

These Anthropology bylaws are consistent with the UTK Faculty Handbook (<https://provost.utk.edu/faculty-handbook/>) as well as the bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences (<https://artsci.utk.edu/about-us-2/college-bylaws/>).

In addition to describing the mission, administration and hiring policies of the department, these bylaws specify principles of shared governance (Section II), Voting Faculty (Section III), composition of search committees for hiring tenure-track faculty (Sections IV) and criteria for assessing faculty performance for annual reviews, tenure and promotion (Section VIII).

These bylaws are available to faculty via the Faculty Senate Bylaws Directory posted at: <http://senate.utk.edu/bylaws/> .

### **I. Mission statement**

The mission of the Department of Anthropology is to achieve excellence in undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and scholarship, institutional service, and community or public outreach. The Department's mission is pursued by developing, maintaining, and promoting balance and interdependence across the subdisciplines of archaeology, biological anthropology, and cultural anthropology. The Department is therefore committed to successfully design, implement, and monitor undergraduate and graduate curricula that reflect the many different interests of anthropologists, but which emphasize that the greatest strength of the discipline is its core concepts uniting anthropological inquiry. The Department's commitment to academia, the public, and its students is firmly grounded in quality and ethically-responsible research and scholarship. The Department encourages to the greatest possible extent innovative and collaborative research and teaching that focus the activities of faculty from different subdisciplines on common goals. The Department further recognizes its responsibility to promote greater understanding of human diversity in the university and public communities. In keeping with these goals, the Department is committed to intellectual freedom, equal opportunity, and affirmative action for its faculty, staff, and students.

### **II. Departmental Administration**

A. Department Head - The department's chief administrative officer is the Department Head, who is responsible for overseeing the operation, management, and academic status of the department in accordance with the duties and responsibilities specified in the Bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences and in the current Faculty Handbook.

B. The Associate Department Head is elected by a simple majority vote of the faculty (ordinarily following nomination by the Department Head), approved by the Dean of the College, and given such duties as may be assigned or delegated by the Head. In the absence of the Head, the Associate Head acts on the Head's behalf and makes such decisions as are necessary and appropriate. The Associate Head serves for two years and can be re-elected.

C. The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) is elected by a simple majority vote of the faculty (ordinarily following nomination by the Department Head), and given such duties relating to graduate education as may be assigned or delegated by the Head, but which generally include

coordination of all aspects of graduate admissions, bi-annual open houses for prospective graduate students, graduate assistantships and awards, curricular changes and administration. The DGS acts as chair of the Graduate Committee, and is a voting member of the Curriculum Committee. The DGS serves a three-year term, and can be re-elected.

D. The Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) is appointed by the Department Head, and given such duties relating to undergraduate education as may be assigned or delegated by the Head, but which include matters pertaining to the Undergraduate Committee (section II.G.3). The DUS acts as chair of the Undergraduate Committee and is a voting member of the Curriculum Committee.

E. The Forensic Anthropology Center is a separate unit within the Department of Anthropology and is administered by a Director. The Director of the Forensic Center and staff oversee appointments to five assistantships and manage the Center's operating budget.

F. The Archaeology and Environmental Research Laboratory is a separate unit within the Department of Anthropology and is administered by a Director appointed by the Department Head. The Director of the AERL and staff manage the Laboratory's projects and operating budget.

G. Responsibilities of standing committees of the Department of Anthropology are defined below. These include a Performance Assessment Committee, Graduate Committee, Undergraduate Committee, and Curriculum Committee.

