



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

TO: College of Education Faculty

FROM: Salvador Hector Ochoa, Dean

DATE: August 24, 2018

RE: College of Education Procedures for Faculty Review as approved by COE Leadership on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 and by COE Faculty Governance on August 16, 2018

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY REVIEW

This document provides the College of Education and its Departments policies, procedures, and an implementation plan for faculty reviews (annual, mid-probationary, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion). This document supports faculty governance and is based on policies articulated in the UNM Faculty Handbook as well as relevant COE policies and procedures. General procedures for the mid-probationary, tenure and/or promotion review process were revised in 2018 by a task force named by the Faculty Governance Committee.

All policies referenced can be found at <http://handbook.unm.edu/>

The University strives for inquiry, learning, and scholarship of a breadth and depth that will result in excellence in all of the University's major functions: teaching, scholarly work, and service. The College has an obligation to contribute to each of the three functions of the University. Faculty members play a central role in the realization of these functions and help fulfill the obligations of their College by contributing their unique expertise and competence [Adapted, *B1.1 (c) Faculty Handbook, 1998*].

For tenure-track faculty, the award of tenure at the University is one of the most important and satisfying milestones of a professional, academic career. Promotion through the academic ranks is another such satisfying milestone. For faculty, it signifies engagement in the national conversation of a particular field and the progressive confidence by peers and academic administrators that the faculty member is growing professionally and will continue to contribute in all dimensions of academic life. [Adapted, *Tenure and Promotion at UNM* August 1, 1998]. For tenured faculty, ongoing post-tenure reviews provide identification of exceptionally good performance or deficiencies and set performance goals for the coming year.

The faculty of the College, the University, and many other colleagues engaged in work across a large array of professional contexts set the standards to be met in order to achieve the milestones of the professoriate. These standards are articulated throughout the peer review process and in such documents as the *Faculty Handbook*. The peer review process is a fundamental feature of higher education (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). Its significance for individual faculty members and for their colleagues, the College, and the University is incalculable. Because of this, it is critical that the policies and procedures affecting peer review are understood and followed precisely and uniformly by faculty who perform the reviews as well as by faculty who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion or post-tenure review. The official policies in effect at the University of New Mexico are set forth in the Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure, *Faculty Handbook*, section B (December, 1998). Sections B1 through B4 are most pertinent to criteria and to the review process itself. Interpretations and applications are found in precedents established through the years. It should be understood, however, that the views of the faculty, the University administration, the Regents, and the courts are the ultimate authority.

This document focuses on the criteria that should be considered, in accordance with the revised (December, 1998) *Faculty Handbook*: Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure, for any faculty review. The document elaborates on the criteria in the context of a professional unit (college) of education. It also gives procedures, a process (steps to be followed), and information on the compilation of the dossier for faculty reviews.

I. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY REVIEW

At the University of New Mexico, faculty effectiveness is assessed in four categories: (1) Teaching, (2) Scholarly Work, (3) Service, and (4) Personal Characteristics. In order to earn either tenure or promotion or both, faculty are required to be effective in all four areas. Excellence in either teaching or scholarly work constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion [B1.2, *Faculty Handbook*].

In order to earn promotion to professor, faculty are required to attain high standards in teaching, scholarly work, and service to the university or profession [B4.8.3a, *Faculty Handbook*]. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank in comparable universities. This document sets forth College of Education standards for tenure and/or promotion in accordance with University policy in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Teaching (UNM Faculty Handbook B1.2.1)

Teaching has special significance as a standard in the College of Education at UNM. It is not only the vehicle by which we carry forward the University's teaching mission, it also serves as a

model for the behavior we seek to instill in our students who become professional educators and practitioners in a variety of settings. As students and practitioners of teaching and learning, we have a special appreciation of the difficulties inherent in describing and assessing teaching. We as College of Education faculty have an obligation to appraise teaching as thoroughly as we can in the peer review process.

