

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION GUIDELINES  
FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW:  
COMMUNICATING PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN ANTHROPOLOGY

*Posted May 1, 2017*

**I. Background and Rationale**

Promotion and tenure committees at the departmental and institutional level are tasked with judging the scholarship of anthropologists undergoing review. Much of this scholarship follows established norms, which center on disciplinary and academic impact, and assume the greatest impact is achieved by publishing peer reviewed journal articles, monographs, and chapters in edited volumes. Increasingly, a significant vein of scholarship defies these traditional boundaries. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines to assist tenure and promotion committees in assessing the quality of new, public forms of anthropological scholarship that are not typically accounted for in existing guidelines. We define public scholarship as that which is in dialogue with non-academic as well as academic audiences, and that is informed by anthropological scholarship and knowledge. Public scholarship communicates the insights and value of anthropology beyond the academy.

The American Anthropological Association (AAA) has played a key role in providing guidelines for tenure and promotion committees that reflect important developments in theory, method, and practice in anthropology.<sup>1</sup> The Association has also been at the forefront of scholarly publishing and in recognizing the significance of and possibilities offered by technological innovation.<sup>2</sup> In the context of the growing importance of and demand for public anthropology, scholars today are encouraged to write for various publics/audiences, deploy alternative forms of communicating anthropology in non-traditional writing formats and by other means (video, radio, museum installations and other creative means), and take advantage of the opportunities that new communications tools allow. However, some tenure and promotion committees are unclear about how to recognize these new, public forms of scholarship and evaluate them for tenure and promotion purposes. The guidelines offered here help address that gap, and complement the existing AAA Guidelines on Practicing, Applied and Public Interest Anthropology and on Ethnographic Visual Media.

Scholarship is the production and dissemination of knowledge. Developments in new media and technology have created fresh opportunities for scholars to create and disseminate research findings and communicate knowledge. With theoretical advances and new methodological approaches, public anthropology is becoming a standard practice.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, colleges and universities increasingly require faculty to demonstrate their public engagement to inform broad

audiences on critical social issues and policy debates.<sup>4</sup> The result has been an exponential increase in the number of scholars developing and experimenting with innovative, accessible means of communicating knowledge, especially alternative writing strategies<sup>5</sup> and publishing in an ever-growing number of online venues.<sup>6</sup> Today, scholars, policy makers, students, community leaders, readers of serious nonfiction, and members of the larger public from around the world receive scholarly knowledge and information via blogs, Twitter feeds, department and individual web pages, print and online news outlets (articles and op-eds), and discipline-specific news outlets and open-source journals as well as from non-academic books of various genres. These media play an important and growing role in producing and disseminating anthropological knowledge; today they have an integral place in research outputs, course offerings, service, civic engagement, and leadership activities.

Anthropologists who engage in public forms of writing, publishing, and communicating anthropology make valuable scholarly contributions to the discipline. It is appropriate that these works be included on faculty and graduate student *curricula vitae*, as many already do. Yet many tenure and promotion review committees struggle to evaluate these outputs and give them appropriate credit in relation to tenure and promotion expectations. In response, AAA formed the Working Group on Writing and Publishing Forms<sup>7</sup> of the AAA Executive Board to assess the state of tenure and promotion expectations and to create the guidelines presented here. Among its activities, the Working Group consulted with a diverse group of twenty-two anthropologists representing the main subfields of anthropology and who hold faculty and/or administrative positions at US colleges and universities (see Appendix I). In their comments, the reviewers made special note of the importance and value of this project, and expressed appreciation for the conversations the guidelines will generate. The resulting guidelines represent an important step towards developing ways to evaluate new forms of producing and disseminating scholarship in anthropology.

We expect these guidelines will be useful to faculty, department chairs, deans, tenure and promotion committees, external reviewers, as well as traditional and nontraditional publishers, editors, and curators looking to support the creative production and dissemination of anthropological content. Specifically, the guidelines may help:

- **Faculty members on the tenure stream:** Use this document as a guideline to understand what is considered and what could be considered scholarship. Bring this document to your chair to see how it matches departmental guidelines. If no guidelines exist, inquire about best practices in the department.

