activities
f. academic administration
g. compensation for prior overload
h. externally funded research
i. institutionally supported research
j. institutional service
k. service to the public
l. service to the profession
m. off campus scholarly assignment/on leave
n. other research/service

VII. Graduate Faculty Status Policy

Adopted: September 21, 2009
Reviewed: March 15, 2017

Two or more peer reviewed manuscripts or one book accepted for publication within the past five years.

Research presentation at one or more regional, national or international meetings within the past five years.

Should both criteria not be met, a review of the applicant may be conducted by a committee consisting of the department chair and all members of anthropology’s graduate faculty. Any special circumstances will be
considered in the formulation of a recommendation. The committee may, for instance, agree to waive a research presentation at a meeting if a candidate publishes more than two research papers in the five-year period.

VIII. Faculty Development: Mentoring Policy and Procedures

First discussed at Anthropology Department Meeting: December 7, 2006
Text drafted and submitted to Department for review at Anthropology Department Meeting: January 25, 2007
Reviewed: April 27, 2009
Revised: January 18, 2012

The hiring of each faculty member is an investment in the university’s future. The university hires promising faculty in the hope and expectation that they will successfully complete a probationary period, achieve tenure, and provide the university with years of estimable service.

The department of anthropology provides continuous mentoring to each new faculty hire by appointing one senior faculty mentor who will meet informally to provide information and advise on

- Balancing teaching, research, and service
- Deadlines for add/drop and withdrawals of student
- Classroom behavior and student expectations for attendance/absences
- Preparation of the annual report
- Office hours
- Any other matters relating to fulfilling university and departmental obligations
- Recreation
The senior faculty mentor will be involved in annual assessment of the teaching, research, and service of the junior faculty. This may include one classroom visitation per semester and written evaluation of teaching and an informal assessment summarizing progress on research and publication that will be discussed with the junior faculty and signed by the mentor, the junior faculty, and the chair. A formal assessment of teaching, research, and service will be submitted by the mentor to the chair prior to reappointment and promotion and tenure.

The Chair will also request an annual productivity report from the junior faculty member and write a statement of evaluation that will be signed by the junior faculty and sent to the Dean at the end of each spring semester.

Prior to reappointment and promotion and tenure, a formal assessment of the junior faculty will be made by the Chair and senior faculty.

IX. **Peer Evaluation Policy**

Reviewed: September 21, 2009

Annual Productivity Report (APR)

During the spring semester each faculty member is required to complete the department Annual Productivity Report. Faculty will evaluate one another with respect to teaching, research, and service. The evaluation will be made on forms provided by the chair and based on the information listed on the Annual Productivity Report. The chair will use results from the APR as input in annual merit recommendations and annual evaluations. The chair also prepares an annual written evaluation of each faculty member. The evaluation addresses each of the three areas – teaching, research, and service.
X. **Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Policy**

First discussed at Anthropology Department Meeting: December 7, 2006
Text drafted and submitted to Department for review at Anthropology Department Meeting: January 25, 2007
Reviewed: April 27, 2009,
Revised: October 19, 2016

The senior faculty, defined as tenured associate and full professors, shall meet to have a full and frank discussion of the candidate’s application for retention, promotion, and tenure. The senior faculty shall consult with and advise the chair of the department about their recommendation. The chair will report the members present, absent, and their vote (numerical) in her/his formal written statement known as the Chair’s Evaluation for the university retention, promotion, and tenure committee that recommends for or against RTP action. At least five business days prior to forwarding the candidate’s dossier to the dean, the chairperson must notify the senior faculty, by either written or electronic means, whether the Chair’s Evaluation recommends for or against the action. If a majority of the department’s senior faculty disagrees with the recommendation of the chairperson or believes the Chair’s Evaluation does not represent their sentiment on the action, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated statement and recommendation. Only one such statement and recommendation from senior faculty may be submitted, and it must be signed by a majority of the department’s senior faculty. The Chair’s Evaluation and a separate senior-faculty statement and recommendation, if any, are forwarded as part of the faculty member’s RTP dossier.

Note: If there are fewer than 3 senior faculty members in a department, the department chairperson, in consultation with the candidate and the dean, identifies additional tenured senior faculty in a related discipline from the colleges or school to serve as a voting member for RTP decisions. If there are no tenured senior faculty in a college or school in a related discipline, a committee may be selected from outside the school or college within UNCW as outlined within the Faculty Handbook.
The complete procedure for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure process shall be in accordance with the detailed description given in the UNCW Faculty Handbook, Chapter IV, Section A.

XI. **Research Active Status Policy**

Adopted: March 4, 2009
Reviewed: April 28, 2009

Proposal to adopt CAS definition for use in department of anthropology

Criteria for Research-Active Status in the College of Arts and Sciences  
(Adopted 03.04.09)

1. Newly hired assistant and associate professors on the tenure track will be given research-active status with the understanding that these faculty members are making steady progress in building a record of research and scholarship consistent with their departments’ expectations for permanent tenure at the rank of associate professor.

2. Full-time lecturers have no expectations of research and scholarship; therefore, they are not eligible for research-active status.

