

Faculty Policy and Procedures  
on Promotion, Tenure, Merit, Annual and Post-Tenure  
Review, and Sabbatical Leave

*School of Architecture and Planning  
University of New Mexico*

**Adopted April 11, 2017 for implementation July 1, 2017**  
This document updates and supersedes the previous faculty policy  
dated **August 30, 2014**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **Part I. Policy on Promotion, Tenure, and Merit**

Part I sets out the School's policies regarding tenure, merit, promotion, and sabbatical leave.

|           |                                    |
|-----------|------------------------------------|
| Section A | Introduction                       |
| Section B | Categories of Evaluation           |
| Section C | Performance Criteria for Promotion |
| Section D | Annual Review and Merit            |

### **Part II. Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty, Department Chairs, the Dean, Committees, and Staff**

Part II describes the roles and responsibilities for tenure, annual merit reviews, mentoring, and sabbatical leave. Each section lists the responsibilities and tasks for individuals, school administrators, committees, and staff.

|           |                              |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| Section A | Individual Faculty Members   |
| Section B | Department Chairs            |
| Section C | The Dean                     |
| Section D | Program Personnel Committees |
| Section E | School Personnel Committee   |
| Section F | Staff                        |

### **Part III. Procedures**

Part III sets down the procedures for conducting annual faculty reviews; merit assessment, tenure and promotion reviews, and sabbatical leave applications.

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Section A | Annual Faculty Review and Merit Assessment |
| Section B | Documentation for Tenure and Promotion     |
| Section C | Initiation of Promotion                    |
| Section D | Tenure and Promotion Review                |
| Section E | Sabbatical Leave                           |

# Part I

## Policy on Promotion, Tenure, and Merit

Part I sets out the School's policies regarding tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave.

### **SECTION A: INTRODUCTION**

#### **1. Mission of the School of Architecture and Planning**

*"The School's mission is to provide an excellent educational experience that is enabling and inspired by a solid base of scholarship, research and professional practice.*

*The underlying academic philosophy of the School is keyed to three primary objectives: to elevate the aesthetic, ethical and theoretical foundations of our professions; to understand the significance of ecological and social conditions in planning and design decisions; and to be responsive to the culture and history of New Mexico and the region.*

*The faculty of the School is committed to increasing public awareness of the importance of the natural and built environment and the relationship of design to societal needs and aspirations."*

—School of Architecture and Planning Mission Statement, 2010

#### **2. Purpose of this Document**

The purpose of the School of Architecture and Planning's *Faculty Policy on Promotion, Tenure, Merit, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, and Sabbatical Leave* is to establish clearly defined criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation and advancement.

The School of Architecture and Planning offers accredited professional degrees in architecture and planning as well as undergraduate programs in architecture, and environmental planning and design. Promotion and tenure are awarded in recognition of demonstrated academic and professional achievement, which contributes to the mission of the School and the University and fulfills the requirements and expectations of professional education.

This policy on promotion, tenure, and merit:

- Supplements and clarifies the criteria for tenure and promotion defined in the University Faculty Handbook and supplemental advancement guidelines issued from time to time by the Office of the Provost;
- Focuses on the special opportunities and obligations that accredited professional education requires;
- Sets forth administrative procedures and information sources for reviewing and awarding tenure and promotion and for assessing merit;
- Provides a guide to faculty members seeking tenure and promotion; and
- Establishes procedures for the annual review and evaluation of all School of Architecture and Planning faculty members.

### **3. Applicability**

This document applies to internal School policies and those mandated by the University. University-related policies include:

- Mid-probationary tenure reviews and final tenure evaluations (Code 6);
- Promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty (*UNM Faculty Handbook Section B2*); lecturers (*UNM Faculty Handbook Section C190*); and
- Annual faculty evaluation.

Internal School policies pertain to:

- Appointment and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty; and
- Merit evaluation and compensation of all faculty.

While it is the policy of the School to support and encourage the professional development of its faculty, it is imperative that individuals manage their own professional careers and demonstrate their capabilities to peers. Candidates for tenure, promotion and advancement are responsible for demonstrating their qualifications.

## **SECTION B: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**

### **1. Categories of Evaluation**

While a person's entire career is considered in any tenure and promotion decision, the emphasis for tenure evaluation will be on work, engagement, accomplishments and recognition since being hired in the School; and emphasis for promotion evaluation on work, engagement, accomplishments and recognition since appointment to current rank. The School recognizes distinct categories for evaluating faculty performance, and different emphases among the categories for lecturers and tenure track faculty. Listed in order of importance they are:

- Teaching;
- Creative research, scholarship, and professional work;
- Service to the School, the University, the profession and the community; and
- Leadership and character.

The School of Architecture and Planning is first and foremost an educational community with a primary responsibility to provide a high quality educational program. Faculty at all ranks and for all types of appointments should aspire to teaching excellence.

Creative research, scholarship, and professional work are also essential to the School. These activities enrich teaching, contribute new knowledge, enhance understanding, and generate resources for the School and the University. It is central to the educational mission of the School that its faculty stays current with their discipline, works to have a social or community impact, and grows professionally.

Service, particularly to the School and the University, is expected as part of a normal faculty workload. The School of Architecture and Planning is small and it is essential for all of the faculty to share administrative, governance and service responsibilities. Service to the profession or community is an activity, which may be considered in the evaluation process as either service, teaching or scholarship, depending on its content and impact.

Leadership and character that contribute to academic and professional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members as appropriate to rank and personal maturity. Faculty leadership is an important quality for promotion and tenure.

#### a. Teaching

Teaching the disciplines of architecture, planning, and landscape architecture is the central mission of the School of Architecture and Planning. Each individual brings a unique blend of experience, knowledge, pedagogical philosophy, and personality to teaching. Faculty members *at all ranks (including Lecturer III, tenure-track and tenured faculty members)* are expected to develop their individual competence within the context of the School's programs and to demonstrate excellence in the area of the curriculum for which they have responsibility.

Faculty members must perform competently in the classroom, exhibiting knowledge of their subject, skill at presenting information, sensitivity to student needs and high standards for student work. Teaching in the School should promote the discovery, integration and application of knowledge. The teacher is expected to demonstrate proficiency in course management by establishing and attaining clear and appropriate course objectives.

Faculty must keep abreast of developments in their fields and bring this knowledge to their teaching. The breadth of problems addressed by architecture, planning, landscape architecture, and environmental design places a responsibility on teachers to understand and communicate to students how areas of specialization relate to a broader context. The teacher should establish a climate of intellectual curiosity, inquiry, accountability and creativity, to assist students in developing their skills of analysis and synthesis while encouraging them to work independently, creatively, and responsibly.

Improvement and growth of teaching performance is expected for faculty advancement in the School. While performance may vary from semester to semester, demonstrated quality of work is required over the period of evaluation.