- **The Department:** Review your guidelines to see how public forms of scholarship reflect AAA guidelines. Be explicit about why certain forms of scholarship “count” or do not count. Consider citing or attaching AAA guidelines to a candidate’s dossier for promotion so it is clear how the departmental guidelines are in line with the discipline’s major professional organization.
- **Promotion and Tenure Committees:** Consider how the department and AAA value public forms of scholarship. Consider the impact of these forms on the university community, local communities, and global communities.
- **External Review letter writers:** Does the department or university provide scholarship assessment guidelines? If not, be aware of the AAA’s position on evaluating public forms of communicating, writing and publishing as you write your letter of support. Does the candidate highlight these forms of scholarship on their CV? If so, describe the value of public anthropology and cite these guidelines.

## II. Knowledge Production: Aims and Purposes

There are four areas of knowledge production to which scholarship should contribute, according to a report of the Carnegie Foundation.<sup>8</sup> We have adapted the four areas to apply to anthropology and the inquiries central to our discipline as follows:

1. **The scholarship of discovery: new ways of knowing.** This scholarship encourages anthropologists to address a range of human differences and global issues in their research and writing. This research makes new contributions to the questions anthropologists ask about human experiences, and troubles traditional ways of knowing in the discipline.
2. **The scholarship of integration: cross- and inter- disciplinarity.** This scholarship seeks to connect discourses and debates within and across various disciplines and cultures in order to understand the ways humans learn, give meaning and perspective to facts, and bring new insights to multiple bodies of knowledge. This research includes writing and publications that investigate the various standpoints on which multiple forms of knowledge are constructed, and lead to the creation of new and remixed methodologies.
3. **The scholarship of application: connections to everyday life and social structures.** This scholarship is explicitly action-oriented. It seeks to provide solutions to social problems; offer new models for activism, organizational structures, community building, or modes of dialogue; can enhance public policy analysis and mainstream debates on popular issues.

- 4. The scholarship of teaching: anthropological pedagogy.** This scholarship critically engages and reimagines pedagogical theory and practice, and the ways we teach anthropology both inside and outside the academy.

Identifying the aims and purposes of disciplinary knowledge production is useful as departments and universities consider how to assess new, public forms of scholarship as well as the traditional forms.

### **III. Tenure and Promotion Guidelines: Scholarship Assessed**

In order to get a sense of what counts and what does not in tenure and promotion in anthropology today—especially in terms of public scholarship—the Working Group gathered data on existing guidelines from a convenience sample of twenty-six U.S. institutions.<sup>9</sup> The findings suggest there are no agreed-upon standards for assessing scholarship, which is consistent with earlier research on the topic (Boyer 1996). Specific findings are detailed in Appendix II.

Over half (14 of 26) of the institutions we examined consider public scholarship, digital publications, and non-peer reviewed writing as having either some or great value. These institutions value public scholarship and alternative forms of writing in diverse ways in their tenure and promotion guidelines.

They also make clear that new and alternative forms of communicating, writing, and publishing do not replace traditional forms of scholarship, such as monographs and peer-reviewed journal articles.

The following is an overview of notable departmental practices in acknowledging and evaluating new forms of public scholarship among these institutions:

- 1. *Forms of scholarship*** Some departments give examples of public scholarship; most but not all reference alternative writing and publishing forms. Departmental categories of public scholarship are often generated in response to the actual activities of their faculty. A possible list of activities that qualify is thus always growing in response to community need, new digital technologies, and faculty energies and commitments. A non-exhaustive list of possible forms includes:
  - digital scholarly communication such as blogs, electronic essays or exhibits, web portals or gateways, online bibliographies;

- refereed and non-refereed open access and/or online-only journals;
- textbooks;
- refereed and non-refereed books for broader audiences, including creative nonfiction, fiction and graphic novels;
- articles published in the popular press (with national and international circulation);
- books translated into another language;
- books in languages other than English;
- book and film reviews;
- creative performance (e.g., verbal, musical, theatrical, dance), exhibits or installations;
- ethnographic or documentary photography, and film or video produced or directed;
- museum installations and curation;
- substantive and/or published reports from funded research;
- substantial reports from designers, directors, or administrators of community projects involving multiple sites and a significant period of time;
- reports for professional organizations that receive national or international distribution;
- public talks to community groups;
- public pedagogical work; and
- edited collection of syllabi with critical framing and structure.

