Bylaws of the Department of Sociology

Adopted and Revised, November 2013

This statement describes the Department's system of governance. This includes procedures for: (1) the conduct of departmental business; (2) departmental planning and its budgetary impacts; (3) procedures for making recommendations to the Dean of Arts and Sciences with regard to the reappointment, promotion, and award of tenure to full-time faculty; (4) procedures for making recommendations to the Dean of Arts and Sciences with regard to the appointment of a departmental Chair; (5) determination and staffing of undergraduate and graduate curricula and requirements; (6) procedures for considering secondary appointments; and (7) procedures for faculty to initiate departmental discussion.

I. Procedures

The Department Meeting is the primary unit for setting departmental policies, making personnel decisions and recommendations to the Dean of Arts and Sciences as well as appointing members of Special Review Committees and Search Committees, and making nominations for departmental Chair. In the following section these structures are described, following which the sequence of activities in faculty reappointment or promotion proceedings is detailed.

A. The Department Meeting

The Chair of the Department schedules regular monthly Department Meetings during the academic year. The Chair may convene additional meetings from time to time. All full-time faculty members are expected to attend unless they are on sabbatical or leave. A full-time faculty member is one who holds a tenured or tenure stream appointment in the Department or who holds the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer. The Department Chair chairs the meeting. The Department's Administrative Assistant attends the meeting and is responsible for taking the minutes of the meeting. The minutes are maintained and are made accessible to all faculty and graduate student representatives. Secondary appointees, non-tenure stream instructors and student representatives may attend and participate in the meeting. Voting is limited to tenured and tenure stream faculty, non-tenure stream faculty with the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer, and one student representative. Visiting faculty are not permitted to vote. Students may not vote on reappointment, promotion or tenure decisions.

The Department Meeting makes decisions by a majority vote of a quorum of members. A quorum is defined as the ceiling of the number of full-time faculty members actively participating in the Department's daily affairs divided by two. Faculty members with full-time appointments outside the Department are not included in this number, but faculty on sabbatical or leave are counted. For example, if the department had 13 tenured and tenure stream faculty members, two of whom held full-time administrative appointments, and one lecturer on a renewable long-term contract, a quorum would be the ceiling of 12/2 (6). All full-time faculty (but not non-tenure stream instructors on annual contracts) have a vote on all decisions made at the Department Meeting. More than one graduate student representative may attend meetings, but graduate students have only one vote; they can vote on all matters other than reappointment and promotion decisions or on decisions about particular graduate students.

Some departmental decisions require that all faculty vote. In such cases, the vote is not limited to those present at a particular meeting, but is conducted by mail or e-mail ballot. In addition, the Department Meeting may decide that a particular issue should be decided by a mail or e-mail ballot of all eligible voters rather than by those members present. All reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions as well as recommendations as to the Department Chair will be made in this fashion.
The Department Meeting sets departmental policies, including those regarding the graduate and undergraduate programs and the directions of future recruiting. It also may take on the functions of a planning and budgeting committee of the whole.

The Department Meeting is responsible for personnel decisions, both in the recruitment of new faculty and the reappointment, promotion, and recommendation of tenure for current faculty. In all these matters except initial appointments to the Department, voting follows the "rank above" principle. That is, assistant, associate, full professors and senior lecturers vote on decisions regarding instructors and lecturers; associate and full professors vote on decisions concerning assistant professors; and full professors vote on decisions concerning associate professors. Faculty of all ranks participate equally in decisions concerning initial appointments. All members of the relevant faculty subset (e.g., all senior faculty in the case of promotions to tenured rank) are expected to study the candidate's dossier. They are asked to express their opinions on the proposed action through the ballots circulated among them, as required by A&S policy. All departmental decisions concerning personnel actions become recommendations to the Dean of A&S.

