UC San Diego Department of Anthropology Advancement and Promotion Guidelines

October 21, 2025

Effective 7/1/2025 for AY 25/26 Review cycle

The Department of Anthropology has generally expected at least two significant pieces of work per review period for normal advancement. Our criteria recognize the diversity of anthropology and the differential importance of books, edited volumes, and other high impact publications to portions of our field. Moreover, we recognize the central importance of sole-authorship (on the one hand) and co-authorship (on the other) to different publication models. In addition, our reckoning of faculty achievement takes into account the time involved in writing high-impact publications and books. Excellence in teaching and service is expected of all faculty, although entering junior faculty are given course release and the opportunity to improve on any teaching deficits they may have.

Overview

Anthropology at UCSD encompasses archaeological anthropology, biological anthropology, linguistic anthropology, sociocultural anthropology, and psychological and medical anthropology. Each of these subfields makes a vital and integral contribution to the discipline through different areas of research as well as different research methodologies and practices. Anthropology integrates methods from the social sciences, the natural and the biological sciences and the humanities, one of the few fields to attempt this. Laboratory or field research on evolutionary, biological, archaeological, linguistic, semiotic or psychosocial processes is central to the work of some anthropologists, while others primarily engage in long-term ethnographic fieldwork and social analysis. In some cases, faculty combine fieldwork and laboratory research. Long- term studies in which the researchers are embedded in communities or ecological settings are also a hallmark of anthropology.

Our standards recognize the value of, and challenges of, the various methods and research modes that are central to anthropology. For example, directing and maintaining a laboratory provides a commitment to student-centered research environment aligned closely with the mission of our University. Ethnographic, archeological and linguistic research is often conducted outside the United States, and in the languages of the places where fieldwork is done. Fieldwork with non-human primates involves understanding the ecological context of the species as well as working

with the local community to sustain co- existence while promoting development. All these approaches—sustained ethnographic fieldwork, archaeological fieldwork, and observation of non-human primates in their ecological settings—require not only long commitments of time in the field, but also long term interactions with communities and groups. Anthropological research pioneered engagement with communities, usually over the long-term, with the researcher being embedded in the patterns of human life of the communities they study; and even research that does not directly explore human life in such communities may have communities as stakeholders or vitally interested parties. Accordingly, anthropological researchers must sustain ethical and culturally sensitive relationships with local groups and individuals. The role of the anthropologist may include participatory research and service conducted within those groups. Where relevant, the department recognizes such work by faculty members as making a contribution to the discipline, the university, and society.

Given the varied professional roles, modes of research, and research settings that characterize Anthropology as a discipline, faculty in our department often engage in multiple and overlapping forms of research, publication, teaching and service. In terms of publication, for instance, some faculty produce sole-authored books, articles, and book chapters, while others primarily publish collaborative research pieces published as journal articles, conference proceedings, or book chapters. In many cases, a career can involve shifts between overlapping publication models as a research program develops or as new research programs are initiated.

In addition to traditional academic publications, our standards also recognize creative or curatorial endeavors that are important to the field. These include, but are not limited to, organizing and curating archaeological, biological, ethnographic, or other public museum exhibits, creating ethnographic or natural history films, or developing computer models, simulations, and visualizations that offer heuristic value or afford deeper insight into anthropological data or human processes. Biological anthropologists may organize and curate collections and exhibits focused on human biology and evolution (eg., brain collections, serum, tissue or cells banks, etc.) that convey knowledge and have a significant impact in the field.

Creative and other works may be contributions to scholarship, may inspire or educate the public, or may contribute to the public understanding of societal problems.

Productivity is judged primarily in terms of the impact of published work on a faculty member's chosen area of study within the broader discipline of anthropology and beyond anthropology. Both quality and quantity of the research contributions are considered. In general, publications are used in quantifying research productivity and judging its significance, although we also recognize that other creative works count towards building a significant body of work in anthropology. In assessing the impact and significance of work, the faculty take into account the intellectual impact of publication venues as well as the reception of an individual's research within the various subfields of anthropology, as determined by internal and external reviews by academic peers.

Additionally, our faculty recognize that the quantity of research is also a consideration for promotion and normal merit advancement; and so evaluates the rate at which individual scholars produce work within any given review period. Expectations for quantity of work vary somewhat per subfield and depend in part on whether a scholar tends to produce mostly in the form of self-authored articles or books or in the form of multiple-authored collaborative work. When candidates publish with their students or post docs, we expect that often, but not always, their mentees are given first authorship. As in the biological sciences, there is no standard format for order of authorship. The order varies among subfields and even publications within fields; therefore we explain the significance of the author order in the analyses of the individual publications.