2. ***The means of evaluation.*** These institutions use both qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate new forms of communicating, writing and publishing. Qualitative categories of assessment include evaluating if the work:

- supports and furthers the department's mission and vision;
- promotes the reputation of the university;
- highlights the profile/reputation of the scholar;
- develops students' capacities as engaged learners and citizens;
- contributes to public dialogues in local, national, and international media; and
- contributes to the public good.

In addition, works are evaluated in terms of the:

- quality of the writing and research;
- quality, reputation, and distribution of the publication site;
- number and scope of research reports; and
- significance of the research and inquiry to one's field.

Quantitative assessments were fewer in number than qualitative assessments, and include:

- Applying quantitative values to all teaching, service, and research/scholarship labor, giving points to each publication and creative work, and placing the cumulative value in a formula the department agreed upon.
- Counting number of words published, with minimum requirements by position rank and that includes traditional and alternative forms of writing (e.g., 25,000 for Associate; 50,000 for Professor).
- Considering such quantitative indicators as unique page views for digital scholarship that appear in blogs, electronic essays or exhibits, web portals or gateways, or online bibliographies.

There is pronounced variability in the way these forms of scholarship are described and discussed in the guidelines. The following is an excerpt from the guidelines of a Research 1 institution in which public scholarship is valued near or equal to traditional scholarship:

Digital technologies are reshaping every profession. Digital technologies shape not only how we communicate new knowledge, but also how we perceive and develop knowledge in the first place. Since digital technologies influence every aspect of professional life, including research, teaching, and service, the Department of Anthropology should regularly evaluate this changing landscape. Candidates for promotion or tenure should help articulate the nature and reception of their digital work [...] Faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on these grounds.

-- Anthropology Department, Research1 Public University

The following is an excerpt from a college that includes public anthropology in its tenure and promotion guidelines but classifies it at a lower tier of research or as a form of community service:

These contributions are valued as important to the field and community, and we encourage this important translation of our work. Such works are considered important *supplements* [their emphasis] to intellectual independence, impact, and productivity but do not hold the same value as peer-reviewed scholarship and are considered secondary indicators of impact.

-- Anthropology Department, Undergraduate-focused Private College

Overall, the findings suggest there is movement towards favorably evaluating new forms of producing and disseminating scholarship, and affirm there is need for tenure and promotion guidelines that can be adopted or adapted by anthropology departments in any institution type. Appendix III offers examples of specific ways some universities evaluate scholarship that includes traditional and new forms as well as links to a sample of tenure and promotion guidelines that are available online.

#### **IV. New Technologies in Facilitating Public Scholarship**

Public scholarship contributes to scholarly production and dissemination, and to the visibility and growth of anthropology for both individual practitioners and the discipline at large (see forms of public scholarship in Section III-1, above). New digital technologies facilitate the contributions of public scholarship in four specific domains:

- 1. *Disseminating anthropological research.*** Digital technologies enable scholars to get their work out into the world in a manner, reach, and speed not previously possible. Many online anthropological sites are open access, and thus available to readers throughout the world for free. As a result, anthropological research and writings now reach more people than ever before. This increases knowledge of individual research projects and results as well as in international awareness of anthropology as a discipline, of what it is anthropologists do, and how our insights and analyses matter in today's world.
- 2. *Reaching new audiences.*** Writing and publishing on social media, blogs, association websites, e-books and other digital platforms such as podcasts grow new audiences for anthropology and help us reach longstanding audiences in new, effective ways. In addition to encouraging dialogue with other anthropologists and the communities in and with whom we do our research, digital technologies can help scholars reach new audiences for their research including activists, journalists, and policy makers.
- 3. *Building community, creating opportunities.*** New forms of online writing and publishing can be instrumental in connecting community members to scholars as well as helping scholars be accountable to communities where they work and about which they write. Digital technologies also link scholars to colleagues around the world thus creating possibilities for collaboration, for the generation of new research projects, and for feedback on one's work. Short-form online essays also often plant the initial seeds for organizing conference panels, for invitations for guest lectures, and for peer-reviewed articles.