After a promotion or reappointment decision of the Department Meeting has been reached, the Chair transmits it as the Department's recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Sciences including a description of the steps taken in reaching the decision. The Department Chair is expected to inform the Dean of his/her own recommendations; should the Chair hold a divergent opinion from the majority she or he must inform the full-time members of the Department. The Chair's report will discuss dissent within the faculty when there is general agreement about the strength of the case, but the vote is divided; however, if there is significant division over the strength of the case, as reflected in the discussion and the vote, both majority and minority reports will be submitted to the Dean.

Secondary appointments are reviewed and approved by the Department Meeting. All participants take part in the deliberation and decision.

The Department Meeting has the responsibility of approving Special Review Committees and Search Committees appointed by the Chair. The Department Meeting sets priorities for Search Committees.

The Department Meeting may delegate departmental tasks to standing or ad hoc committees or to individuals. Standing departmental committees include a Graduate Committee that works with the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) to administer the graduate program, an Undergraduate Committee that works with the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) to administer the Undergraduate Program, an Undergraduate Course Proposal Review Committee (consisting of the current and past Chairs and the DUS) to approve new courses, and a Scheduling Committee (consisting of the Chair, DGS, and DUS plus staff) to draw up teaching schedules. Individual positions include the Research Ethics Coordinator, who deals with issues arising from student research on human subjects as part of class projects, the Diversity Liaison Representative, the Library Representative, and the Speakers Series Coordinator among others. Committee members and individual positions are appointed by the department Chair, except in the cases of Search Committees, which are recommended by the Chair and approved by the Department Meeting, and Special Review Committees, which are approved by the rank-above subset of the Department Meeting. The Director of Graduate Studies and the Undergraduate Advisor are appointed by the Department Chair, unless otherwise specified by contract.

The Chair distributes an agenda prior to the regular monthly meeting, and any member of the department may add an item to the agenda.
B. Planning and Budgeting Committee

The University's Planning and Budgeting process requires that each Department have a Planning and Budgeting Committee. These committees have representatives of faculty, staff, and students. In Sociology, the Department Meeting as a whole, which includes faculty, staff, and students, functions as such a committee to decide questions of departmental planning and budgetary impacts. For example, the Department Meeting may set priorities in the allocation of department funds.

C. Special Review Committee

The Department Meeting appoints a Special Review Committee (SRC) for the purpose of preparing a Departmental report on a faculty member whose reappointment or promotion is under consideration by the Department. While Special Review Committees may make recommendations, the responsibility for arriving at decisions rests with the Department Meeting, which must form a comprehensive picture of the merits of the case including evaluation of the material and recommendation found in the report produced by the Special Review Committee. The Department Meeting may accept the Special Review Committee's report as it stands or it may delegate a group (within the relevant subset) to do some rewriting. The outcome is the final Departmental report that becomes part of the materials forwarded to the Dean, as indicated above. In cases of reappointment of assistant professors, Special Review Committees consist of two or three members of the tenured full-time sociology faculty. In cases of promotion to associate professor with tenure or promotion to full professor, the Committee may either consist of three departmental members of a rank above that of the person under consideration or two rank-above departmental members and one member with relevant expertise and appropriate faculty rank from another department of the university.

Special Review Committees are appointed by the rank-above subset of the Department Meeting. Although the Department Chair will normally make a recommendation as to the composition of the Special Review Committee, approval of that membership is the responsibility of the entire rank-above faculty. Before the Special Review Committee is named the Chair will consult with the candidate on its composition. The candidate may indicate to the Chair preferences for inclusion or exclusion of faculty members for this Committee. However, the rank-above faculty subset will recommend Special Review Committees on the basis of scholarly competence and balances of judgment. It may disregard preferences expressed by the candidate.

It is the responsibility of the Special Review Committee to prepare a detailed report, presenting a profile of the candidate relating to the Department criteria. Their work will be based on the collection of materials in the candidate’s dossier. The candidate may indicate the significance he/she attaches to these materials and their relative importance. However, the Special Review Committees may use any information or material they consider relevant to the task.