Evaluation of teaching performance must carefully consider the teacher's objectives, priorities, and criteria for student evaluation, as well as assessments by others (faculty, students, and professional) of the courses taught. The School respects and supports excellence in the use of multiple pedagogic approaches, including studio, seminar, and service learning. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to articulate personal teaching goals, priorities, and criteria and to provide evidence of teaching performance suitable for peer evaluation. Teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by a number of methods including strong student evaluations, high quality student work, and, in the case of service learning, assessments from community partners. Teaching improvement and growth may be demonstrated by the development of new courses or course material, the initiation of new teaching methods, and positive peer evaluation.

## **Evidence of Performance in Teaching**

While the candidate's Tenure and Promotion file will contain items demonstrating teaching ability, such as course evaluation results and course syllabi, other forms of recognition and accomplishment in teaching should be noted in a separate section of the Curriculum Vitae, including such recognition as:

- Awards for teaching;
- Awards to students for work accomplished under the candidate's direction;
- Development of a print publication or website disseminating the results of student research
- Acceptance or adoption by an official body or community organization of student work accomplished under the candidate's direction;
- Membership on panels or committees reviewing proposals for teaching grants;
- Membership on visiting accreditation teams reviewing programs at other universities;
- Development of on-line course materials and adaptation of curriculums for electronic delivery within UNM (Those for distribution outside the university should be listed under research, scholarship and creative work.);
- Direct participation in the development of a major revamping of a curriculum; and
- Development of new courses

### b.Creative Research, Scholarship, and Professional Work

Creative faculty research, scholarship, and professional work are vital to the School of Architecture and Planning. These activities fulfill three important objectives: they inform and vitalize teaching; they contribute to knowledge and understanding within a discipline: and they contribute to the professional growth of the individual.

Informing and vitalizing teaching is essential to the educational mission of the School. All faculty members have a responsibility to stay current with developments in their area of expertise. Professional and intellectual growth ensures that students receive 'state of the art' instruction in the classroom. Contributing to knowledge and understanding within a discipline is more difficult. However, assessment at any level must demonstrate understanding and the potential for contribution of knowledge. Contributing to the professional growth of the individual faculty member is also crucial to the vitality of the institution and the individual. Intellectual and creative growth is an essential cornerstone of a university faculty.

Creative professional work, scholarship, community engaged practice and research—whether qualitative or quantitative, theoretical or applied—are all valid means to demonstrate competence and growth. The ultimate objective for evaluating the quantity and quality of these components is generation of new knowledge and practices that are of use in the classroom, to our professions, to local and global communities, and for the benefit of the environment. Quality is given a higher priority than quantity. It is required that faculty members develop a body of work sufficient to demonstrate intellectual and professional focus and growth.

## **Research**

Research is a systematic investigation or diligent inquiry seeking to establish facts or principles that contribute to professional practice and/or knowledge in a field. The basic evaluation of research must consider whether it is significant, well-conceived and developed, and appropriately disseminated. Research or creative work it is expected to inform teaching, generate and disseminate knowledge, and enhance professional growth.

Funded research consists of all research that is sponsored and supported by peer-reviewed grants awarded either internally by the university or externally by local, regional, national or international funding agencies. Faculty Curriculum Vitae describe the following characteristics of funded research: research project title, funding period, faculty member's role (PI, Co-PI, etc.), total dollar amount (including contracts and in-kind donations), amount granted to the faculty member, and funding agency. [SEP]

### **Scholarship**

Scholarship is the pursuit of knowledge and understanding through the study of the existing literature. Scholarship often involves the analysis and synthesis of existing research and is particularly appropriate for improving the knowledge base required for teaching a subject. Community engaged scholarship seeks to enhance the well-being of local communities, and to create new knowledge that informs a broader understanding of practice-based evidence. Scholarship may be demonstrated by independent studies, academic works, articles, professional reports, publically adopted processes, lectures, conferences, exhibits, etc.

### **Professional Work**

Creative professional work includes a range of activities that demonstrate a faculty member's intellectual, professional, and creative competence and growth. This work is viewed by the faculty of the School as an important ingredient of our professional programs. Work may include commissions, design competitions, conceptual work, practice and professional reports, studies, investigations, grants, and the development of methodology. The primary consideration for evaluation of professional work is the quality of the product and its contribution to the faculty member's body of work and/or its contribution to the program for work completed in collaboration with others, such as a team project, a clear recognition of the faculty member's specific contribution must be documented.

#### c. Dissemination of Research, Scholarship and Creative Professional Work

Dissemination for peer review is fundamental to faculty research, scholarship, and creative professional work. The rigor of the review and the selection of peer referees must be commensurate with the level of advancement sought. Dissemination must meet a simple test: is the work presented to a qualified group of academic, professional, or community peers in a manner that is appropriate to the work and has it received rigorous critical evaluation? Dissemination may take many forms depending on the nature of the work. In some cases, such as published research, broad dissemination is integral to the work itself. In others, such as a constructed architectural or landscape architectural design, or practice-based evidence disseminated within the profession or community, the candidate may need to build the

case for the relationship of the dissemination process to peer review.

The format and medium of dissemination will vary according to the nature of the work. The categories are described below in order of priority.

### **Rigorous juried or peer review processes**

The highest level of evaluation is that which provides peer recognition of the quality of research, scholarship, or creative professional work through rigorous juried or peer review processes. Achievements may include:

- Awards, honors, or formal professional recognition;
- Publication of juried, reviewed books, or book chapters;
- Juried major works in other digital, non-print media in the field;
- Juried publication or exhibition in recognized refereed print journals, exhibitions, or other recognized non-print media, including on-line venues;
- Awards or recognition in design competitions and/or professional work;
- Published critical reviews of the candidate's work in recognized journals
- Authorship of adopted plans or professional projects; Formal recognition of authored analysis or practice by professional associations, governmental agencies, or established community organizations; and Completion of research funded through a competitive granting process by national agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment of the Arts, National Endowment of the Humanities, or the Graham Foundation.

**Peer evaluation and recognition with less formal review** The second level of evaluation includes dissemination with less rigorous review, providing the opportunity for peer evaluation and recognition. Dissemination may include:

- Papers or creative work published in conference proceedings;
- Presentation of work to scholarly or professional conferences;
- Reports, plans and professional projects disseminated to community audiences;
- Publication of books, articles, designs, or planning projects in non-juried publications, either print or digital;
- Invited lectures;
- Exhibitions and publication of creative or professional work; Completion of research funded through a competitive granting process by a local or regional agency or foundation;
- Development of a website disseminating research result;
- Blogging on a recognized website, and
- The construction of an architectural or landscape architecture design

### **Other dissemination and recognition**

The third level includes work that is neither juried nor broadly disseminated to a peer audience. It usually supplements other forms. This level usually requires solicited peer evaluation. Dissemination includes:

- Solicited peer evaluation of work;
- Client evaluation;
- Technique or product innovations in the field with supporting documentation;
- Research grant,
- Proposals, research reports, or manuscripts;



- Contribution to the development of public policies;
- Consultation resulting in a design, written evaluation or report;
- Design competition entries;
- Work submitted directly to qualified peers for evaluation; or
- Completion of research funded through a competitive granting process within UNM.