- 4. *Transforming anthropological practice.*** The communicative power of digital technologies is transformative. Digital mediums and the ability to use audio, photo, radio, and video in our work changes what we communicate as well to whom. Our understanding of ethnographic space shifts as we share online platforms with colleagues and community members for both research and everyday life. And, perhaps most critically, digital technologies have enabled a new responsiveness within the discipline. We can now bring anthropological knowledge and insights to bear on events as they unfold, responding in the current moment (in addition to our peer-reviewed analyses of these events that will follow anywhere from one year to a decade later). Such in-the-moment contributions rest on anthropologically informed scholarship, enabling us to demonstrate both the rigor and the relevance of anthropology in a time of need.

## **V. Conclusion and Recommendations**

Anthropological scholarship in the twenty-first century has expanded in ways that require new ways of assessing and evaluating these new forms of producing and disseminating scholarship in anthropology, especially for purposes of tenure and promotion. The American Anthropological Association acknowledges the importance of these new, public forms of peer-reviewed, editor-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed scholarship, as well as the ways they add to and complement traditional peer-reviewed publication of articles and books. AAA recommends that departmental and college/university tenure and promotion committees review their existing guidelines with the following considerations:

- 1. *Acknowledge the value of public forms of communicating, writing and publishing as scholarship.*** Some of this scholarship involves experimentation and risk-taking or requires rapid responsiveness. Some of this work is crucial in terms of community and public engagement, and in numerous instances it includes scholarship that blurs boundaries between research, teaching, and service. We encourage departments to familiarize themselves with this new ecology of writing and publishing.
- 2. *Articulate what counts for excellence in anthropological scholarship, as well as expectations for communicating research with different publics, including the community of one's scholarship (where relevant and appropriate).*** Questions to ask include: In terms of design, content, and reach, what is the nature of scholarship under consideration? How does this work contribute to the profile of the scholar, the department, institution, and discipline? How should faculty categorize the various publication forms and scholarship activities on their CVs?

3. ***Develop approaches for assessing quality and impact of public forms of scholarly communication.*** These may be both quantitative (metrics, such as unique site visits, page views, citations, etc.) as well as qualitative (author reports on responses, faculty assessment of the publication venue; peer reviews of individual works or of a portfolio of work), and include considerations such as invitation-only publications. In addition, it may be crucial to evaluate online scholarship in its characteristic digital format rather than in one-dimensional print form.
4. ***Seek out qualified reviewers for public scholarship, as necessary.*** One source of qualified reviewers is the [AAA Resource Panel for External Tenure and Promotion Review and External Program Review](#), comprised of individuals with the expertise and knowledge to evaluate the accomplishments and contributions of practicing, applied, and public interest anthropological scholarship, and of the academic programs in applied, practicing, and publically engaged departments (created by the CoPAPIA). In some cases, seeking letters from external communities and individuals might be an important supplement to the traditional outside academic reviewers (e.g., members of Tribal Councils, community organizations, government representations, etc.).
5. ***Connect with other departments on campus in order to create institutional guidelines for valuing public forms of writing and scholarship, and assessing their impact.*** The [National Science Foundation's guidelines](#) would be useful for creating university standards for assessing the impact of writing, scholarship, and research-based activities. Once universities decide how to value and assess this work, institutions could detail how these forms of writing and scholarship will be evaluated during formal processes such as annual and mid-tenure reviews, or in offer letters that describe expectations of hired faculty members.
6. ***Engage a full reassessment of tenure and promotion requirements to ensure a fair balance of expectations across all forms of academic work.*** In the broad ecology of expectations, the new forms of communicating anthropology cannot become additive to traditional responsibilities but requires a new balance of weights across publishing, teaching, service and leadership.