Teaching [B1.2.1, *Faculty Handbook*] occurs in various settings and via diverse forms of instruction, such as didactic lecturing, small group seminars, problem-based learning, clinical practica, and online technologies. The term teaching as used here includes, but is not restricted to, regularly scheduled undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional instruction, and the advising, direction and supervision of individual undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students. Teaching also includes the direction or supervision of students in directed readings, research, internships and practica, residencies, or fellowships. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that confer no University credit should also be considered as teaching. Teaching is evaluated by students and faculty through formal questionnaires (e.g., university approved evaluation instrument) as well as peer review.

Evidence to be evaluated during annual, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews must include written reports of peer observations of teaching, student course evaluations, a self evaluation, and descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member [B1.2.1 (c), *Faculty Handbook*].

1. Peer Teaching Evaluations. Faculty members must have their teaching appraised by other faculty members. **Probationary faculty should include at least two peer teaching evaluations per academic year. Post-tenure faculty should include at least one peer teaching evaluation per academic year.** These peer teaching evaluations should be recorded in a consistent manner, addressing the qualities of effective teaching and citing areas for improvement. The Department Chair shall arrange for the faculty member's teaching to be observed [B4.2.3 (c), *Faculty Handbook*]. Peer evaluations also should include simultaneous reviews of course syllabi, assignments, course examination, and grading practices. It is the faculty member's responsibility to make these available to the reviewer prior to the observation. Each peer observation shall result in a non-confidential, written document from the observer to the faculty member and department chair detailing the observation, as well as any review of the syllabus and/or other instructional materials associated with the class. All peer reviews should be included in the electronic dossier.
2. Student Evaluation. The University provides opportunities for obtaining student ratings of instructors and courses. These course ratings should be compiled in the form of a summary table of scores. An explanation must be provided for each course for which information is not provided in the table. Student comments, unsolicited letters from former students and any other supporting documentation (e.g. letters of support) can be incorporated into the teaching statement or in other sections of the dossier as appropriate.

3. **Self evaluation.** Self-assessment can provide other evidence of teaching excellence, particularly if it documents that a faculty member deliberately seeks the improvement of syllabi, uses feedback from peer and student evaluations, sets performance standards and works toward them, seeks opportunities to become familiar with new teaching techniques and materials (e.g. attending teaching workshops), and maintains currency in the teaching field. Self-assessment is not simply a self-serving document; it should be a thoughtful and careful analysis of one's own strengths and weaknesses and should provide supporting evidence that systematic effort has been made to improve and to expand one's ability in the area of teaching. This may be included in the teaching statement or in a separate document.

Scholarly Work

Another primary and necessary responsibility of faculty in this College is scholarly work. Scholarly work comprises scholarship, research, and/or creative work. "Scholarship embodies the critical and accurate synthesis and dissemination of knowledge. The term research is understood to mean systematic, original investigation directed toward the generation, development, and validation of new knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems. Creative work is understood to mean original or imaginative accomplishment in literature, the arts, or the professions (1.2.2.a)" "To qualify as scholarship or creative work, the results of the endeavor must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field in question.(1.2.2.b.)" "Evidence of scholarship or creative work is determined by the faculty member's publications, exhibits, performances, or media productions and may be supplemented by evidence of integration of the faculty member's scholarly work and teaching [B1.2.2c., *Faculty Handbook*].

Using the conception of scholarly work articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), we engage in the scholarship of discovery (or basic research); the scholarship of application (applied research and scholarship); and the scholarship of integration (or synthesis, such as scholarly articles). A balance of scholarly work that may be theoretical, applied, or a synthesis of existing literature meets the scholarship criteria, provided that such scholarship is both disseminated and peer reviewed. This does not contradict University standards in any way, but places the standards for Education within the context of both the University and the discipline. Education is an applied science, as are medicine, engineering, and law. As such, scholarship based in the field (that is, conducted in any type of educational setting) is especially significant and of value to the profession. Our scholarly work, consequently, contributes to the enhanced and basic understanding of teaching and learning, to the improved practice of the profession of education, or to both.