#### d.Service

The evaluation of service to the School, the University, the profession, and the community will be based on importance, appropriateness and individual contribution.

Important activities or responsibilities will be recognized in the evaluation. Service as an officer, committee chair, or active member of a national or regional organization; editor of a professional journal; or chair or member of a major university committee are examples of activities that demonstrate personal commitment and peer recognition of ability and leadership.

The appropriateness of the service contribution to the professional growth of the faculty member must also be considered. Time or effort in projects unrelated to the expertise or academic responsibilities of the candidate will not be given weight in evaluations.

The individual's personal contribution must be clearly described. This is particularly important for the evaluation of efforts that have involved group work.

#### **Service to the School and the University**

Faculty participation in the administration and governance in an academic setting is essential. Particularly in a small school such as the School of Architecture and Planning, service to the School and the University is expected as a part of a faculty member's normal workload. The degree of commitment and distribution between the School and the University will vary. Faculty members with appointments of half time or more are expected to participate in service activities in the School. Administrative or committee assignments that require substantial time commitment call for adjustment in other categories of evaluation. Faculty members will also be called upon to provide the University with service on committees, special events, the Faculty Senate, and other activities.

Pertinent service and leadership activities within the university may include membership on or chairing of regular and ad hoc committees; filling the role of Dean, Associate Dean, Department Chair or Associate Chair, Certificate Program or Center Director; organization of a conference at UNM; such fund-raising activities as donor cultivation and the securing of bequests and donations to School programs and endowments; etc.

#### **Service to the Profession and the Community**

The School of Architecture and Planning has an important obligation beyond its educational mission to serve the professions and the community at large. This area of service is valued and can demonstrate professional competence and development.

Appropriate service and leadership activities may include holding office in professional organizations; serving on a public or professional committees; advising or consulting with community organizations; public lectures; articles in the popular media; contribution to professional workshops; serving on award juries and on program accreditation teams at other universities; review of book manuscripts for publication and of tenure and promotions cases at other universities, etc.

#### e. Leadership and Character

Leadership and personal characteristics form a general category that is pertinent to the assessment of the evaluation categories. Leadership involves a faculty member's capability to influence the direction and quality of some activity, program, or field of endeavor. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate leadership in their area of responsibility and expertise, although expectations are higher for senior ranks than junior ranks.

Leadership may be demonstrated in many ways. A faculty member may influence the direction of a program, help restructure a curriculum, or define a School policy. Academic or professional leadership may be recognized through professional or scholastic awards, office in professional organizations, service on public panels, invitations to serve on symposia, etc.

Character includes those intangible but important traits of a faculty member's personality that contribute to their professional and academic effectiveness including intellectual breadth, maturity, vitality, compassion, honesty and ethical standards, and have the ability to work cooperatively while maintaining integrity of thought and action. Character is probably the most sensitive and difficult area to evaluate. Great care must be taken that personal feelings are not allowed to unjustly influence evaluations in this category.

Evaluation of leadership and character must acknowledge the basic principles of academic freedom. The School of Architecture and Planning supports civil debate that promotes diversity of thought and reject activities that obstruct it.

## **2. Weighting of the Categories of Evaluation**

The policy of the School of Architecture and Planning is to allow flexibility in each faculty member's categories of evaluation. This policy establishes percentage ranges required for evaluation in each category. These ranges represent evaluation weighting not workload assignment. The actual weighting for evaluation shall be determined jointly by the individual faculty member and the Department Chair.

#### a. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Evaluation of faculty members with tenure-track or tenured appointments requires acceptable performance in teaching; creative professional work, scholarship, or research; and in service to the School and the University. The balance of commitment will vary among individual faculty members as documented in the work load allocation in annual reviews, but a demonstrated contribution must be made in all categories.

The SAAP Faculty has established the following recommended ranges of the overall evaluation for each category during the period of evaluation for faculty members, who do not have a formal administrative title:

- Teaching: 30% -60%;
- Research, Scholarship and Creative Professional Work: 10% - 40%; and
- Service to the School and University: 5% -20%;
- Service to the Profession and the Community: 5%- 10%.

### Continuing Appointments: Lecturers

Lecturers on continuous appointments will have annual evaluations and promotion in rank reviews. Lectureships and adjunct positions do not lead to tenure. Lecturer III faculty may pursue promotion to Senior Lecturer after 5 years or Principal Lecturer after 11 years. The basic requirement for Lecturer promotions is to maintain high teaching standards and stay current in the field. Achievement in research, scholarship, or creative professional work, while welcomed and encouraged, is not required for advancement, however excellence in teaching is. Research scholarship, and creative work, and service focused on teaching may be considered as supplemental to the other evidence of excellence in teaching outlined below. The total workload must be comparable to that of tenure-track faculty.

Lecturers with appointments of half time or more are expected to contribute to the service needs of the School and/or the University.

Lecturers' workload shall be defined and documented annually by the Department Chair in consultation with the individual faculty member.

### b. Part-time Faculty

Part-time faculty are evaluated on teaching quality and service contribution. Teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for selection and merit consideration.

## **SECTION C: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

### **1. General Expectations**

The expectation for faculty performance is proportional to rank, and the criteria for evaluation are significantly more demanding at the senior ranks than the junior. A junior faculty member may advance by demonstrating progress and potential in teaching and research or creative work, whereas achievement and leadership are expected in the senior ranks.

### **2. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion**

The Faculty Handbook defines the University's criteria for appointment and promotion to the various ranks. The School's qualifications described below supplement the Handbook.

General Standards:

**Effectiveness in Teaching:** to demonstrate effectiveness, one should at a minimum:

- Demonstrate effective communication skills;
- Show evidence of strong preparation;
- Present material that reflects the current state of knowledge in the field;

- Demonstrate effective management skills;
- Organize individual topics into a meaningful sequence;
- Demonstrate an ability to interact with students in an encouraging and stimulating manner; and
- Demonstrate a commitment to the discipline.

**Excellence in Teaching:** to demonstrate excellence, one should have superior teaching evaluations, a clearly articulated pedagogy, have worked consistently to improve one's teaching, and be able to cite several of the forms of Recognition for Teaching (I.B.1.a above), which demonstrate independent recognition of the quality of one's teaching, and substantial contributions to the advancement of teaching in general or the development of new curriculum within the university.

**Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Professional Work** (in short research): to demonstrate effectiveness, one should have articulated a clear research agenda and the interrelationship between one's research and teaching, and be able to cite a sufficient number and quality of forms of dissemination of one's work at least the Peer Evaluation and Recognition with Less Rigorous Review level (I.B.1.c above) sufficient to have an established reputation within and outside the University in their fields of scholarly work.

**Excellence in Research, Scholarship, and Professional Work:** to demonstrate excellence, faculty must have a record of an on-going, productive research agenda, integrated with teaching that demonstrates significant contributions to his or her field through a substantial number and quality of dissemination and recognition of one's work at the Rigorous Juried or Peer Review level, and the other two levels (I.B.1.c above) sufficient to have established a national reputation.

**Standards By Rank:**

a.Instructor

Instructor rank is appropriate for teachers who have finished their professional education with little or no teaching or professional experience. Instructors are required to demonstrate basic competence in their field, intelligence, vitality, and the ability to learn.

b.Assistant Professor

Promotion or appointment to assistant professor is appropriate for faculty members who have demonstrated competence in the classroom and/or in their field of professional work. Teaching or professional experience is required. Accomplishment in research, creative work or community engagement may be limited, but there should be a record of endeavor and indication of potential. New hires at the Assistant Professor rank should clearly demonstrate the potential to attain tenure at the University of New Mexico.

c.Associate Professor

Promotion or appointment to the rank of associate professor requires demonstrated competence and accomplishment in all of the evaluation categories, and excellence in either teaching or research, scholarship and creative work. The faculty member is expected to be proficient in his or her subject areas and have a serious commitment to teaching. Teaching skills must be well developed as reflected in student evaluations, peer evaluations, student performance, course materials, and course development.

Research, creative activities or/ and community engagement are expected to reflect high levels of competence and creativity but not yet demonstrate the maturity, experience, and skill expected of senior faculty. Creative professional work should form a body of work that demonstrates competence and knowledge of current developments in the field. The quantity of research or creative work must be judged in the context of the faculty members work load history and assignments.

Service to the School and the University, as well as to the profession and the community, should constitute a constructive contribution.

Personal characteristics and the potential for leadership are important concerns. A candidate for associate professor should demonstrate maturity, integrity, and sensitivity in his or her relationships with others. There should be a clear indication of potential for leadership in academic, creative, or service activities.

#### d. Professor

Promotion to professor is based on the quality of achievement in all of the categories of evaluation and the demonstration of continued professional and intellectual growth.

The candidate must have achieved maturity and demonstrated excellence as a teacher. Peer recognition of leadership, and demonstrated contributions to the field are expected in research, scholarship, and creative activities. Research should evidence competent management, appropriate dissemination of results, and receive outstanding peer review. Creative and professional activities should be of excellent quality and serve as educational and professional models. A candidate for professorial rank is expected to have demonstrated a leadership role in service to the School and University as well as to the profession and/or the community (as outlined above under I.B.1.d, Service, and I.B.1.e, Leadership and Character).

The personal characteristics required for professional rank are similar to those for the associate professor except the candidate must demonstrate well-developed skills of leadership in both the academic and professional arenas. Experience and maturity should be evident in all aspects of academic and professional work.

#### e. Regents' Lecturers and Professors

Individuals who have demonstrated outstanding achievements and are nationally and internationally renowned for their creative research, scholarship and professional work may be considered for this faculty rank. Individuals who have demonstrated substantial accomplishments and contributions in research, scholarship and creative work, in teaching and/or in service may be considered for the faculty rank of Regents Professor.

### **Nomination and Review Process**

- Upon the availability of funding for either of these positions, the Dean issues a call for self-nominations.
- Only faculty in the rank of Professor may apply for the Regents' Professorship.

Faculty in the rank of continuous contract Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Assistant Professor, and Associate Professor may apply for the Regents' Lectureship.

- Administrators are not eligible to apply.
- Self nominations should include a) a self-nomination statement of no more than two pages, and 2) the applicant's curriculum vitae.
- The criteria to be addressed in the self-nomination statement for Regents' Professor are primarily research, scholarship and creative work, and secondarily teaching and service. The criteria, to be addressed in the self-nomination statement or Regents' Lecturer are teaching, service, and research, scholarship and creative work.
- The Dean will consult with the Department Chairs, who will review self-nominations for Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers and make recommendations to the Dean.
- The Dean makes the final selection within the School and forwards her or his recommendation to the Provost, who make the final selection.

#### f. Distinguished Professors

Individuals who have demonstrated outstanding achievements and are nationally and internationally renowned as scholars—including research, scholarship and creative work—may be considered for this faculty rank. This is the highest faculty title the University bestows and is used only for a few of its most prominent faculty members. Only full Professors may be nominated for Distinguished Professor, either initiated as a self-nomination or at the suggestion of another member of the School faculty, which requires the ascent of the person nominated.

Nomination submission requirements to initiate the review with the School include: a draft letter of nomination from the Director of the nominee's program, the nominee's Curriculum Vitae, and the completed Provost's Office nomination form. These additional items are added to the nomination file at subsequent steps in the review process: optional faculty evaluation letters, the program faculty vote tally added to the final Director's nomination letter, the advisory committee's report, a letter of support from the dean, and a minimum of eight external evaluation letters.

Each year that there are nominations, the Dean appoints an ad hoc, School-level advisory committee to vet cases, and make recommendations on whether or not each nomination should be supported by the Dean for advancement to the Provost's Office. This five member committee of full professors may include administrators and one full professor from another UNM college, when deemed necessary or desirable. Directors who are nominating a member of their program's faculty may not serve on the advisory committee.

If the Dean endorses a nomination to move forward, the candidate next submits a list of six to eight distinguished external reviewers who can assess the impact of the nominee's research, scholarship, or creative activities. Successful nominees have generally recruited reviewers from Carnegie R1: Highest Research Activity Universities. The Director develops additional potential reviewer names and solicits eight external review letters, up to half of which may come from the candidates list.

***Nomination and Review Schedule:*** Check the following School schedule against the Office of the Provost's Academic Affairs Calendars for Academic Departments, and for Deans and Directors for deadlines for current academic year, which occasionally change: <http://www.unm.edu/~acadaffr/academic-affairs-calendar.html>.

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| May 30       | Candidate or nominator makes intention known to Department Chair  |
| September 1  | Dean appoints Ad Hoc advisory committee. Initial nomination package available for faculty review  |
| September 25 | Program faculty discusses and takes a vote on each nominee.<br>Optional faculty review letters due to the Director  |
| October 1    | If there is a majority positive faculty vote, the Director sends final nomination letter, including faculty vote, to the Dean and to the Dean's advisory committee  |
| October 15   | Advisory committee's recommendation report to the Dean  |
| November 15  | Dean forwards all nominations she or he endorses to the Provost's Office. Director begins soliciting outside reviewers  |
| December 1   | Following Provost's Office certification of a completed nomination, Director send formal invitation letters, including UNM's standards and review process for Distinguished Professors, to external reviewers |
| February 15  | External review letters due   |
| March 7      | Complete nomination dossier to the Provost's Office<br>Provost's advisory committee reviews and makes recommendation.<br>Provost makes final decision   |

#### g. Research Faculty

The titles of research lecturer, research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor are appropriate for persons who are engaged primarily in research activities and have qualifications similar to those held by tenure-track faculty. They may occasionally teach or serve as members of thesis or dissertation committees. Research appointments are renewable annually for an unlimited time. The title of research scholar is used for visiting faculty whose primary function pertains to the exchange of specific laboratory or research skills with University researchers.