## **Appendix I**

This document was reviewed by a diverse group of 22 anthropologists representing a range of institutions, from Research 1 universities to liberal arts colleges. The following table provides a description of reviewers by their title, position type and subspecialty in anthropology

<b>Title</b>	<b>Position Type</b>	<b>Subdiscipline</b>
<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Applied/Practicing</b>
<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Applied/Practicing</b>
<b>Dean</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Applied/Practicing</b>
<b>Professor emeritus</b>	<b>Faculty and Past Admin</b>	<b>Applied/Practicing</b>
<b>Executive/nonprofit organization</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Applied/Practicing</b>
<b>Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>
<b>Professor, and former Dean</b>	<b>Faculty and Past Admin</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>
<b>Professor and Director, MS Campus Archaeology Program</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>
<b>Associate Professor and Department Chair</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Biological Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Biological Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor &amp; Department Chair</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Biological Anthropology</b>
<b>Associate Dean, Professor</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor and Associate Dean for Global Strategy and Programs</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor and Dean, School of Social Work</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor and past Dean, Social and Behavioral Sciences, past Dean, International Studies</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor and past Dean of Academic Affairs</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Cultural Anthropology</b>
<b>Distinguished Professor emeritus</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Linguistic Anthropology</b>
<b>Associate Professor and Director, Interdepartmental Program in Linguistics</b>	<b>Admin and Faculty</b>	<b>Linguistic Anthropology</b>
<b>Academic Relations/non profit organization</b>	<b>Practicing Anthropologist</b>	<b>Linguistic Anthropology</b>
<b>Professor</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Linguistic Anthropology</b>

## Appendix II

We assessed guidelines from 26 institutions of higher learning in the United States, which is not a representative sample of the country’s colleges and universities (Table 1).

<b>Institution Classification*</b>	<b>Total from sample</b>
Public institution	18
Private institution	8
Research 1 University	12
Research 2 University	3
Research 3 University	1
Master’s 1 Colleges and Universities	2
Master’s 2 Colleges and Universities	4
Baccalaureate Colleges (Liberal Arts & Sciences)	3
Total	26

\* As per the [Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education](#)

The Working Group found pronounced variability in tenure and promotion guidelines overall. For the twenty-six mix of public and private institutions whose guidelines we examined, some are very specific, detailed and elaborated, while others are vague and general, and some give weight to certain forms of scholarship over other forms, while others provide few or no weights.

Nevertheless, some patterns do emerge from the information we gathered, namely: 1) the practice of written tenure and promotion guidelines is not universal across the sample, whether university-wide, college-wide or department-specific; 2) the practice of university-wide guidelines is more common than anthropology department-specific tenure and promotion guidelines; and 3) type of institution by classification (e.g., a Research 1 university or a liberal arts college) does not predict correspondence in how scholarship is assessed; variation prevails within each type of institution. The data do suggest that public institutions and those focused on undergraduate learning seem more likely to value public scholarship than other institutions, a finding that would need to be substantiated with further research.

The following summarizes key findings regarding the ways in which public anthropology is assessed—or not—by the twenty-six institutions in our sample. We coded the twenty-six sets of tenure and promotion guidelines into three categories as they relate to public scholarship: None, Included, and Normative. “None” are those institutions that make no mention of including public scholarship (ten). “Included” are those institutions in which public anthropology is included in

the guidelines but classified at a lower tier of research or as a form of community service (nine). “Normative” are those institutions in which public scholarship is at a tier near or of equal value to traditional scholarship (five).

As Table 2 indicates, the five institutions in which public scholarship is at a tier near or of equal value to traditional scholarship are R1 institutions; given the small sample size, we do not conclude that R1 institutions are more likely to value public scholarship. For fourteen of the twenty-six, public scholarship is either included or is normative for tenure and promotion. The ten institutions that do not mention public scholarship range across the spectrum of institution type.

<b>Institution Classification</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Included</b>	<b>Normative</b>
R1	3	3	5
R2	2	1	0
R3	1	0	0
M1	1	1	0
M2	1	3	0
Baccalaureate	2	1	0
Total (n = 26)	10	9	5

Language used in the guidelines by the “included” and “normative” institutions reveals how departments and universities understand public scholarship and its growing importance; for example, some explicitly name digital writing, including blogs and public lectures as important forms of creative and intellectual work. Several of the public institutions consider public scholarship a reflection of their core values.