In the case of recommendations for promotion to associate or full professor, and in decisions regarding tenure, the Special Review Committee must ascertain the national and/or international standing of the candidate by soliciting letters of reference from at least six well-known authorities in the candidate’s field. External reviewers will be sent a selection of the candidate’s writings prepared by the Special Review Committee. Appendix B provides a set of Guidelines for Tenure/Promotion Special Review Committees. In cases of reappointment of assistant professors, external letters are not solicited, but the Special Review Committee may, if appropriate, solicit the views of colleagues in other departments or programs at the University of Pittsburgh.

D. The Search Committee

The Search Committee is approved by the Department Meeting and consists of three full-time faculty members of the Department. The Search Committee reviews the applicants for a tenured
or tenure stream position in the Department and selects the candidates to be invited for a campus visit. The Search Committee reviews applicants using criteria established by the Department’s planning process and confirmed by the Department Meeting.

E. The Sequence of Events in Promotion Decisions

In order to illustrate how the Departmental procedures work, a brief description of the sequence of events in decisions concerning promotion to the rank of associate professor and conferral of tenure is provided. It should be understood that this is offered for illustrative purposes only. An assistant professor is considered for promotion and tenure during his/her sixth year of service in the tenure stream of the University. However, the procedure may be initiated prior to that time by the Department Chair if she/he views the case to be especially meritorious or by formal application by the individual. Promotion proceedings can only be undertaken prior to the time at which they become mandatory according to University rules with the consent of the individual concerned.

As a first step, the Department Chair consults with the candidate about the tenure case and composition of the Special Review Committee, typically in the spring of the candidate’s fifth year of service. At that meeting, the Chair will review with the candidate the decision process, both in and beyond the department. Next, the Department Meeting approves a Special Review Committee, which writes a report to the Department early in the fall of the candidate’s sixth year. In the spring of the fifth year, before the report is written, the candidate puts together a dossier consisting of statements on research, teaching and service and associated materials (see Appendix B). After the dossier is complete, external letters are solicited. The candidate is asked to provide names of potential external referees, which the SRC may use along with others generated by the SRC. The SRC report is given to the appropriate subset of full-time faculty members, who also have access to the external letters and dossier, and this group meets in a Department Meeting to decide the case in the fall of the sixth year. The Department Meeting can accept the report or ask that the report be rewritten to reflect the views of the Department Meeting. Following discussion of the report, a formal vote of the rank-above faculty is taken by secret ballot.

Subsequent procedures in the University are described in the Faculty Handbook found on the Provost’s website (http://www.provost.pitt.edu/handbook/handbook.html).

F. Contracts and Time Tables

The duration of the contract for junior faculty varies within the framework set by the Provost of the University, and the rules of Arts and Sciences. As a rule, the Department requires the completion of the Ph.D. or the equivalent for any appointment. In exceptional cases a candidate for the Ph.D. at another university may be appointed as instructor with the understanding of automatic promotion to the rank of assistant professor in the term following the receipt of the doctorate. While special terms may be negotiated in individual contracts, it is the Department's policy that persons entering as instructors would be appointed to a period of such duration that the combined time in the ranks of instructor and assistant professor would equal the normal first assistant professor contract, i.e., three years. Instructors are encouraged to complete their dissertations as speedily as possible. Contract terms in that rank are for one year only. Reappointment to a second year as instructor is normally the responsibility of the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Meeting without intensive review of the candidate. However, a second such reappointment, i.e., for a third year as instructor (which would mean failure to complete the doctorate for more than two years) can only be recommended in exceptional circumstances.

Given an initial three-year appointment, the decisions bearing on the junior faculty member's status and the various possible outcomes are as follows:
(1) There is a required routine annual review of non-tenured full-time faculty. This is conducted by the Chair in consultation with the tenured members of the Department Meeting. This review is essentially a discussion with the junior faculty member of his/her professional development. Following the discussion, the Chair writes a brief memorandum to the individual, summarizing the main points of discussion, as a way of recording officially that the review has taken place.