Research faculty appointments generally have extramural funding. Appointments are temporary in nature, and therefore, research faculty are not eligible to vote in the general faculty unless the faculty approves voting by the research professor. Such appointments are renewable annually and are non-probationary. In the event that a person with a research title is appointed to a faculty rank that can lead to tenure, the time served with a research title shall not count toward tenure. Research faculty shall prepare an annual self-evaluation using the School's Annual Review form, which is submitted to and reviewed by their supervisor.

#### h. Continuing Appointments: Lecturers

Faculty may be appointed to the position of Lecturer I, II, or III. These appointments are for professionals with appropriate academic qualifications, who are demonstrably competent

in the relevant areas of their disciplines. While not eligible for tenure, lecturers in each numerical class may hold the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer.

(a) Lecturer I—The title used for individuals who have qualifications equivalent to teaching assistants or graduate students and who are not currently graduate students at the University in the same department as their academic appointment.

(b) Lecturer II—The title used for qualified professionals who have completed all requirements except the dissertation for the terminal degree (or equivalent) in their fields of study and who are not currently graduate students at the University in the same department as their academic appointment. It may also be used for professionals who have the terminal degree but only limited experience in teaching or scholarly work, or for professionals who do not have the terminal degree but have extensive experience.

(c) Lecturer III—The title used for qualified professionals who hold the terminal degree (or equivalent) in their fields of study and who have additional experience in teaching and scholarly work.

Note: for the purposes of the discussion of Senior and Principal Lecturers below, the word, professional, pertains to the profession of teaching rather than to the professions of architect, planner or landscape architect.

#### i. Senior Lecturer

(a) Lecturers with at least five years of continuous service to the University at 0.5 FTE or greater who have demonstrated professional excellence and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills.

(b) Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Senior Lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the department, School or College, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions in their professional areas. The appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise.

#### ii. Principal Lecturer

(a) Senior Lecturers with at least eleven years of continuous service to the University at 0.5 FTE or greater who have sustained consistently high standards in their professional contributions, consistently demonstrated their wider service to the University community and its mission, and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills. It is expected that Principal Lecturers will continue to develop and mature with regard to their professional activities and leadership within the University.

(b) Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Principal Lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the department, School or College, and University that the individual has attained and will continue to sustain an overall profile of professional. (*UNM Faculty Handbook C190 A.2.b and A.3.b.*)

#### h. Professor of Practice

This title may be used to appoint individuals in the School of Architecture and Planning who have achieved distinction in practice, and who may benefit a professional program at the



university by the integration of professional practice with teaching. Professors of Practice are chosen by the professional degree programs in the School of Architecture and Planning with approval of the dean, and serve renewable terms of three years.

Specific titles will be granted with respect to the applicable professional program, "Professor of Practice in \_\_\_\_". Those holding these appointments will not have voting privileges except as described in Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Constitution. Professors of Practice are not eligible for tenure. As nominated by the program faculty, a candidate for the rank of Professor in Practice must have achieved maturity and demonstrated excellence as a teacher with the ability to provide strong academic leadership. Peer recognition of leadership and demonstrated contribution to the field is expected in practice and creative activities. The practice should evidence competent management, appropriate dissemination of results, and receive outstanding peer review. Creative professional activities should be of the highest quality and serve as educational and professional models.

The personal characteristics required for the Professor of Practice rank are similar to those for the associate professor except the candidate must demonstrate well-developed skills of leadership in professional arenas. Experience and maturity should be evident in all aspects of professional work.

The Department Chairs will use the School's "Form A" annual evaluation system in making annual reviews and recommending reappointment.

## ***SECTION D: ANNUAL REVIEW AND MERIT***

### **1. Annual Review Policy**

The Department Chair and the Dean shall conduct an annual review of every faculty member. This review shall provide feedback on all areas of faculty work and establish goals and priorities for the upcoming year. Procedures for the evaluation shall be established by the Department Chair in consultation with the Program Personnel Committee.

### **2. Merit Policy**

It is the policy of the School of Architecture and Planning to evaluate and award meritorious faculty performance on an annual basis. Merit is considered accomplishment and contribution above the normal expectation of faculty performance in any of the evaluation categories.

Awards of merit shall be the responsibility of the Dean with the advice of the Department Chair and the Program Personnel Committee. Taking the faculty member's rank and type of appointment into consideration, assessment of faculty merit shall consider each faculty member's leadership and contribution in teaching; research, scholarship and creative professional work; and service.

The assessment shall be guided by the impact of the faculty member's contribution to the School, the University, and the profession with due consideration given to the scope of the contribution at the local, regional, national, or international level. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the case for merit through the Annual Review Process.

## Part II

# Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty, Department Chairs, the Dean, Committees, and Staff

Part II describes roles and responsibilities of individuals, school administrators and committees in relation to tenure, annual merit reviews, mentoring, and sabbatical leave.

### **SECTION A. INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS**

The individual faculty member is responsible to:

- Complete the Annual Review Form and its required documentation by the due dates;
- Mentor junior faculty as required; and

Conduct peer reviews that may include reading the mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion files thoroughly and preparing substantive letters of evaluation: observing classes taught by colleagues and preparing assessments of teaching effectiveness: and/or reviewing research/creative work. Faculty members at the rank being reviewed or higher and in the Program of the candidate, must write a review letter, including a positive or negative vote. Other faculty members--either at a lower rank in the candidate's program or in the other programs of the School of Architecture and Planning--may write a review letter. Each faculty members participates in the review process and votes not more than once per candidate

### **SECTION B. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS**

A Department Chair is responsible to:

- Establish procedures and annual scope of work for the Program Personnel Committee;
- Consult the Program Personnel Committee regarding annual faculty review;
- Conduct an annual review with each faculty member. The annual review includes consultation with the faculty member to determine the annual workload and expectations for teaching, research and creative work, service, and special assignments. This review shall define criteria for evaluation of tenure, promotion, and merit. The Department Chair schedules reviews in accordance with the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*;
- Develop a mentoring plan for each tenure-track faculty member that includes assignment of a faculty mentor and provision for an annual review of progress with the mentee and the mentor;
- Assign mentoring tasks to faculty, which may include reviewing course materials, critiquing pie-competition entries, reading written work, etc.;
- Develop a program policy on sabbatical leave and present it for faculty review and adoption;
- Participate in the Merit Review; and
- The Department Chair in consultation with the Program Personnel Committee makes merit recommendations to the Dean and meets with the Dean as part of the school- wide merit review process;
- Participate in the tenure-track appointment process. In consultation with the Dean and the Program Personnel committee, the Department Chair establishes the terms of employment that relate to tenure expectations (see Policy, Part I);
- These expectations are documented, given to the tenure-track faculty member

and placed in the personnel file.