1. The Performance Assessment Committee shall be composed of one archaeologist, one biological anthropologist, and one cultural anthropologist who are full-time tenured teaching faculty. When necessary to review exceptional cases or grievances, the Performance Assessment Committee (PAC) shall meet with the Department Head and Associate Head to review the specified case and recommend appropriate action to the Head. PAC members will serve staggered terms of one year (chairperson), two years, and three years. Thereafter the normal term for all members will be three years with each member chairing the committee during the third year.
2. The Graduate Committee shall be composed of one archaeologist, one biological anthropologist, and one cultural anthropologist. Each member shall serve a term of three years. After consultation with the faculty, the Department Head shall appoint replacements for committee members whose terms are expiring. The chairperson shall be the DGS. The Graduate Committee shall screen and vote on all applications for admission to the graduate program and administer procedures for monitoring and assessing students' progress toward meeting the degree requirements outlined in the Graduate School Catalog. The committee members also serve as advisors for the incoming MA students until these students establish a committee chair. The Graduate Committee administers the annual evaluation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) evaluation of the MA and Ph.D. programs, collecting data and conducting other performance measures as recommended by the Curriculum Committee. The Graduate Committee also administers departmental graduate student awards.

3. The Undergraduate Committee shall be composed of one archaeologist, one biological anthropologist, and one cultural anthropologist. The initial committee members will serve staggered terms of one year, two years, and three years. After consultation with the faculty, the Head shall appoint the members. The chairperson shall be the DUS. The Undergraduate Committee shall advise the faculty on curriculum, advising, and other matters affecting undergraduates, administer screening of Arts and Sciences students applying to major in Anthropology, and monitor and assess students' progress toward graduation. The undergraduate committee will also administer departmental awards for undergraduates and identify top graduating seniors for the Senior Recognition Brochure. The committee will also administer the annual evaluation by SACS of anthropology majors, collecting data and conducting other performance measures as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.
4. The Curriculum Committee shall be composed of one archaeologist, one biological anthropologist, and one cultural anthropologist and will include Associate Head, the DGS and the DUS. The initial committee members will serve staggered terms of one year, two years, and three years. The chairperson of the committee will be the individual serving their third year on the committee. Members of the committee shall be elected by the tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The Curriculum Committee shall be in charge of coordinating all curriculum changes and department-wide evaluation of the curriculum to comply with SACS. All curriculum changes proposed by faculty will be submitted to the Curriculum Committee to ensure the forms for the curricular change are properly completed, and that the proposed change fits within the existing curriculum. The committee will provide guidance to the faculty on these curricular changes. The committee is charged with keeping the departmental curriculum in compliance with and current with college and university curricula. Members of the committee shall also provide guidance and oversight to the annual evaluation of the department curriculum to comply with SACS. This includes determining the criteria by which the curriculum is assessed, the metrics used, and guiding the Graduate Committee and Undergraduate Committee in the administration of these measures. Actions of the committee will be guided with input of the faculty and the Head.

H. The Head may also form ad hoc committees and charge them with carrying out specific tasks. The Head appoints ad hoc committee members and designates a chairperson. These committees are dissolved upon completion of the assigned task.

I. A new standing committee may be created by a simple majority vote of the faculty, and the composition or powers of a standing committee may be altered by a majority vote of the faculty. All actions to create, abolish, change composition or powers of standing committees shall require prior notification in writing to the faculty.

J. Individuals appointed by the Head in special liaison roles include: a human subjects liaison, a library representative, and as needed, proxies for the Head to the College divisional committees, curriculum committee, undergraduate and graduate councils.

### **III. Conduct of Business**

Faculty meetings shall be open to observers who are members of the University community or are residents of the State of Tennessee, except those meetings held to consider issues that are confidential (*e.g.*, faculty tenure, promotion and retention). Attendance at these meetings will be restricted to those persons designated by the Bylaws of the College. Business entailing discussion of students' records is deferred until student representatives and guests have left the meeting. Faculty meetings shall take place at least once per semester during the Fall and Spring semesters. Additional meetings, normally scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, are called by the Department Head and announced by memo, posting, or e-mail 24 hours in advance. Those who wish to place items on the agenda have until noon the day before the meeting to do so.

Voting Faculty shall include individuals at the rank of Assistant Professor and above who hold at least half-time appointments in the Department of Anthropology. Except in personnel matters, Voting Faculty shall also include full-time non-tenure track faculty at rank of Distinguished Lecturer or Research Associate Professor. In personnel matters, as specified in the U.T. Faculty Handbook, only tenured and tenure-track members of the Voting Faculty shall vote on the appointment of new faculty to tenure-track positions or the appointment/renewal of faculty to non-tenure-track positions. Consistent with this, the Performance Assessment Committee (above) comprises only full-time tenured teaching faculty. A quorum shall consist of a majority of Voting Faculty. General business is discussed and actions taken by voice vote or show of hands with a simple majority of those present being required to pass an item of business.