### **Appendix III**

#### **1. Sample A: Research 1 public university, 22,000 students**

<b>Scholarly Product</b>	<b>Per Capita Value</b>
Single-authored book, submitted	2.0
Single-authored book, in press/accepted	2.5
Single-authored book, appeared	5.0
Single-authored book, re-published	2.0
Edited collection, submitted	.5
Edited collection, in press/accepted	.75
Edited collection, appeared	2.0
Edited collection, re-published	1.0
Peer-reviewed article, essay, introduction, or chapter, submitted	.25
Peer-reviewed article, essay, introduction, or chapter, accepted	.5
Peer-reviewed full-length journal research article, appeared	1.0
Peer-reviewed other journal article or essay, appeared	.75
Peer-reviewed introduction or book chapter, appeared	.75
Peer-reviewed paper, re-published, appeared	.5
Non-peer-reviewed publication (book review, blog post, journal comment, news item, introductory note, etc.), appeared	.25
Exceptional high-impact non-peer-review publication, appeared <sup>1</sup>	.6
Conference plenary, keynote, or departmental invited lecture	.5
Conference or colloquium presentation	.25
Conference discussant or workshop presentation	.15
Conference or panel organizer	.25
Book prize or award for research: external	5.0
Book prize or award for research: internal	2.5

**2. Sample B: An urban public institution, 15,000 students**

<b>Scholarly Product</b>	<b>Per Capita Value</b>
Book, authored	2
Book, edited	2
Book, chapter	1
Book, Preface	0.2
Conference pre-published	1
Conference pre-other	0.2
Journal article, peer-reviewed	1
Newspaper/magazine article	0.2
Lecture, invited	0.2
Review/Commentary/Blogging	0.2
Art Exhibit/Play Produced/ Music Published/Direction, Design	0.5

**3. Sample C: Examples of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (a sampling of what is available online)**

[Indiana University-Bloomington](#)

[Lafayette College](#)

[University of Memphis](#)

[University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill](#)

## **References**

American Folklore Society. AFS Position Statement on Promotion and Tenure Standards and Review. <http://www.afsnet.org/?page=PromotionTenure>

American Historical Association. [Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship in History](#), 2015.

American Sociological Association. [What Counts? Evaluating Public Communication in Tenure and Promotion](#), 2016.

Bartanen, Kristine M. "Digital scholarship and the tenure and promotion process." *The Academic Commons* (2014).

Bennett, Linda A. and Sunil, K. Khanna 2010 A Review of Tenure and Promotion in Applied, Practicing, and Public Interest Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 112(4):648-650.

Boyer, Ernest L. "From scholarship reconsidered to scholarship assessed." *Quest* 48, no. 2 (1996): 129-139.

Flaherty, Colleen. [Is Collaboration Worth It?](#) *Inside Higher Ed*. January 6 (2017). Accessed January 6, 2017.

Foster, Brian L. The Changing World of Higher Education. *Practicing Anthropology*. Vol 39 No. 2, Spring (2017): 2-4.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, Gene I. Maeroff, and E. L. Boyer. *Scholarship assessed*. Vol. 9. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Indiana University School of Education. [Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education](#), 2017. Accessed April 8, 2017.

Lende, Daniel. [Digital Anthropology: Projects and Platforms](#), 2011.

Linguistic Society of America. Resolution Recognizing Scholarly Merit of Language Documentation. 2011. <http://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/resolution-recognizing-scholarly-merit-language-documentation>

- McCall, Leslie et al. [What Counts? Evaluating Public Communication in Tenure and Promotion](#). American Sociological Association. August (2016).
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship: Promotion and tenure (pp. 271-294). In Fitzgerald, H. Burack, C. & Seifer, S. (eds). *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship*, Volume I: Institutional Change, 2010. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 2005. 46(5), 479-510.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Rice, R. Eugene, eds. Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship, 2005. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pryse, Marjorie. [Defining Women's Studies Scholarship](#). National Women's Studies Association Task Force. June (1999).
- Saltmarsh, John, John Wooding and Kat McLellan. [The Challenges of Rewarding New Forms of Scholarship. Creating Academic Cultures that Support Community-engaged Scholarship](#). Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2014
- Sandmann, Lorilee, John Saltmarsh and KerryAnn O'Meara. Integrated Model for Advancing the Scholarship of Engagement: Creating Academic Homes for the Engaged Scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 2008. 12(1), 47-63.
- Stoller, Paul. [The Power of Public Scholarship](#). *The Huffington Post*. June 12 (2016).
- Walker, Leila. [Beyond Academic Twitter: Social Media and the Evolution of Scholarly Publication](#). Digital Pedagogy Lab. July 14 (2016).
- Wexler, Ellen. [Academics Discuss How Social Media Informs Their Scholarship](#). Inside Higher Ed. April 12 (2016).