3. For tenured associate and full professors, the minimum criteria for research-active status are as follows
   a. Every five years, a faculty member is expected to publish two articles in a discipline-appropriate peer-reviewed journal; or one peer-reviewed article and the development of one peer-reviewed funded grant whose results are widely disseminated; or a monograph.
   b. Every five years, for a faculty member whose discipline requires creative/artistic achievement, the expectation is a minimum of two performances, exhibitions, recordings, or other forms of artistic accomplishment subject to regional, national, or international peer evaluation as recognized by the academic discipline.
   c. The dean is the final arbiter regarding any research contribution for which there is a question of compliance with these criteria.
4. By the start date of each new calendar year, a faculty member with research-active status is expected to have met the minimum criteria within the preceding five years. Exception: Department chairs, associate deans, and deans returning to regular faculty roles will do so with research-active status, and will be expected to meet the minimum criteria within five years.

5. Departments can adopt criteria for research-active status that exceed the college’s minimum criteria.

---

XII. **Senior Faculty Classification**

Reviewed: September 21, 2009  
Revised: October 19, 2016

The definition of the senior faculty in the department of anthropology includes tenured associate and full professors.

---

XIII. **Student Evaluation of Faculty Policy**

Revised January 22, 2015  
Approved: January 28, 2015

All faculty must participate in the student survey of teaching in all courses taught each semester, and must encourage student participation in the survey to the best of their ability and professional judgement. The exceptions: DIS, Senior Projects, Internships/Practica (except classroom sections), and Honors projects. Links and/or electronic forms will be sent to the faculty each semester, and will be sent to the students at the end of each semester by
whoever is responsible for this survey as determined by the Faculty Senate and the Division of Academic Affairs.

For further information on the student evaluation instrument chosen by the Faculty Senate, refer to the UNCW Faculty Handbook. Faculty must also administer the department's Subjective Evaluation Form at the end of the semester. Results of both the departmental and university-selected instruments are made available to faculty the following semester. When significant results are obtained from these surveys, including the departmental Subjective Evaluation survey, the chair uses the results as input in making merit recommendations and annual evaluations.

In cases when the student participation in the university-selected evaluation of teaching is low, the chair shall follow these guidelines in determining the significance of the results, as long as these guidelines do not conflict with any policy adopted by the Faculty Senate:

1) Participation below 35% of students in a class in the university-selected evaluation: the evaluation shall not be viewed as significant in the annual evaluation, or any other departmental evaluation. Since student participation is voluntary, participation below 35% shall not reflect negatively on the faculty member.

2) Participation between 35-60% of students in a class in the university-selected evaluation: the evaluation shall be mentioned and described in annual evaluations or other forms of evaluation, but should be used judiciously in the context of other feedback from the departmental subjective instrument and faculty classroom observation.

3) Participation above 60% of students in a class in the university-selected evaluation shall be viewed as significant by the department, and shall be utilized in annual evaluations and other departmental evaluations.

XIV. Faculty Development: Travel Allocation Policy

Reviewed: August 20, 2008
Revised: January 18, 2012
1. A full time faculty member is eligible for $800 to cover travel to meetings for the presentation of papers and participation in sessions.

2. A faculty member on phased retirement is eligible for $400 to cover travel to meetings for the presentation of papers and participation in sessions.

XV. **Departmental Overhead (Indirect Costs) Policy**  
Discussed August 25, 2010  
Passed October 20, 2010

Various funding agencies provide for the payment of overhead (also called indirect or F & A costs) to cover some of the expenses associated with conducting research that are not considered direct costs to individual projects. When a portion of these indirect cost funds are returned to the department, the department chair will allocate these funds according to the following schedule:

a. 25% will be reserved to support and maintain departmental facilities and equipment,

b. 25% will be reserved to support student learning and research, and

c. 50% will be reserved for use by the faculty members who served as the Principal Investigators on the projects that generated the funds.

Student support funds would normally be distributed proportionately back to the PI’s generating the indirect funds. The department’s administrative assistant will track these funds and provide the chair with regular reports on the distribution of these funds.

XVI. **Post-Tenure Review Policy**  
Approved March 26, 2012  
Revision discussed October 21, 2015  
Revision Approved November 16, 2015
The complete procedure for the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process shall be in accordance with the detailed description given in the UNCW Faculty Handbook, Chapter VII, section 5. The faculty member being evaluated shall produce a Post-Tenure Review Report, whose format shall be based on the Annual Productivity Report. The Report shall contain data from the period since the prior review event or for the preceding five years, whichever period is less. It must contain courses taught, theses directed, and all evaluations of teaching; publications, performances, and presentations; service activities; copies of all annual evaluations for the years under review; the goals established by the faculty member as part of their five-year plan; and a brief statement of progress toward achieving these goals.

The senior faculty of the department shall form a peer review committee to evaluate the Report on teaching, research, and service. If there are fewer than three members of the committee, then the Department Chair shall serve as an ex-officio member of the committee. The Peer Review Committee shall present its evaluation in writing as advice to the chair. The chair will then write an evaluation based on teaching, research and service of the faculty member. This evaluation shall state whether the faculty member’s overall professional performance exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations, and the major reasons for the determination.

The chair shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss it. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response. The faculty member and chair shall sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the faculty member. Within ten days, the chair shall forward the faculty member’s PTR Report, a list of the members of the peer review committee, a copy of the written evaluation, and the faculty member's response, if any, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for the remainder of the PTR process.