- A general summary is made available to program faculty;
- This tenure expectation statement is also copied to the internal and external reviewers of the tenure and promotion file; at the time that a faculty member is hired at or promoted to Associate Professor, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean and the Program Personnel committee, and the faculty member establishes the expectations for promotion to Full Professor. In addition to expectation for teaching and service, which may come primarily from UNM, School and Program guidelines, a more specific statement may be needed to articulate the forms of national recognition the candidate is expected to have received in recognition of the contributions to his or her field or specialty. (See UNM Faculty Handbook, 2.2.3);
- These expectations are documented, given to the candidate for promotion, and placed in their personnel file. This expectations statement is also copied to all internal and external reviewers of the promotion file;
- Establish the expectations for teaching and school service for Lecturers, adjunct, and part-time faculty;
- Appoint faculty search committees and chairs; and
- Approve announcements for faculty appointments and establishes procedures for searches.

### **SECTION C. THE DEAN**

The Dean is responsible to:

- Make appointments to the faculty in consultation with the Department Chair;
- Document the School's expectations in terms of teaching and research for new appointments;
- Conduct the Merit Review in consultation with the Department Chair;
- Determine annual merit compensation and awards of recognition;
- Make recommendations regarding mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion actions;
- Issue a *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions* that includes specific dates for annual personnel actions. The Dean distributes the calendar to the Department Chairs and affected faculty;
- Appoint ad-hoc committees and make committee assignments; and
- Organize and maintain all appropriate personnel files.

### **SECTION D. PROGRAM FACULTIES**

The faculties of the three degree-granting programs:

- Should develop a mentoring program that reflects the value placed on mentorship and continued growth for tenure track and tenured faculty, paying particular attention to mentorship resources for any faculty member who has received an unsatisfactory review; and May develop their own more detailed Tenure and Promotion guidelines, which may emphasize key guidelines and present additional criteria, but must be in keeping with existing School of Architecture and Planning, and University of New Mexico tenure and promotion policies;

### **SECTION E. PROGRAM PERSONNEL COMMITTEES**

The Program Personnel committees are standing School committee. The committees are charged with conducting various faculty review actions and providing peer consultation to the Department Chair regarding annual review, faculty appointments, and sabbatical leave.

### **1. Membership and Tenure**

The committees have a minimum of three tenured faculty members. All members of the professional programs are voting members and eligible to serve on committees.

### **2. Elections and Periods of Service**

Terms of service shall be determined by a majority vote of the faculty. Annually the Committee elects a chairperson who may serve consecutive one-year terms. Alternates, as required, are decided upon by majority faculty vote.

### **3. Committee Responsibilities**

The Program Personnel Committee is responsible to:

- Conduct a mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion review. This includes managing and executing the review process, liaison with the candidate regarding dates and documentation, creating an external letter list, soliciting the external letters as required, and being knowledgeable of appropriate University guidelines;
- Make an assessment that includes the quality and quantity of work and write a specific recommendation using the Part I Policy as the baseline;
- Provide peer review and consultation to the Department Chair for the Annual faculty review process;
- Provide consultation to the Department Chair and the Dean regarding responsibilities and expectations of all new tenure-track appointments;
- Review sabbatical requests for content and feasibility and relation to the program's mission and make recommendations to the Department Chair; and
- Constitute a Subcommittee of the Program Personnel Committee of faculty members at the rank being reviewed or higher. If there are not at least 3 faculty at the rank for which the person is being reviewed or higher in the candidate's Program, the Program Personnel Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair (or the Dean, if the Department Chair is being reviewed), shall select additional faculty at rank for which the person is being reviewed or higher with appropriate expertise from the School or UNM. Once constituted, such a Subcommittee takes the place of the Program Personnel Committee in conducting the review of the candidate and preparing the final committee report.

### ***SECTION F. THE SCHOOL TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY COMMITTEE***

The School Tenure and Promotion Policy Committee is a standing committee empowered by the faculty to develop guidelines for how the University's policies on tenure, promotion, annual review, merit, and sabbatical leave will be implemented within the School; and provide oversight to the evaluation review process and present to the faculty for approval.

### **1. Membership and Tenure**

The Committee has three members, all of whom hold tenure. The architecture, landscape architecture and planning programs each have one member. A Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer or Professor of Practice may be added as a fourth member as needed.

### **2. Elections and Period of Service**

Each member serves a three-year term. Elections are staggered with one member being replaced each year. Normally elections are held in the beginning of the fall semester. Elections are by nomination and majority vote of the School voting faculty. Annually, the Committee elects a chairperson who may serve consecutive one-year terms.

### **3. Committee Responsibilities**

The School Tenure and Promotion Policy Committee is responsible to:

Develop and present guidelines and policy related to tenure, promotion, merit, and assessment to the faculty for review and adoption.

- Conduct oversight of the annual evaluation procedures for administrators as set out by the UNM Faculty Senate;
- Review the School policy document every three years and make recommendations on adjustments to the faculty;
- Update, as needed, items included in the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*; and
- Consult with the Department Chairs and the Dean on updates of the Annual Faculty Review form.

### **SECTION G. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF**

The School staff is responsible to:

- Ensure compliance with all policies governing records confidentiality and authorize appropriate access to personnel files as needed
- Maintain and update the personnel files. These files shall contain all relevant documentation related to mid-probationary reviews, tenure and promotion;
- Establish, maintain and archive a system of document support that assists the candidate, Department Chair and Personnel Committee in their review tasks;

Develop and maintain faculty search files and assist the search committee in file management and documentation.

# Part III

## Procedures

Part III sets down the procedures for conducting annual faculty reviews, merit assessments, tenure and promotion reviews, and sabbatical leave applications.

### **SECTION A. ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW AND MERIT ASSESSMENT**

#### **1. Annual Faculty Review**

There shall be an annual faculty review to assess faculty development and evaluate teaching, research/creative, and service efforts. The Department Chair schedules the reviews in accordance with the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*.