---

<sup>1</sup> See AAA's online page: [Academic Tenure and Promotion Resources](#) for the [AAA Guidelines for Evaluating Scholarship in the Realm of Practicing, Applied, and Public Interest Anthropology for Academic Promotion and Tenure](#) produced by the Committee for Practicing, Applied and Public Interest Anthropology (CoPAPIA), and for the [AAA Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media](#) produced by the Society for Visual Anthropology (SVA)

<sup>2</sup> With more than 20 titles published in print and online, AAA is the largest single publisher of anthropological journals and was the leader among the social science and humanities disciplines in developing AnthroSource, a searchable, digital package of over 30 anthropology journals and other publications.

<sup>3</sup> With Margaret Mead the classic example, there is a long tradition in anthropology of producing public scholarship although the value of this work has not been widely appreciated or adequately recognized by the discipline or the academy. AAA has awarded an annual Anthropology in Media Prize for the last 30 years (since 1987) specifically to recognize the successful communication of anthropology to the general public through the media.

<sup>4</sup> As one reviewer of these guidelines notes, "Many granting agencies – at least in Europe and Canada – now *require* some kind of plan for "knowledge mobilization", that is, dissemination of research knowledge among relevant non-academic stakeholders, and often this is expected to harness new media and to be collaborative. Research involving indigenous groups in particular requires forms of knowledge production not traditionally recognized in tenure and promotion cases."

<sup>5</sup> For discussion of alternative writing strategies in anthropology, see for examples, [Alive in the Writing: Crafting Ethnography in the Company of Chekhov](#); [The Anthropologist as Writer](#); [Anthropology off the Shelf](#); [From Notes to Narrative: Writing Ethnographies that Everyone Can Read](#); [Savage Minds "Writers Workshop" Series](#).

<sup>6</sup> There are many examples, including [Allegra Lab](#); [Anthropology News](#); [Anthropology Now](#); [HuffPost Anthropology](#); [Peeps](#); [PopAnth](#); [Sapiens](#); [Savage Minds: Notes and Queries in Anthropology](#); [Somastosphere: Science, Medicine and Anthropology](#); the websites of different AAA sections, such as [Cultural Anthropology](#) and [Anthropology and Environment](#); and regular columns for such publications as *Forbes*, *New York Times*, *NPR*, *Science*, and *Scientific American*.

<sup>7</sup> Working Group members are Alisse Waterston, AAA President and Presidential Professor of Anthropology, John Jay College, City University of New York; Bianca Williams (Chair), Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Colorado Boulder; Kathryn B.H. Clancy, Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; Carole McGranahan, Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Colorado Boulder; and Alexandra Frankel, AAA staff. Elizabeth Chilton, Professor of Anthropology and Associate Chancellor for Research and Engagement, University of Massachusetts, Amherst serves as advisor.

---

<sup>8</sup> These four areas of knowledge production are drawn from guidelines recommended by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and implemented by various colleges and universities, such as in the Department Women's and Gender Studies, the College of New Jersey's "Disciplinary Standards for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion" (see Pryse 1998; Glassick et al 1997; Boyer 1990).

<sup>9</sup> Members of the Working Group emailed a convenience sample of approximately 40 colleagues at colleges and universities across the US requesting the tenure and promotion guidelines used by their departments and/or their college/university-wide personnel committee. It was beyond the scope and capabilities of and even appropriateness for the AAA working group to gather data on and develop guidelines for non-US institutions. Member associations of the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA) may find it useful and appropriate to undertake a similar endeavor; these guidelines would be accessible to download from the AAA website.