The role of grant applications and awards is a significant aspect of scholarship; and while not essential for tenure or promotion, grant applications and awards are a positive component of a tenure or promotion review. No faculty member can write or be awarded a grant in a

competition at the federal level without bringing his or her scholarly skills and knowledge to bear. Grant applications are often subjected to the same peer scrutiny as journal articles and the acceptance rate of competed proposals is often lower than that of major journals. Grants are an important form of scholarly work for faculty. Scholarly work through a grant should lead to major products, such as instructional materials, national presentations at juried conferences, journal articles, and/or books.

Publication normally is the most important vehicle for reporting scholarship, research, or creative activity. There are many forms: journal articles; scholarly books; chapters; CD-ROMs; papers prepared for professional meetings; innovative instructional materials including web-based strategies; project reports; research proposals; and/or other educational technology formats and presentations. For all of these forms, critical peer review in a manner appropriate to the particular field is essential. Some scholarship may be directed more towards faculty peers while other scholarship is directed toward those who practice education, such as teachers, counselors, or school administrators. Faculty may not opt to forego scholarship directed toward faculty peers, but they may present a balanced profile of scholarship with reviewed work written for the practitioner. In the field of education, research and scholarship that are sometimes labeled “applied” are entirely appropriate and can be a significant part of the work of the faculty. Other outlets also are appropriate for scholarship, especially in the arts and humanities; faculty and programs must devise appropriate strategies for identifying and assessing these outlets.

The college has not determined a minimum number of publications necessary for promotion and tenure; there are too many confounding variables such as where the article is published, the quality of the article, whether the article is single or coauthored or collaborative between practitioners and academics, and the peer review process of the article. The number of publications may be less important than their quality. Peer review, no matter who the audience is, is the principal vehicle for quality assessment of scholarship.

A special note is in order concerning the assessment of college textbooks, program development, curricula and teaching materials for use in the schools. They may serve as indicators of both teaching performance and scholarship and should be judged in terms of both pedagogical and scholarly criteria. Finally, although textbooks are not generally peer reviewed, there may be marketing evidence—the usual criterion of success outside academia—that can be included in the dossier. Work on program development that results in written position papers, conceptual pieces, and so forth can be submitted for external assessment. Materials prepared for use in the schools sometimes do not elicit published reviews; however, it is possible to obtain peer reviews by asking curriculum experts to provide assessment of the materials. Creative work and performance must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field (B.1.2.2b). In particular, faculty should indicate whether book chapters are peer reviewed.

If publications in a language other than English are to be reviewed, the candidate and the Department Chair should reach an agreement, in writing, and well in advance of the review process. The agreement should state whether translations are to be provided and whether outside reviewers are to be proficient in the language of the publication. Spanish is an official language in New Mexico, and candidates who publish in that language have special legal rights. If reviewers are proficient in the non-English language, their letters nonetheless should be written or translated into English.

For additional information please refer to the COE policy on excellence and the scholarship section in the COE workload policy for a list of suggested scholarship activities.

Service

Service occurs in two broad categories: professional and public. Professional service consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession. Public Service consists of activities that arise from a faculty member's role in the University. These activities normally involve the sharing and application of faculty expertise to issues and needs of the civic community (local and statewide) in which the University is located. (B1.2.3 (a) (1), *Faculty Handbook*.)

Evidence about the quality of service activities can be obtained by contacting officials in the organization or on the committees to which the service was rendered. However, such contacts must be designed to produce verifiable descriptive and evaluative data, rather than mere evidence of membership.

Please refer to the service section in the COE workload policy for a list of suggested service activities.

Personal Characteristics

This category relates to the personal traits that influence an individual's effectiveness as a teacher, a scholar, researcher, or creative artist, and a leader in a professional area. Of primary concern are intellectual breadth, emotional stability or maturity, and sufficient vitality and forcefulness to constitute effectiveness. There must also be demonstrated collegiality and interactional skills so that an individual can work harmoniously with others while maintaining independence of thought and action. Attention shall also be given to an individual's moral stature and ethical behavior, for they are fundamental to a faculty member's impact on the University. Information used in the objective appraisal of personal traits may be acquired from peer evaluations (e.g., letters of recommendation for new appointees, or written evaluations prepared by colleagues for promotions or for other departmental reviews) and must be handled

with great prudence. By necessity, the category of Personal Characteristics requires flexibility in its appraisal [*Faculty Handbook* B1.2.4]

The 1987 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics [Section B, Appendix V, *Faculty Handbook*] may provide additional insight in this category.