(2) In the third year, there is a more comprehensive review with the two possible outcomes of non-renewal of the contract and renewal for an additional three years. As indicated above, an internal Special Review Committee prepares a report and makes a recommendation. The Department Meeting makes the final decision. In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member has a fourth terminal year in the Department.

(3) In the sixth year, the tenure decision is made, using the procedures described earlier. In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member has a seventh terminal year in the Department.

(4) In cases of leaves, the tenure clock will be adjusted (or not) according to university policy. The granting of a leave is a matter of Departmental recommendation to the Dean.

G. Procedures for Recommending the Appointment of a Chair

1. (a) All full-time faculty holding primary appointments in Sociology are eligible to vote.
   (b) The term of office of the Chair is three years. Subsequent re-election is permitted. The current Chair and all prior Chairs are excluded from the ballot unless they explicitly indicate a desire to be on the ballot.

2. The selection of a Department Chair will involve these steps:
   (a) All full professors who do not have wider University administrative responsibilities are automatically on the ballot for the Chair election (subject to the conditions outlined in item 1b).
   (b) In the fall semester of the Chair’s last year of a 3-year term there will be a dedicated department meeting for the election of the Chair. The selection process will be facilitated by the current Chair, if not on the ballot, or by another full professor not on the ballot. The facilitator will collect confidential communications, chair the meeting, and review and report on the vote.
   (c) The chairship meeting will include tenured and tenure-stream faculty, non-tenure stream lecturers, a representative of the graduate students, and a representative of the staff. Those on the ballot will be individually invited to discuss chairship questions with the meeting, but will otherwise not be present. Following the conversation with each candidate, the meeting will continue discussion. Discussion will include a presentation of staff and student views by their representatives (who will have solicited their views before the meeting).
   (d) The meeting will be followed by an informal, secret ballot that will include an option to abstain. NTS lecturers as well as TTS faculty will participate, and graduate students and staff will collectively each have one vote. The results of the balloting will be announced to the department in the form of a qualitative description of the overall pattern of the vote and not necessarily a precise count.
   (e) A final, second vote will then be carried out. This will be by secret ballot and only lecturers, full-time tenured and tenure stream faculty will vote.
   (f) The candidate with the most votes will be recommended to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. In the event of two or more people being tied, a new ballot will be constructed for a runoff secret ballot. This can be iterated until a Chair is selected.
   (g) The election results will be reported to the Dean in the form of the precise vote. In reporting its decision to the Dean, the Department must distinguish the T/TTS from the NTS vote.
H. Procedures for Approval of New Undergraduate Courses

A committee consisting of the current Chair, current Director of Undergraduate Studies, and most recent available former Chair will review all proposals for new undergraduate courses in Sociology. (Approval for a course to fulfill an Arts & Sciences General Education Requirement must be submitted through Arts & Sciences Undergraduate Council.) The department committee will meet once each term, to be scheduled by the Chair and announced to the faculty. Proposals for new courses should indicate the intended audience for the course (primarily freshmen and sophomores or juniors and seniors; majors or non-majors); the general content, purposes, and methods of this course; and specific course prerequisites. Proposals should also contain a proposed syllabus. In its review, the committee will consider the extent to which the course reflects state-of-the-art sociological scholarship and pedagogical approaches as well as how the course fits into the department's curriculum and complements current departmental offerings. The committee can accept a course proposal; ask for revisions and a resubmission; or reject the proposal.

II. Standards and Criteria

The Department of Sociology functions within the policy framework of the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences. Its members are advised to study the university regulations on criteria and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and conferral of tenure found in the Faculty Handbook. For TTS faculty, departmental criteria and standards are elaborated in Appendix A. Lecturers should consult the Faculty Handbook found on the provost's website for university policies.
APPENDIX A. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (Adopted March 6, 2009)

These are general guidelines. Given the variety of forms scholarly excellence assumes in our department, the diversity of ways to be an excellent teacher and mentor, and the range of service needed by department, university and profession, these guidelines sometimes come with qualifiers like “generally” or “in most cases.” In addition to these guidelines, individual feedback is especially important as well.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In assessing a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the department looks for evidence of excellence in scholarship, teaching and mentoring, and service. We do not operate with a trade-off model in which deficiencies in some areas can be compensated by excellence in others. Rather, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor require evidence of significant contribution to scholarship, effective teaching and mentoring, and active participation in the collective life of the department and, weighted less heavily, the university and profession.