The procedure consists of the following steps:

- In January, the Office of the Dean issues an Annual Faculty Review form to be completed by faculty holding continuing appointments;
- Faculty members complete the form and deliver it along with any needed documentation, to the Office of the Dean by the date established in the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*. Documentation must include; the UNM Annual Biographical Supplement, IDEA summary pages, and the personal assessment of your annual activities;
- The Program Personnel Committee reviews faculty forms and meets with the Department Chair to discuss assessment and evaluation. University post-tenure procedures are observed as required; and
- The Department Chair meets with each faculty member for an annual review. This review utilizes any documentation provided by the faculty and by students. University post-tenure review procedures are observed as needed. The review is documented and a copy given to the faculty member.

#### **2. Merit Assessment**

Merit compensation and special awards and recognitions are granted for accomplishment and contribution above normal performance expectations in the evaluation categories. The merit award process is conducted annually.

The procedure is as follows:

- Each faculty member documents activities by completing the Annual Review Form and the standard University biographical data forms by their due dates;
- The Department Chair, after the Annual Review, makes a recommendation to the Dean regarding merit;
- The Dean meets with the Department Chairs to discuss annual faculty reviews and the issue of merit. This occurs prior to the issuance of annual faculty contracts; and;
- Prior to the end of the spring semester the Dean notifies the faculty of merit awards.

## **SECTION B. DOCUMENTATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

Documentation for tenure and promotion is a continuous and cumulative process. The faculty member is responsible for providing all documents needed related to teaching, service, and the conduct and dissemination of research, scholarship, and creative work.

### **I. General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions**

The Office of the Dean issues the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions* that sets all dates related to tenure, promotion, and annual review actions for the coming year.

#### **1. Documentation of Work for Tenure and Promotion**

The candidate for tenure and promotion prepares the documentation listed below and submits it to the Program Personnel Committee by the dates shown in the *Review Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*. Candidates are encouraged to prepare a dossier containing such materials as the self-assessment statement, Curriculum Vitae, supporting samples of scholarly and creative work, examples of applied research, results of community service, and a summary of teaching evaluations. The dossier should be thorough yet concise in making a clear case for tenure and promotion. A successful case can be made with a focused single-spaced ten-page self-assessment statement discussing the issues outlined below, and supported by other representative materials, also outlined below.

Additional materials and the form of the submission are at the discretion of the candidate with guidance provided by the program faculty mentor(s) and the Program Personnel Committee.

Candidates for Senior and Principal Lecturer submit all material noted above, but are not expected to prepare documentation of scholarly and creative work, although such work may be included as supplemental evidence of engagement and currency in their design or planning profession. Accomplishments in research, scholarship, creative work and service focused on education should be noted in the curriculum vitae and discussed in the personal statement, especially as they contribute to the demonstration of leadership and excellence in teaching.

The documents to be prepared include: Self-Assessment Statement

- Each candidate for tenure and promotion prepares a Self Assessment Statement. It is a standalone document that can be read without direct reference to any other document;
- The statement sets out the candidate's assessment of the evaluation areas (see Policy, Part I.) Work accomplished during the tenure-track period shall be discussed separately from work accomplished prior to employment at UNM; and
- The statement has a table of contents and an introductory section that establishes the case for tenure and/or promotion. Refer to Policy, Part I, for an expanded discussion of expectations by rank.

For mid-probationary reviews, the statement also details the candidate's work and plans for the

remaining period until tenure and promotion review.

### Curriculum Vitae

Faculty members update their Curriculum Vitae by the date established in the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*. Additions to the Curriculum Vitae are to be organized into separate sections for teaching accomplishments, and for the three levels of research/scholarship and creative work with specific indications of where and how the work has been disseminated (see sections I.B.1.a and c, above).

The Curriculum Vitae notes:

- Date of last update.
- Name, school address, telephone numbers, and e-mail address;
- Education history;
- Employment history, including specific years at various academic ranks;
- Teaching areas and courses taught;
- Publications, including exhibitions and competitions, arranged by category and within categories. Other forms of dissemination should be included, as appropriate;
- Creative, community and professional work;
- Research and scholarship with funding history, as appropriate;
- Service to the university, profession and community;
- Presentations at invited academic and professional lectures. Include dates; place, and the sponsoring organization; and
- Special awards and recognition.

**Other supporting materials**, which may include:

### Teaching Evaluation File

This file contains summaries of course evaluation reports, other evaluation of current and past students, and any faculty classroom reviews. Course syllabi and exams, teaching materials, documentation of new courses, and redesign of old courses should be included here.

### Awards, Service and Professional Activities File

This file documents awards, service and activities of special merit.

### Student File

This file contains the names of students:

- For whom the candidate has served as chair of thesis or project. The file notes title of work, dates of completion of work, and names of other committee members; and
- Students who could provide an assessment of teaching.

The file also contains selected samples of student work that demonstrate teaching effectiveness.



### Portfolio File

This file contains professional work, scholarship, and research.

### Supplemental Material File

This file can include other material such as:

- Grants, contracts, program development achievements; and Reviews of exhibitions, competitions, built work.

### External Peer File

This file contains a list of peer academics, professionals and community partners who the candidate believes capable to review his/her work. Depending on the nature of the candidate's teaching and research endeavors, peers may be professional or academic colleagues, community or governmental researchers or teaching partners, or other people whose practice and expertise bring legitimate sources of assessment of the quality of the faculty members' work. A minimum of six and preferably ten reviewers is recommended. At least half of the peers identified by the candidate must be from academia. Name, brief biography and affiliation, relevant expertise, telephone numbers, addresses, and fax number should be included.

### Mid-probationary Review File

A candidate for tenure and promotion also prepares a file that contains his or her earlier mid-probationary Self Assessment, the Provost's mid-probationary review letter, and any other follow up documents.

## ***SECTION C. INITIATION OF PROMOTION***

The promotion process can be initiated by:

- A faculty member following the procedure set down in the UNM Faculty Handbook;
- A Department Chair when a faculty member meets the minimum requirements set down in the Faculty Handbook. The faculty member is asked to prepare documentation for promotion review; and
- The Dean when the faculty member meets the minimum requirements set down in the UNM Faculty Handbook and

## ***SECTION D. TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS***

### **1. Review Schedules**

**Reviews shall adhere to the appropriate schedule.** Check the following School schedules against the Office of the Provost's Academic Affairs Calendars for Academic Departments, and for Deans and Directors for deadlines for current academic year, which occasionally change: <http://www.unm.edu/~acadaffr/academic-affairs-calendar.html>.