Community Engaged Scholarship

As a College of Education, a significant number of faculty conduct research, teach, and provide service in school and other professional settings. As a comprehensive College of Education, there are a number of other clinical and professional settings in which our faculty work, and which serve as legitimate venues for faculty efforts. The work in these settings must conform to the same standards of performance that have been explicated previously in this document under scholarship, teaching, and service.

II. REVIEWS AND PROCEDURES

UNM Performance Reviews include Annual, Merit, Mid-Probationary and Post-Tenure reviews that are internal review processes and Tenure and/or Promotion Reviews, which often involve broader evaluation audiences, both internal and external to UNM.

These performance reviews should complement each other, and provide consistent information that permits the ongoing assessment of a faculty member's contribution to his or her field of study, Program, Department, the College, and the University.

Responsibilities for all faculty reviews are widely shared. The individual faculty member is responsible for maintaining and submitting an updated curriculum vita each year, for compiling evidence of scholarly work, and for submitting data pertaining to teaching performance and service activity.

UNM Performance Reviews

Annual Review

All probationary faculty members [B4.2, *Faculty Handbook*] and continuing non-tenure track faculty members [B4.10, *Faculty Handbook*] are reviewed annually. Mid-probationary Reviews and Tenure and Promotion Reviews serve as the annual review. The purpose of the annual review is to provide the faculty member written information about his or her performance in the College, identifying both strengths and weaknesses.

For probationary faculty, the review entails cumulative evaluation of the faculty member's achievement and progress toward tenure. The faculty member shall assemble a file including:

- Updated Curriculum vita annually
- Classroom materials, teaching evaluations, and other materials reflecting on teaching performance
- Copies of scholarly works completed or submitted during the previous year and other materials reflecting on scholarly work
- Statement of self-evaluation based upon goals set for the previous year
- Statement setting goals for the coming year [*Faculty Handbook* 4.2.3.b]

As part of the review, the Chair shall review the faculty member's assembled file and obtain written evaluations of the member's performance from at least those tenured members in the department who are best acquainted with the faculty member's work. The Department Chair is responsible for conducting the annual review. Each candidate is strongly encouraged to work with his or her Department Chair to create a systematic plan for assessing performance annually. This might, for example, include identification of a mentor and setting of specific goals. It also should include a plan for systematic peer review of teaching. The Department Chair writes the annual review summarizing the evaluation of all four performance domains of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics using the 3 scale rubric of excellent, effective or ineffective. If earlier reviews have identified specific deficiencies, special attention should be paid to the progress made toward remedying them. The Department Chair shall discuss each annual review report with the probationary member or non-tenure track member before the end of spring semester. The faculty member shall acknowledge receipt of the report and may provide a written response. This report and any response shall be filed with the Department and the Dean's Office by the end of the spring semester. For those faculty who are deficient in one or more areas, a professional development plan will be implemented.

Probationary faculty members serve on annual contracts. A decision as to whether the contract will be renewed is based on the review of the faculty member's performance. In the case of a recommendation of non-renewal made at a point other than at the mid-probationary or tenure review, the procedures to be followed are found in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.2.4].

Post-Tenure Review

The Post-Tenure Review Policy, *Faculty Handbook* [B4.9], ensures that all tenured faculty members will have a Post-Tenure-review annually, and that those with either exceptionally good performance or deficiency in one or more areas will be identified. Data collection used in this review includes at a minimum: student evaluations of teaching, one annual peer evaluation of teaching and merit evaluations for salary recommendations. Criteria and standards for conducting the review and written annual evaluation should meet the descriptions of teaching, scholarly work, and service found in the *Faculty Handbook*, [B-5, B-6, B-7] and be evaluated

using the 3 scale rubric of excellent, effective or ineffective. COE Administrators who hold tenured faculty rank shall also be reviewed on the performance of their current administrative positions through annual surveys sent to faculty within the Department and/or College and will be assessed by the Dean.