In Anthropology we expect peer reviewed multi- or single- authored significant publications (journal articles, book chapters, edited volumes/journal issues, books) where the faculty member is a significant contributor, by making key conceptual, empirical, or methodological contributions that are critical, meaningful, or creative, irrespective of position in order of authorship in multi authored publications (the norm in our field). It is noted that faculty in Biological Anthropology as well as those with joint appointments have a much higher teaching load (4 courses/year) than most faculty appointed in STEM-heavy departments such as neuroscience, SIO, and health science departments; research productivity should be scaled accordingly in peer comparisons.

We recognize that books or writing large research grants (especially, but not limited to, grants in novel directions, not merely to support continuing lines of work) may involve long term effort that exceeds the length of review periods, and that setting up labs or establishing field sites may also affect productivity within any given review period.

As a global discipline, establishing and running field projects in anthropology depends on the priorities and policies of other countries, and changes in these can adversely impact research productivity; when this occurs, and if relevant to assessing a file, such impacts will be noted in departmental letters.

Departmental letters supply context for Campus Reviewers and indicate how the department's rigorous and reasonable standards apply to individual cases.

NORMAL MERIT REVIEWS

In a normal merit review the department expects evidence of ongoing research productivity in the form of peer reviewed articles, book chapters, edited collections and/or chapters of books in progress. It requires evidence of successful teaching and mentoring. The department also expects service appropriate to the rank of the candidate.

Expectations for Teaching

The department seeks to provide excellence in teaching for graduate and undergraduate students. In appraising normal merit cases, the department will consider whether departmental expectations for teaching have been met, in terms of the number of courses taught, the number of students taught and mentored, and the contributions of faculty in sustaining and enhancing the teaching mission of the department, the division, and the university. The role of faculty in the graduate training program will be appraised. The quality of teaching and mentoring will be evaluated by CAPE evaluation and/or SET evaluations. The department always encourages innovations designed to make pedagogy more effective; it recognizes that pedagogical experiments can sometimes fail, lowering CAPE scores in any particular review cycle. In general, our faculty looks for an overall pattern in student evaluations and pays particular attention to qualitative metrics and comments in those evaluations.

Expectations for Service

While service is recognized at all ranks, and some departmental service is expected of all faculty. Pre-tenure faculty are not expected to take on a heavy burden of service within the department, the university, or the discipline. Associate and Full Professors, on the other hand, are expected to engage in significant service to the department, university, and discipline; the amount and import of this service is expected to increase with seniority. In addition, the department recognizes the crucial role that community and public service addressing societal challenges and human needs plays in the discipline of anthropology.

While we do not require community or public service as part of our departmental standards, we recognize that it should be rewarded when it occurs and draws on anthropological expertise. When relevant, such service and ways it advances the mission of anthropology and the university will be detailed in departmental recommendation letters.

The Department also values faculty contributions to furthering aspects of equity, diversity and inclusion at our university, and such contributions will also be detailed in departmental recommendation letters, whether these efforts take the form of service, outreach, mentoring, teaching, or contributions to programs or communities.

Expectations for Research Productivity

The department generally expects something in the order of 2 significant contributions as sole or coauthored articles per review period for faculty in the 2 year review cycle, 2-3 significant pieces for those in 3 year review cycles, and 3-4 comparable entries for higher ranked faculty in 4 year review cycles. In the case of faculty in any field working on a sole- authored book(s), which commonly take more than one review cycle to come to fruition, the department will credit finished chapters in Section C of the BioBib towards normal merit advances after internal departmental

peer-review. Such pieces, however, are not credited toward advancement across barrier steps. Exceptions to these guidelines may be made for work of exceptional distinction or quality.

The relative discrepancy in numerical expectations for publications between Assistants Professors, on the one hand, and Associate and Full Professors the other is explained by the greater service demands our department places on its faculty as they progress in rank and step.

Peer reviewed edited volumes and special journal issues have a significant place in anthropology. When considering an edited volume/journal special issue, current departmental standards count writing a substantial introduction to an edited volume/special issue, one that goes beyond summarizing the chapters of contributors, to makes an original intellectual contribution, as one item; contributing an original piece as one item; and editing the volume as one item. Introductions that are significant original contributions in their own right will be highlighted in the departmental letter to ensure that campus reviewers understand the contribution and assign them proper weight.