### **IV. Hiring of Tenure Track Faculty**

Faculty hiring procedures are conducted as specified in the College Bylaws and the Faculty Handbook and according to Affirmative Action guidelines. It is the Department Head's responsibility to assure appropriate search committee representation in accordance with university search procedures; but in all cases search committees will consist only of tenured and tenure-track Voting Faculty and will be appropriate to the specific subfield (if any) of the search. Final discussion of the hire is conducted in a faculty meeting and includes the Graduate Student Representative's poll of student opinion. The vote shall be conducted by paper ballot with each of the tenured and tenure-track Voting Faculty having one vote and one vote from the Graduate Student representative to represent the collective vote of the graduate students.

### **V. Appointment of Adjunct and Non Tenure Track Faculty & Staff**

Qualifications must be substantially the same as those for regular faculty positions. Appointments may be made for periods of one-to-three years, with reconsideration of the appointment after the stated period. The appointment process is as follows. Nominations may originate from the Head or any faculty member, with the originator of the nomination required to identify the nature, frequency, and cost of the proposed relationship with the Department and the proposed length of appointment. A letter of support and the candidate's curriculum vitae shall be circulated to all faculty following initial discussion in a faculty meeting and a vote taken at the following meeting.

### **VI. Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure and promotion decisions are made in accordance with guidelines contained in the current Faculty Handbook and the College Bylaws. Expectations for tenure-track faculty are stated

below in the description of the annual review process. Tenure-track faculty should have a minimum of 9 peer-reviewed articles (or their equivalent) in print or in press (on which they are lead author or have made a significant contribution) by the time of submission of their tenure dossier.

Additional criteria, stated in the departmental annual performance-and-planning review below, will also guide tenure and promotion decisions. These criteria by academic rank may be summarized as follows:

**The Full Professor** should hold the doctorate in the appropriate discipline, have served as an associate professor for at least five years, and have acquired an established national professional reputation demonstrated through a record of scholarly accomplishment and accomplished teaching in his/her field. Prior to consideration for this rank, the Full Professor will have shown evidence of excellence in teaching, including one peer evaluation of classroom teaching. The Full Professor should also have contributed significantly and substantially to meeting the needs of the University, the community, and the profession.

**The Associate Professor** should hold the doctorate in the appropriate discipline, have served as an Assistant Professor for at least four years, and have a strong record of scholarly accomplishment with clear promise that promotion to professor is likely at some point in the future. Appropriate evidence would be publication of a book-length manuscript or equivalent record of peer-reviewed research articles (see equivalencies in section VIII, C). Prior to consideration for this rank, the Associate Professor will have shown evidence of excellence in teaching, including two peer evaluations of classroom teaching.

**The Assistant Professor** should hold the doctorate in the appropriate discipline, have established an active research/creative achievement program with the goal of publishing a book-length manuscript or equivalent record of peer-reviewed research articles (see equivalencies in section VIII, C). The Assistant Professor should also participate significantly in professional activity in the discipline beyond formal teaching and research.

**The Lecturer** is eligible for promotion to **Senior Lecturer** typically after a minimum of five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of Lecturer. The Senior Lecturer is eligible for promotion to **Distinguished Lecturer** typically after three-to-five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of Senior Lecturer. The criteria and Lecturer promotion process are described in the University's Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part VI.

## **VII. Work Loads**

Faculty work load and teaching assignments shall be determined jointly by the faculty member and Department Head as described in the College Bylaws. The Department Head shall determine course staffing on the basis of these discussions. All statements about workload and performance expectations are understood within the context of a three-year rolling average.

*Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity:* Anthropology faculty members are engaged in ongoing research agendas with clear goals. Faculty members are expected to publish peer-

reviewed articles and/or books. Faculty members are also expected to present their research before professional organizations. Faculty members are expected to regularly apply for external funding to support their research and to employ graduate research assistants. Faculty members are expected to contribute professional service (*e.g.*, reviewing journal manuscripts and grant proposals) to their discipline.

*Teaching:* Normally, with research and service contributions, the annual teaching load is 2 courses (= 6 credit hours) per semester. Faculty members also provide oversight and direction of undergraduate and graduate research including theses and dissertations.

*Service:* Faculty members, and to a larger degree tenured faculty members, participate in departmental governance and committees, college and university committees and taskforces, and community outreach activities. Faculty members' student advising duties are considered service to both the department and the college. Non-tenure track faculty may have a role in shared Department governance.

It should be noted that a normal work-load at full (100%) time teaching has been defined by the University as comprising 12 hours (four courses) per semester. This definition includes no research, graduate thesis direction, or service activity in addition to the course load. These latter activities require that the normal teaching load be diminished on an individual basis, conditioned by varying involvement in research and service. Differential teaching loads may result from variability in the types of activities individual faculty members pursue. These considerations will serve as a baseline for the annual performance assessment described below.

## **VIII. Annual Performance-and-Planning Review**

Departmental policies designed to consider faculty performance are advisory to the Head, who is responsible for the final decision in these matters.

### **A. Procedures – Annual Review for Tenured Faculty**

Before the Fall semester, faculty members receive and are expected to complete a faculty workload report (using the “Elements” system online) documenting their teaching during the current Spring and prior Fall semesters, their service over the past calendar year and their scholarship for the past three calendar years. Faculty may attach a narrative statement (one page maximum) to their faculty workload report to contextualize their professional activity (*e.g.*, describe their contribution to a multi-authored work, summarize reviews of their recently published scholarship, etc.)

Upon completion of the workload report (in “Elements”), the faculty member uploads the document (<https://webapps.utk.edu/Provost/facultyreview>) for the Department Head to access. The Department Head evaluates each faculty member's activity and productivity in the context of the criteria for “Meets Expectations” as described below. Should the Head require the input of the Performance Assessment Committee, the Committee will rate each faculty member's teaching, research and service on the university's five- level scale (also described below), provide a summary rating, and then meet with the Head to discuss these recommendations. In

addition, length of service to the University may also be considered by the Committee if it is seen as relevant to annual review and merit considerations. Committee members recuse themselves from consideration of their own records. The Committee's recommendations are advisory to the Head who is charged to provide the final annual evaluation for each faculty member. Merit pay increases (when and if they become available) will be strongly influenced, if not entirely determined, by these identifications as well.

After the Head (and Committee, if applicable) complete their evaluations, the Head meets with each faculty member to discuss their annual review ratings. The Head reserves the right to adjust these ratings based on the content of this discussion. This meeting also involves a "Management by Objective" (MBO) component in which the faculty member and Head discuss the faculty member's professional agenda for the coming year. Progress towards achieving these goals and objectives is assessed by both the Committee and Head in the following year's review of each faculty member. As part of the MBO process, work-load expectations will be developed that will meet Departmental needs while providing individual faculty members with the opportunity to best demonstrate their talents. Some faculty members with particular skills in teaching, or few research opportunities, may elect to emphasize teaching and service while de-emphasizing research for a given year. Others may take an opposite approach.

Through discussions between the Head and faculty member, an activity formula will be generated for which each faculty member wishes to be evaluated at the end of the year. With a mix of 75% teaching, 15% scholarship, 10% service, for example, the faculty member would undertake to teach 3 courses per semester and would have reduced expectations for the amount of research and service than someone teaching fewer classes and ascribing more weight to research. Changes to an agreed upon activity profile may be made if circumstances warrant them through discussions between faculty members and the Department Head and Associate Head; such changes should be made as early in an academic year as is possible to avoid scheduling problems.

Note that, following College and University policies, differential teaching loads among faculty are expected under this process, i.e., each faculty member will undertake some teaching, research, and service every academic year. Teaching activity in particular must allow the Department to meet College curricular, undergraduate major, and graduate program course responsibilities.