Scholarship:
Excellence in scholarship is best established by a track record of high-quality publications and evidence of a future scholarly productivity. It is generally useful to publish from and build on research from the dissertation, but also necessary that the record demonstrate a trajectory of scholarly independence from graduate school advisors and teachers. This can take a variety of forms, including new research designs and data collection, new analyses of previously-collected data, new theoretical directions, and so forth.

In some disciplines or departments, scholarly excellence is demonstrated by high quality book publication. In others, articles in prestigious journals are decisive. In our Department of Sociology, we recognize that some excellent scholarship is expressed in books and some in refereed journal articles and that appropriate patterns of publication will vary both with the field of inquiry and the vision of particular scholars. It is therefore not possible to set out a precise quantitative formula that will fit all instances. For this reason, effective individual feedback from senior to junior faculty may be very helpful. Nonetheless, we can recognize some broad principles.

The role of a first book in a tenure decision. For many fields of sociological inquiry, a book is not the most probable place for innovative scholarship. Demographers, for example, will want their work to appear in particular journals. For some junior scholars, however, an excellent book will be an important professional milestone. In such instances, it will often be the case that this first book will be an outgrowth of the dissertation project and it might be the case that this book will be the major work at the time of the promotion review.

It is important to remember that the conferral of tenure is a departmental and university commitment to a support a lifetime of scholarship and not simply a reward for past work. The case for tenure will include a judgment about future scholarly productivity and creativity in which an excellent book will furnish important evidence but will not be conclusive. Especially when the book is based largely on research done for the doctoral dissertation project, the department will want evidence that points to a research project beyond the first book. This new project should use a conceptual and research design that is clearly distinct from the doctoral dissertation. Although the new project need not be fully complete in all cases, there should be clear evidence of the project in the form of published articles and talks and, in some cases, research grants or a contract for a second book. To the extent that the first book goes substantially beyond the dissertation – new chapters, new data, new analyses, major new writing – the need for such additional evidence of future creative work is reduced, but it is never absent altogether.

In making decisions about tenure and promotion, the department will consider the originality and contribution of a published book. Books that provide the best evidence of scholarly productivity are those that report the results of empirical research or make significant theoretical contributions.
As a general rule of thumb, books that essentially review or consolidate existing literature, textbooks, extended essays, and edited volumes are not appropriate in most cases as the centerpiece of a tenure and promotion cases. We indicate "in most cases" because we can imagine, and want to be open, to the possibility that some improbable genre will be the vehicle for a significant scholarly achievement. Untenured faculty are encouraged to consider carefully, and consult with colleagues and mentors, before deciding which press should publish a book. Generally, prestigious university presses carry more weight than commercial presses.

Reviews of published books as well as the judgments of the external referees consulted at the time of promotion decisions are major sources of evidence of quality and impact. Since the tenure decision may occur before any published reviews are available, the publisher's reader's reports are an important alternative source.

The role of refereed journal articles in a tenure decision. In some fields of sociology, let us say, demography, it may be very clear which are the high prestige journals; in other fields there may be less consensus. One scholar's work may be squarely within the traditions recognized by the American Sociological Association; another's might be at some distance. A scholar making use of formal mathematical models will very likely be writing articles a great deal briefer than one deploying a mountain of historical data. We therefore do not give a single list of desired journals, nor numbers of articles, nor pages, by way of specifying the ways in which journal publication constitutes demonstrable excellence. Ultimately, the quality of the work is what matters most, but the form and outlet of publication can make tenure and promotion cases easier or more difficult to make. In general, we have some rules of thumb:

1. While jointly-authored work may be excellent, and publishing in collaboration with esteemed senior colleagues is a sign of the respect in which that colleague holds one's collaboration, we strongly recommend some significant publishing of first-authored or solely-authored articles.