### **Tenure and Promotion Candidates**

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| February 1  | Candidate declares her or his intention to seek tenure or promotion. Department Chairs schedule meetings with all faculty who will undergo mid-probationary, tenure or promotion reviews during following academic year to discuss review procedures and schedule. |
| March 1     | Program Personnel Committee (or special Subcommittee) formed, and solicits recommendations for outside reviewers from the candidate and from school faculty as appropriate   |
| April 1     | External reviewer suggestions due  |
| April 15    | Department Chair, in consultation with Program Personnel Committee, selects the external reviewers   |
| May 1       | Department Chair contacts and confirms outside reviewers who will participate in the review  |
| August 15   | Candidate completes up-loading her or his dossier  |
| September 1 | Department Chair sends out charge letter, including electronic access to dossier, to outside reviewers. Department Chair submits names of all candidates for promotion and tenure and names of all reviewers to Dean.  |
| September 7 | Dean notifies Academic Affairs of all faculty members who will undergo mid-probationary, tenure or promotion review during the current year  |
| October 1   | Review letters due from external reviewers   |
| November 15 | Review letters due from SA+P faculty   |
| December 15 | Program Personnel Committee (or Subcommittee) recommendation to Department Chair   |
| January 15  | Director's recommendation to Dean  |
| March 7     | Complete Tenure and Promotion files, including Dean's recommendation, up-loaded for Provost level review   |
| March 15    | Complete Mid-Probationary files including Dean's recommendation, up-loaded for Provost level review  |

### **Lecturers Promotion Candidates**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| April 15     | Candidate declares her or his intention to seek promotion. Program Directors schedule meetings with all lecturers who wish to pursue promotions to Senior or Principal Lecturer, during the following academic year to discuss and review procedures |
| September 15 | Candidate completes up-loading their dossier   |
| November 1   | Review letters due from SA+P faculty   |
| December 1   | Program Personnel Committee (or Subcommittee) recommendation to Department Chair   |
| January 15   | Director's recommendation to Dean  |
| March 7      | Complete lecturer promotion files, including Dean's recommendation, up-loaded for Provost level review   |

See also Office of the Provost's Academic Affairs Calendars for Academic Departments, and for Deans and Directors for deadlines for current academic year: <http://www.unm.edu/~acadaffr/academic-affairs-calendar.html>

## **2. Selection of External Reviewers:**

External Reviewers must be at rank being reviewed or higher, and for Professional and Community Partners, External Reviewers must have demonstrated experience equivalent to the rank being reviewed or more. All External Reviewers must have relevant expertise in the field or specialty of the candidate, and are asked to submit a resume with their letter of assessment and evaluation report which will be made a part of the review file. The report conforms to the following process:

- The chair of the Program Personnel Committee requests that the candidate nominate six to ten external reviewers. The candidate describes the reviewer's qualifications, title, and expertise, and any prior professional or personal relationships;
- The chair of Program Personnel Committee also solicits the names of potential external reviewers from the School faculty, who also describe the reviewer's qualifications, title, and expertise; and
- From these nominations, the chair of Program Personnel Committee in consultation with the Director of the Program selects a minimum of six external reviewers, three of which must come from the candidate's list unless there is specific reason not to do so (which must be stated in writing and placed in the candidates personnel file).

## **3. The Program Personnel Committee**

For purposes of tenure and promotion, each program convenes a Program Personnel Committee. The Chairperson convenes the committee or, as necessary and detailed above in II.E.3 above, convenes a special Subcommittee at the beginning of the fall semester and assigns the annual work tasks. The activities of the committee include:

- Meeting with candidates to discuss the tenure and promotion process and to provide guidance as required; and
- Consulting the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*.

A letter to each reviewer group (academic, professional, community, etc.) is prepared and mailed. Great care is needed in writing the external letter, which should contain the basic instructions for the reviewer in preparing the assessment. Letters to non-academic reviews should also describe the process and purposes of university external reviews. Letters are sent to as many of the list as is deemed necessary to assemble an adequate external assessment.

Prior contact and consent from external reviewers to conduct a candidate review is highly

recommended. Letters and accompanying materials (CV, Self Assessment, work examples, publications, syllabi. etc.) are sent early enough for receipt prior to the final deliberation.

External letters evaluating scholarly and creative work are made readily available to all UNM reviewers including faculty members, the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean and Provost's Office.

For evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the committee should solicit input from professional colleagues and students with direct experience with the candidate's teaching. When this assessment is written, it must relate directly to the quality of work.

The committee or subcommittee makes an overall Summary Assessment related to tenure and promotion (or mid-probationary review). The committee uses all documentation and any other assessment information (Provost's guidelines, University Handbook, SAAP Personnel Policy Part I. etc.). The assessment letter documents the quantitative (internal and external) support and qualitative (quality and impact) support. A summary assessment including the vote totals for all faculty reviewers at the rank being reviewed for and other faculty members, as well as a committee recommendation is written and signed by the members. In cases when a subcommittee has been constituted, it files the summary assessment rather than the program personnel committee. The assessment, along with all documentation, is forwarded to the Department Chair by the due date in the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*.

For annual review the committee convenes to make an annual review assessment based on the documentation provided by the faculty member that year. The committee meets with the Department Chair to provide consultation on the Annual Review Process.

For new faculty appointments the committee meets with the Department Chair to discuss the expectations and responsibilities related to tenure and teaching, and research/creative work. This discussion and consultation shall take place prior to appointment and cover areas in which the committee deems important to the overall teaching program(s).

#### **4. The Department Chair**

The Department Chair reviews the file for completeness in content and form. When the file is complete the Department Chair writes a letter of recommendation and forwards the file to the Dean. This letter takes into consideration the candidate's contribution to the School, personal and leadership characteristics, and indications of potential contribution to the field.

#### **5. The Dean**

The Dean examines the entire file and writes a letter of assessment and recommendation. The file with all external review letters is sent to the Office of the Provost by the date set down in the *General Schedule of Faculty Personnel Actions*.

### **SECTION E. SABBATICAL LEAVE**

Sabbatical leave allows faculty members to pursue scholarship, research, and creative work that cannot be achieved within the normal work schedule. To obtain sabbatical leave, application must be made and approval granted by the School and the University administrations.

### **1. Application and Internal Review Process**

The application and review process contains the following steps:

- A faculty member consults the *General Schedule for Faculty Personnel Actions* for application deadlines. Application must be made early enough so that an adequate internal review is possible prior to the university deadline;
- Sabbatical leave is based on a detailed plan of activities, including anticipated results and resources required to achieve these results. The Plan shall relate to the faculty member's areas of teaching or research. The proposed activities are linked to the proposed results in a way that demonstrates the overall feasibility of effort;
- The application is forwarded to the Program Personnel Committee, which reviews it for content, feasibility and relationship to the School mission. An assessment is written and given to the Department Chair;
- The Department Chair reviews the application for content, relationship to career development, and impact upon the teaching program. A recommendation is made and the file forwarded to the Dean; and
- The Dean reviews the file. If approved, the application is forwarded to the Office of the Provost.

### **2. Sabbatical Activities Report**

Sharing with colleagues what has been learned and accomplished on sabbatical is an element of the sabbatical process. When the faculty member returns, a full report of activities and assessment of accomplishments is to be filed with the Office of the Provost, the Dean, the Department Chair, and the Program Personnel Committee. This is due by the sixth week of the returning semester.