## **B. Activity Formulae and Performance**

1. Because each faculty member has different strengths in relation to the scholarship, teaching, and service missions of the University, College, and Department, the goal is to provide maximum flexibility to faculty in defining their activity formulae each year so that they can best position themselves for merit salary increases. However, a few constraints on flexibility are operative. Departmental responsibilities to Major, College, and University curricular requirements must be satisfied. Departmental and University administrative committee responsibilities must be shared. Because probationary faculty will be evaluated by units both outside and within the Department, these faculty represent a special situation. Their meetings with the Head (which can be attended by their senior mentor if the probationary faculty member so desires), and activity distributions should be developed with satisfaction of tenure requirements in mind. Similarly, Associate Professors seeking promotion should also develop activity formulae with promotion considerations in mind. It is believed that a mix of scholarship, teaching, and service

should be the rule and that exclusionary activity distributions do not represent adequate performance in all but extraordinary situations.

2. The Department Head, in consultation as necessary with the Performance Assessment Committee, will review each faculty member's activities and rate them based on the fit between initial activity distribution formulae and actual performance under the assumption that a faculty member's activity was, in fact, guided by the agreed-upon performance profile. All faculty will be rated for teaching, scholarship, and service according to the current University five-level scale:
  - FE: Far exceeds expectations for rank
  - EE: Exceeds expectations for rank
  - ME: Meets expectations for rank
  - NI: Needs improvement for rank
  - U: Unsatisfactory performance for rank

The Department Head, in consultation as necessary with the Performance Assessment Committee, will generate a rating for each faculty member for each activity area in consideration of these criteria and any special considerations, including collaborative effort. The process should be seen as flexible, although standards should be applied without compromising the recognition of excellence in faculty performance. The sum of these ratings constitutes the faculty member's merit score for a given year. Identification of especially meritorious individuals, or faculty exhibiting an unacceptable performance, should depend heavily on the results of the process defined above. In making such determinations, however, the Head should consider a faculty member's rating over the past three years, since stochastic variation in class composition, journal processing rates, etc., should not overly affect these deliberations.

### **C. “Meets Expectations” Criteria for Annual Reviews of Tenured and Tenure- Track Faculty**

In addition to the quantitative measures articulated in the faculty workload statement, there are other measures that come to bear in order to “meet expectations.”

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA):

1. Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in a research program with clear goals.
2. Faculty members are expected to give at least 1 professional paper/poster per year, preferably at national or international conferences.
3. Faculty members are expected to publish at least 1-2 peer-reviewed articles (or their equivalent, see below) each year. Tenured Associate Professors applying for promotion to Professor should have published (since tenure was awarded) a minimum of 9 peer-reviewed articles (or their equivalent) by the time of submission of their promotion dossier.
4. External funding is expected to be sought in order to advance the faculty member's research goals, and to fund graduate research assistants.
5. Faculty members are expected to provide scholarly service to their discipline by reviewing manuscripts, grant proposals, and serving their professional organizations.
6. Peer-reviewed research article equivalencies:

- a. Sole-authored book = up to 5 articles depending on the length and complexity of the project and the reputation of the press.
  - b. Co-authored book = up to 3 articles depending on the relative contribution of the authors, the length and complexity of the project and the reputation of the press.
  - c. Editing book = up to 2 articles depending on the relative contribution of the editors, the length and complexity of the project, the reputation of the press and the impact of the volume.
  - d. Peer-reviewed, sole/first authored chapter in an edited volume = 1 article
  - e. Published and/or copyrighted software = 1 article
  - f. Published book review = 0.25 article
  - g. Unpublished technical or contract report = generally 0.10 article, but up to 1 article depending on length, complexity and whether or not the contribution is peer-reviewed.
  - h. Unpublished legal or applied report to an agency = generally 0.10 article, but up to 1 article depending on length, complexity and whether or not the contribution is peer-reviewed.
  - i. Unpublished forensic case report = generally 0.10 article, but up to 1 article depending on length, complexity and whether or not the contribution is peer-reviewed.
7. Other RSCA contributions to be considered include:
- a. Curating a museum exhibit
  - b. Research Awards received and Research Award nominations
  - c. Scholarly consulting.