2. Publishing on a wide variety of subjects may indicate valued versatility, but it sometimes might also make it more difficult to define one's own voice. So for a junior person especially it is useful to have some significant part of one's article publications constituting a body of work that will establish one's reputation in that area.

3. Although particular lines of inquiry might be more difficult to publish in generalist sociological journals than others, publication in refereed generalist journals in sociology is highly regarded. There are various rankings of journal impact, but ASR and AJS are consistently ranked as the top two journals in sociology. Publication in other highly-ranked refereed generalist journals in sociology, including some of the journals of the regional sociological associations, and in prestigious refereed interdisciplinary journals is also highly regarded. In selecting outlets for publication, it is useful to consider that, while not necessary in all cases, it is easier to make a case for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor with a record that includes publication in widely-recognized and prominent sociological journals.

4. In general, the ideal mix of journal publication, especially for someone for whom a book will not be part of the mix, will include first-rate specialist as well as generalist journals. For someone working on gender issues, specialist journals would include Signs or Gender & Society; for someone working in historical sociology, this might include Comparative Studies in Society and History or more specialized historical journals; for someone working within a particular region of the world, an area-specific journal might be appropriate. Although we are a small department, our intellectual range and methodological inclinations are quite varied and we cannot even begin to spell out a full list of such journals which will with fields of inquiry and even among individual researchers. But the notion of a mix of more generalist and more specialized journals has broad applicability.
5. Our department is strongly committed to work that crosses boundaries of space, time, method, and discipline. This means that while we give great weight to publication in high prestige sociological journals we recognize, and support, the creativity of colleagues for whom it would be appropriate to publish in refereed journals associated with other disciplines.

6. In general, articles in refereed journals are weightier in promotion decisions because they have passed the scrutiny of (with luck) knowledgeable professional peers. However, being invited to contribute to a journal or to write a chapter for an edited book might be a sign of significant professional recognition in itself. In some fields, for example in social movement scholarship, prestigious edited collections aimed at carving out new directions might be a very visible place to publish.

Briefer pieces. We see book reviews as a valuable and vital professional service. Where would we be if no one reviewed our own books? But they are not usually a good vehicle for establishing one’s own credentials as a creative scholar, and will probably contribute more to the service dimension of a promotion review than the scholarship dimension. Extended review-essays are likely to be weightier than brief reviews. While we can imagine the extremely rare review that redefines a field and would regard that as a major contribution, in general articles that report one’s own research or theoretical advances are likely to be weightier in promotion decisions.

Encyclopedia entries are often a sign of professional renown: an editor thinks you have expert knowledge of some field. But it is unusual that such entries are very much read by anyone and so they are not a great place to try to establish one’s reputation.

Teaching:
We take seriously our responsibility to provide high quality instruction in the classroom. The department will consider various indicators of teaching commitment and effectiveness, including class materials (syllabi, teaching materials, examinations), peer evaluations and classroom observations, student evaluations, and similar forms of information.

In graduate teaching, our view is that the lion’s share of work with graduate students and generally by far the most important work takes place outside of the classroom: in the reading of multiple drafts, in guiding students to learn how to write for publication and respond to the critiques of journal readers, in turning projects into conference presentations and job talks, in learning how to improve an early stab at a research design, in a word, in mentoring. We take very seriously therefore effective service on graduate student committees, but the critical thing is not being on a list of committee members, but the development of effectively supportive intellectual relationships that guide future scholars into their own beginnings of professional scholarship.

There are very different kinds of excellence in undergraduate teaching. There is the excellence in engaging students in the classroom to be excited about particular subject matters. There is also working with individual students on projects beyond the classroom, including mentoring undergraduate students on their Sociology honor’s or B.Phil theses as well as in independent study and internship projects.