Proposals for accelerations in any particular review cycle require research productivity that is double the normal quantitative and/or qualitative expectations for the cycle, accompanied by excellent teaching and service. A doubling of research productivity does not in itself constitute a case for acceleration when there are ANY deficiencies in teaching and/or service. Accelerations that bring a candidate up to or through a barrier step are subject to additional criteria outlined in CAP FAQ Section E #1.

As stated in CAP FAQ Section E #1, “Accelerations are possible, but rare, when the exceptional performance is in the domain of teaching or of professional, university, or community service.”

According to PPM 230-620-80a, a bonus off-scale recommendation will be merited "in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement."

FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW FOR UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

The fourth-year review appraises progress toward meeting departmental standards for tenure in terms of research, teaching, and service. The appraisal considers the body of the candidate’s work in terms of its quality and quantity; it addresses the question of whether it is reasonable to expect the candidate to have sufficient work, of sufficient quality, to meet departmental standards for promotion from assistant to associate professor. At this juncture, faculty members are expected to demonstrate their ability to advance an independent research trajectory (as opposed to one dependent on mentors) and to show evidence of ongoing research or scholarly projects. Evidence of a strong record of teaching is expected by the department and by the university at this point.

While, as noted earlier, expectations for service are relatively low for untenured faculty, there should be some service at the departmental level.

PROMOTIONS FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

The department recognizes different ways to demonstrate excellence in research in the case for tenure. The tenure case can be based on a sole-authored book or monograph published (or accepted) by a high- quality academic press, along with 2-4 peer-reviewed significant journal articles, or chapters in peer reviewed compendia, or, depending on the subfield, publications in selective conference proceedings. Alternately, a case for tenure may be based on an equivalent body of peer-reviewed articles or book chapters, with at least two entries placed in top journals in anthropology or beyond anthropology. In such cases, we expect 10 – 12 lifetime significant publications of sufficient quality in peer- reviewed journals by scholars. As always, the quality and impact of the work, as assessed by both internal and external reviewers, is a primary consideration. Exceptions to these guidelines may be made for work of truly exceptional distinction or quality.

Peer reviewed venues may be journals, in English or other languages, evaluated in terms of their significance in the candidate's field of research as well as their overall significance and impact in that field. Peer-reviewed book chapters or special issues/volumes that make a significant contribution count towards building the body of work expected at tenure.

Creative works, such as films or curated exhibits, that have been reviewed and can be judged as having sufficient quality and impact, can also count towards the body of work presented for the tenure case.

Regardless of the model used to build the case for tenu re, the file should demonstrate that the tenure candidate is intellectually independent of mentors or collaborators and has a viable plan for new and/or continuing research that extends well into the future.

Specifically, we expect evidence of progress in the pursuit of a new work or projects that are different from—or meaningfully build on— the work on which the tenure case is based.

Other considerations for tenure include a strong teaching record, sufficient service within the department, and contributions to diversity.

Promotion to Associate Professor is a career review, and outside letters are solicited to help the department evaluate the significance and impact of the candidate's career body of work.

PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR

The department recommends promotion to full professor on the basis of a body of original research that constitutes a significant contribution to a candidate's field of study. A candidate for full professor must demonstrate continued research productivity as manifested in an appropriate number of peer-reviewed publications. These publications may be in the form of a book or books, a book and articles and/or book chapters, or a series of articles, published in appropriate high quality venues. Creative works that have undergone review may also be recognized. The quality and impact of the work as well as the quantity of publications is taken into consideration. Promotion to full professor is a career review, and outside letters are solicited to help the department evaluate the significance and impact of the candidate's career-long body of work. The department also considers external awards and other forms of professional recognition of a candidate's stature in his or her field in all promotions and advancements in the professorial ranks.

Evidence of excellence in teaching and mentoring is expected and, additionally, candidates for full professor are expected to have a strong record of service to the department, the university, and the profession. While community and public service are not required for promotion to full professor, the department recognizes the value of such service to the university and society.

ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR, STEP VI

University guidelines (PPM 230-220-18. b. (4)) for advancement to Professor, Step VI require "… evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service." Additionally, "great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching" as a precondition for advancement and beyond, Professor, Step VI.

To ensure that these criteria are met, the department may, at its discretion, solicit letters from external referees.

ADVANCEMENT TO PROFESSOR, ABOVE-SCALE

PPM 230-220-18. b. (4) states: “Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was

based.”

Advancement to Professor Above Scale is a career review, and outside letters are solicited to help the department evaluate the significance and impact of the candidate’s career-long body of work.