#### Teaching:

1. Faculty members are expected to teach 2 courses (= 6 credit hours) per semester. This expectation can be adjusted either up or down in negotiations with the Department Head based on factors including, but not limited to:
  - a. External funding levels,
  - b. Elected service to professional organizations, and/or faculty governance organizations within the University (*e.g.*, President of Faculty Senate)
  - c. Directing departmental (*e.g.*, the FAC) and/or collegiate units (*e.g.*, an interdisciplinary program).
  - d. Number of graduate theses and dissertations currently directing
2. Quality of teaching is expected to be high in the Department of Anthropology.
3. Measurements of teaching quality within the Department of Anthropology include:
  - a. Student evaluation (SAIS)
  - b. Peer review (tenure-track faculty are expected to have two peer-reviews of their teaching while on their probationary period)
  - c. Self-assessment (*e.g.*, personal statement of “Teaching Philosophy”)
  - d. Regular participation in the departmental curricular process
  - e. New course development
  - f. Teaching Awards received and Teaching Award nominations

4. Faculty members are expected to direct student research, including undergraduate senior honors theses and graduate MA theses and doctoral dissertations. Faculty members are also expected to serve on departmental graduate student MA and doctoral dissertation committees, as well as serve as outside members for other departments when appropriate.

Service:

1. Untenured faculty members are expected to participate in departmental activities.
2. Tenured faculty members are expected to show leadership within the department, to participate, when asked, in the work of the college and the university, including outreach.
3. Service Awards received and Service Award nominations

#### **D. Procedures – Annual Retention Review for Tenure-Track Faculty**

Late in the Fall semester, tenure-track faculty members receive and are expected to complete a faculty workload report (using the “Elements” system online) documenting their teaching during the current Fall and prior Spring semesters, their service over the past calendar year and their scholarship for the current calendar year as well as the past two calendar years. Tenure-track faculty may attach a narrative statement (two pages maximum) to their faculty workload report to contextualize their professional activity (*e.g.*, describe their contribution to a multi-authored work, summarize reviews of their recently published scholarship, etc.)

Upon completion of the workload report and narrative, the tenure-track faculty member submits the documents to the Department’s principal administrative assistant who transmits copies first to the Department Head and then to the tenured faculty. Both the Head and tenured faculty independently evaluate each tenure-track faculty member’s activity and productivity in the context of the criteria for “Meets Expectations” as described above. The tenured faculty and Head meet at the end of the Fall semester to vote on retention of the tenure-track faculty. The senior mentor for each tenure-track faculty member summarizes their mentee’s record. The tenured faculty subsequently discuss the records of each tenure-track faculty member in turn, before voting on retention. The Department Head does not vote, nor materially participates in these deliberations. After each vote is conducted and recorded, the Associate Head is charged with composing individual letters summarizing the tenured faculty’s discussions concerning each tenure-track faculty member. The Head composes his or her own letter concerning retention for each tenure-track faculty member. The Head must also provide a summary recommendation on retention and an overall rating (on the university’s five-level scale) for each tenure-track faculty member. For tenure-track faculty, merit pay increases (when and if they become available) will be strongly influenced, if not entirely determined, by the results of the annual retention review process.

After the tenured faculty and Head complete their evaluations, the Head meets with each tenure-track faculty member to discuss their annual retention review. The Head reserves the right to adjust their ratings based on the content of this discussion. This meeting also involves a “Management by Objective” (MBO) component in which the faculty member and Head discuss the faculty member’s professional agenda for the coming year. Progress towards achieving these goals and objectives is assessed by both the tenured faculty and Head in the following year’s retention review of each tenure-track faculty member.