Departmental, university, and professional service:
We are a small department that has a collective intellectual life and that has collective responsibilities for educating our undergraduates and preparing our graduate students to be creative researchers and effective teachers. There is a great deal to be done by way of service on committees of many kinds, representing the department in a variety of university venues, organizing our collective intellectual endeavors (departmental speakers’ series, for example), and engagement in the university, local, and professional communities. We need the participation of all and value a proactive style of dealing with collective issues. As a general rule, the service
responsibilities of junior faculty are less than those of tenured colleagues, but our normal expectation is for an increasing assumption of those responsibilities. In a small department like ours, it is probable that every Associate Professor will serve a term as DGS and certain that everyone will be filling major roles so a promotion decision will take those expectations into account.

**Reviews:**
There are two periods of assessment for junior faculty: the third year review and the tenure review. Details of the procedures for each review are provided in the faculty handbook and on the website of the School of Arts and Sciences.

The criteria listed above will be used in both the third year and tenure reviews. At the time of the third year review, there is a lesser expectation for the quantity of scholarly productivity, degree of excellence in teaching, and level of contribution in service than is the case at the review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Nonetheless, a successful third year review requires a record of scholarly publication and evidence of an independent post-dissertation research plan (that may or may not be an offshoot of the dissertation), a trajectory toward teaching excellence, and a record of engagement in the graduate mentoring and service responsibilities of the department.

**PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**
The decision of the department’s full professors to recommend a promotion to Full Professor is based on consideration of a candidate’s record and likely future trajectory in scholarly attainment, teaching and graduate student mentoring, and leadership in the department, university, and profession. It is not based on years in rank.

**Scholarship:**
Promotion to Full Professor requires, in the language of the A&S criteria, “attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning.” The department relies on this standard. We look for a substantial and excellent body of work published since promotion to Associate Professor, a record of continual productivity, and signs that scholarly productivity will continue into the future and require evidence of significant scholarly reputation, nationally or internationally as appropriate. Although not an exhaustive list, evidence of such recognition might include citations of one’s research, academic prizes, invitations to serve as editor or on editorial boards of major journals, prestigious fellowships and grants, and invited lectures.

**Teaching and Mentoring:**
Full Professor candidates should have a strong record of undergraduate teaching and mentoring undergraduate students outside the classroom, plus significant and excellent graduate student mentoring including successfully mentoring students to the Ph.D, service on graduate student comprehensive, master’s thesis, and dissertation committees in Sociology, and evidence of supportive engagement with graduate students that prepares them as scholars and teachers. Other important evidence comes from engagement in graduate education of students from other departments and programs, including service on their committees.

**Service:**
In considering promotion to Full Professor, the department requires a record of sustained engagement and contribution to the intellectual life and functioning of the department at a level appropriate for future nomination as departmental chair, a role for which all full professors are eligible and one which, in a small department like ours, all are likely to be expected to fill. In considering promotion to full professor, the department will expect a record of excellent service in a number of leadership roles in the department, generally to include all or most of the following: term(s) as DGS; Chair or service on a Special Review Committee; Chair of External Search Committee; official and unofficial mentorship of junior faculty colleagues; peer review and evaluation of teaching of colleagues; and other leadership roles as appropriate.
A candidate for Full Professor also should have a record of significant contribution to the University and the profession. Contribution to the university may include active participation in multidisciplinary units such as Cultural Studies, UCIS, Center for Race & Social Problems, Women's Studies; service on the A&S councils and university committees; and similar efforts. Service to the profession can take a variety of forms, including leadership roles on committees and task forces; editorial roles on journals and university presses; election to office in national and regional professional associations; organizing sessions at professional meetings and participating in such roles as presenter, moderator, and discussant; and service as a reviewer for national granting agencies, university presses, refereed journals and tenure and promotion cases at other universities.