The review may be performed by the Chair or the Chair and a committee of ALL tenured faculty, shall be in writing (normally 50 to 100 words for most faculty, more for those with special achievements or identified deficiencies) and contain a description and critique of performance during the past year and performance goals for the coming year. It shall be discussed with the faculty member. Two copies of the review, signed by the Chair, shall be given to the faculty member, one to be signed as acknowledgment of receipt and returned to the Chair. A faculty member who disagrees with the review may add a comment or rebuttal. The review and any such statement shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Procedures for appeal are found in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.9]. Each Department Chair shall annually provide the Dean with summaries of the reviews for most faculty (more for those with special achievements or identified deficiencies), and the full text of any comment or rebuttal.

For any type of review, faculty members need to consider potential conflicts of interest. If a faculty member believes there is a conflict of interest he or she must recuse themselves from the review process and notify his or her respective Chair.

Mid-Probationary, Tenure and/or Promotion, Post Tenure Reviews

Mid-Probationary Review

The mid-probationary review occurs at the approximate mid-point of the faculty member's probationary period at the University. The purpose is to enable the College to evaluate progress towards tenure, to inform the probationary faculty member of his or her strengths and weaknesses, and to determine whether or not to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in the four performance domains of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics using the 3 scale rubric of excellent, effective and ineffective. Its rigor approaches that of tenure and promotion reviews. Outside reviewers are not required by the College; in most instances mid-probationary faculty have not had the time to establish a firm, national reputation. Beyond the department level, mid-probationary reviews are handled in much the same way as tenure and promotion reviews. The mid-probationary review serves as the annual review for individuals holding Probationary Tenure Track appointments.

Tenure and/or Promotion Review

The awarding of tenure is the most serious commitment the College and the University make to a faculty member. Tenure is a privilege, not a right, and is awarded only after the most serious

deliberation and review. The faculty member's contract identifies the year for tenure review. Normally this review will be for promotion and tenure.

Tenure and Promotion reviews require a full-scale review process and reporting, including solicitation of assessments from individuals not part of the UNM community. For assistant professors without tenure, promotion and tenure reviews are consolidated and conducted the final probationary year. The anticipated length of service in the rank of assistant professor is six years. **If a faculty member chooses to go up before the scheduled time for a tenure decision, he or she will have only one opportunity to do so.**

The anticipated length of service in the rank of associate professor prior to consideration for promotion to the rank of professor is at least five years. Recommendations for promotion to professor in less time are to be carefully weighted and justified. Faculty members at the Associate Professor rank who intend to put forth dossiers for promotion should inform their Department Chair **at least** one year prior to the submission date of the dossier (typically August of the prior year) but preferably in the spring of the year prior to the submission date.

External Reviewers

In the case of promotion and tenure reviews, the individual faculty member will be asked to participate in the process of identifying (but not contacting) outside experts who can assist in the assessment process. Each Department Chair will be responsible for contacting potential outside experts. In order to obtain at least six reviews, the recommended number of individuals to be contacted should be between 12 and 15. For tenure and/or promotion, outside reviewers are invited/expected to review the scholarship component of the candidate's dossier, and provide a confidential critique. In most cases, one-half of the external experts come from names proposed to the Department Chair by the candidate, while the other half are from names proposed to the Department Chair by the program faculty. Outside reviews are a critical and essential part of the tenure and promotion review. The identity of the outside reviewers and their reviews are confidential to the extent permitted by law. The assessment provided by these external reviewers provides significant information.

The procedures in the Faculty Handbook are to be followed as found there. This document provides additional details and elaborations on the handbook; it is not meant to over-ride the Faculty Handbook.