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that tenure-track faculty maintain an updated profile on Elements, the university’s UT’s Faculty Activity Reporting system, onto which a Faculty Annual Evaluation Report is uploaded by the Department Head. To avoid unnecessary

duplication of effort, the Workload form completed by the tenure-track faculty member in the Fall can simply be updated for Spring submission and the Department Head's retention review rating and narrative from the Fall can be attached to the required Faculty Annual Evaluation Report submitted during the Spring Semester.

#### **E. Procedures – Annual Retention Review for non-Tenure Track Faculty**

All NTT full-time instructional, research and clinical faculty members are to maintain an updated profile on Elements, the university's UT's Faculty Activity Reporting system, from which they can be evaluated annually. Full-time non-tenure-track (NTT) instructional faculty members normally provide the equivalent of twelve hours of instruction each semester. In many instances, this requirement is met by teaching twelve credit hours of regularly scheduled classes. NTT instructional faculty may also have duties in course coordination, lab preparation, departmental service, advising, and other supporting roles. They also have the flexibility to adjust teaching responsibilities to accommodate unusual teaching responsibilities in individual courses. In such instances, the Department Head should come to an agreement with the NTT instructional faculty member on an appropriate reduction in the number of regularly-scheduled courses to be taught during the period that the supporting functions are assigned, and should inform the College of Arts and Sciences of this reduction.

Full-time non-tenure-track (NTT) instructional faculty members normally provide the equivalent of twelve credit hours each semester. The precise teaching load for each individual shall be based on such details as class size, number of examinations, term papers and other assignments that require grading and evaluation. Typically, NTT instructional faculty members are not expected to perform service or research outside of their instructional assignments. Full-time NTT faculty may, however hold significant service roles, such as Director of Undergraduate Studies, or contribute significantly to research in their field. In this case, teaching load for full-time NTT faculty may be adjusted, based upon number of different courses taught as well as student advising, active research and/or creative activities (with publications or other suitable outputs), direction of graduate theses or dissertations, administrative duties, and institutional and/or public service.

#### **F. Procedures – Annual Evaluation of Directors**

The Forensic Anthropology Center is critical to the functioning and mission of the Department of Anthropology. Other semi-autonomous units (*e.g.*, Archaeological & Environmental Research Laboratory) also formally exist in Anthropology. To ensure effective leadership, the Director of each unit will be evaluated by tenured, Full Professors and by the Department Head, annually. This review will occur during the Spring semester, separate from the Annual Performance Review of faculty in the Fall. Each Director will prepare and submit a narrative report describing the goals and activities of the previous year, specifying which were successfully completed, which are in progress, and which were unsuccessful. Additionally, the report will provide a list of objectives for the next year, describing how they will be met, as well as any problems or concerns. The Department Head will include in the narrative a statement of the Director's duties. The senior faculty then meet to review the Director's performance, with the Department Head present to answer questions or provide information. The senior faculty then vote as to how the Director ranks on the university's five-point scale, listed in section VIII.B.2 above, and report the

result in a formal letter to the Department Head, which the Department Head uses to conduct the evaluation of the Director.

### **G. Grievances**

Grievances concerning merit decisions may arise due to perceived procedural errors or because a faculty member disagrees with an assessment of the substance of his/her performance. Faculty should first attempt to resolve the difference with the Head. Should the disagreement remain unresolved, faculty may formally present their position and evidence of the differences to the Performance Assessment Committee, which will vote to support or disagree with the Head based on this formal hearing. While this vote is itself advisory, as are all committee recommendations concerning merit performance, the Head will transmit all pertinent information to the Dean in the event of a contested decision. Grievances should be filed before budget decisions are reached at the end of the academic year under consideration.

### **IX. Curriculum revision**

Curriculum revision may be initiated by any faculty member. Proposals are discussed within the Curriculum Committee and voted on during a regular faculty meeting before being forwarded to the appropriate College Committees for review.

### **X. Grievance Policies**

Faculty grievances are handled according to the Appeals Procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

### **XI. Amendment of Bylaws**

These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty, provided the item has been placed on the agenda and the text of the change has been distributed to the faculty prior to the meeting. Revised 04/25/95, Amended 04/14/99, Amended 5/2/2007, Amended 04/21/2018, Amended 05/01/2018.