This list is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive, and we will take note of other forms of departmental, university and professional service.
APPENDIX B. Guidelines for Tenure/Promotion Special Review Committees

As soon as possible after a Special Review Committee has been established, its Chairperson should request of the candidate the following basic materials:

- curriculum vitae
- copies of published materials plus any unpublished materials which the candidate may wish the SRC to examine
- names of several external persons at a higher professional rank than the candidate
- names of external persons of lesser or equal professional rank may be given, but the number of these should be relatively low; the candidate may indicate a preference that certain persons not be contacted as referees, but the number of these is expected to be very small, perhaps one or two
- names of departmental colleagues who might be helpful in assessing the candidate’s teaching quality
- results of surveys (student evaluations) of his/her teaching performance
- materials which have been used in at least three courses taught by the candidate within the last three years
- basic information in respect to advising and sitting on the committees of graduate students

The candidate may also supply information about community and university service, professional service, and departmental administration. These should, in any case, be listed in the curriculum vitae. It is desirable that all names and materials supplied to the SRC should be itemized by the candidate in a letter to the SRC Chairperson and that this letter be appended to the SRC report.

The SRC Chairperson should, upon receipt of the above specified materials, convene the SRC and commence its detailed discussion of the materials supplied by the candidate as well as the tasks of selecting external referees, consulting with departmental colleagues, graduate students and the candidates.

Concerning the selection of referees, the first task of the SRC is to agree upon the external people to be asked to write letters about the candidate, with specific reference to the formal status for which the candidate is being considered. Requests for such letters should be accompanied by a package of the candidate's writings. The SRC should aim for letters which include within their general foci the thrust of the work of the candidate since the latter's previous formal change in academic status. The number of letters to be gathered is between six and ten. At least half of the letters should be from people not suggested nor precluded by the candidate. Summaries of orally provided reports should be avoided in favor of thoughtful letters.

In consulting with the faculty colleagues the SRC should make sure that each member of the departmental full-time faculty is provided with an early opportunity to comment either orally or in writing. For this purpose, the materials supplied to the SRC by the candidate should be made available for inspection. The styles of consultation may range from direct discussion with every faculty member to sending every faculty member an invitation to comment or a mixture of these two basic approaches. In any case the SRC should strive to obtain an overall departmental view of the candidate’s qualifications prior to the preparation of its report, against the background of as fully informed a faculty as possible. A section of the SRC's report should describe both the consultative procedures used and provide a summary of the overall outcome of the consultations. The latter should include reference to the manner and results of consultation with graduate students. The Chairperson of the SRC should invite, but not require, all current graduate students and all past students on whose committees the candidate served to provide letters about the candidate. The candidate will not approach graduate students for letters.
The SRC should meet with the candidate for the purpose of exploring his/her recent -- and, in the case of pre-tenure and tenure decisions, prospective -- academically-relevant work.

In summary, the SRC, as it moves toward the preparation of its report to be presented to the Department Meeting rank above faculty should take minimally into account the following:

1. the quality and quantity of published materials, with particular reference to
2. accomplishment since the candidate's previous change in academic status;
3. the quality of the candidate's pedagogical accomplishments;
4. the amount -- and, if it so wishes, the quality -- of the candidate's
5. administrative contribution to and participation in departmental affairs;
6. the amount -- and, if it so wishes, the quality -- of the candidate's
7. community and wider-university service, including service to an academic
8. profession (or professions);
9. the views of external referees;
10. the views of departmental faculty -- including, if it so wishes, non-
11. departmental University of Pittsburgh faculty;
12. the views of graduate students.

The report should briefly indicate the manner in which the SRC relates its own inspection of candidate-provided materials to non-SRC commentary upon the candidate.

The SRC’s Report should be submitted to the Departmental Chair who makes it available to the appropriate faculty subset, allowing a reasonable time for all concerned to read the report. The relevant group then meets in a Department Meeting. Following an oral introduction by the SRC Chairperson, the rank-above subset of the faculty discuss the case in detail and formulate a basis for making a final recommendation to the Dean, including any revisions of the Departmental Report. (In case of a decision not to recommend promotion to full professor, the group need not produce a final Departmental Report but the minutes should record the decision and its basis.)