Mid-Probationary, Tenure/Promotion Procedures

Candidates for mid-probationary, tenure/promotion and promotion will work with their Department Chair to prepare materials and compilation of the dossier. Chairs, department staff, and the Dean's office staff also are available to work with candidates on the compilation of the dossier. Prior to the deadline for submitting the dossier to the Department Chair, the Chair and/or Associate Dean will work with the candidate to construct the dossier according to guidelines found in the Provost's document **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for dossier submittal and review for retention, promotion and tenure** and in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.5.1 (a) and (b)].

Procedures for Mid-Probationary, Tenure and Promotion

Step 1 Preparing for the review process:

- No later than February 1, the Department Chair and the faculty member will meet with the Associate Dean to review procedures and guidelines.
- No later than February 1, the Department Chair and faculty member will meet to review procedures and deadlines, including criteria for external reviewers, suggestions for confidential reviewer of teaching and, if necessary, review panel membership. If necessary, when there are fewer than six eligible peers within the department to review, the Chair will identify panel members from outside the Department.
- No later than February 1, for tenure and/or promotion reviews the Department Chair solicits 8-12 nominations for external reviewers from both the faculty member and department faculty.
- No later than March 1, the Department Chair shall select those qualified potential external reviewers from the candidate's area to invite [*Faculty Handbook* B4.5.2]. This process shall ensure that no fewer than six external reviews are received. Every effort shall also be made to have those evenly represent the candidate's and the department faculty's nominees.
- No later than March 1, the Department Chair selects a confidential reviewer of teaching according to the COE guidelines for confidential reviewer of teaching.
- No later than May 15, the Department Chair should charge the Faculty Panel in accordance with any policy approved by the Department Faculty and the Faculty Handbook B4.3.1. "The Department Chair, in consultation with at least the tenured members of the Department conducts a formal review of the faculty member's achievements in teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics... Tenured members of the Department are expected to submit written evaluations of the candidate and indicate either a positive or a negative mid-probationary, tenure, and/or promotion recommendation." [**Faculty Handbook** B4.3.]

Step 2 Construction and Submission of the Dossier

The dossier must conform to the requirements given in the Provost's Memo and any department and college policies. The dossiers must be submitted by the **announced due date**. Once formally submitted, any changes or additions to the candidate's dossier are to be made in accordance with the Provost's Memo and guidelines. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the content and organization of the dossier follow the guidelines as found in the Provost's Memo. The dossier check-list should be completed, signed and dated by the faculty member and Department Chair and sent to the Associate Dean.

Step 3 Notification of College-wide Faculty Review

All candidates' dossiers, excluding confidential documents, will be available at designated times to College Faculty for evaluative review. College Faculty members, regardless of their Department affiliation or other roles they may have (such as Panel Review or College Promotion and Tenure Committee), may review the dossier and furnish a confidential evaluation based on the evidence in the dossier. These evaluations (the College-wide evaluation form or letters) are to be sent, per department instructions, directly and only to the Department Chair. After the designated time for faculty review, the Department Chair will then add these evaluations/letters along with confidential documents to the dossier.

Step 4 Composition of Departmental Review Panel

The Panel shall be formed according to the guidelines in B4.3.1. There is no upper limit on the number of individuals who serve on the Panel, but there may be no fewer than six members. All faculty in the department who are tenured and at a rank higher than the candidate must be included on the Faculty Departmental Panel and are expected to participate and to vote. At their discretion, or if there are no tenured faculty at a higher rank than the candidate from the department available to serve, Department Chairs may request that faculty from other departments serve on this Panel. Department Chairs are responsible for assuring that Panel membership meets the standards and criteria in consultation with the Associate Dean.

Step 5 Departmental Review Panel Pre-Review

The dossier and all supporting materials are then made available to the members of the Faculty Panel, who individually review the dossier. The Faculty Panel discussion will be chaired by a member of the Panel appointed by the Department Chair.

Step 6 Formal Departmental Review Panel Meeting

The Faculty Panel will meet formally and discuss the evidence in the dossier. After the meeting, each Faculty Panel member will individually write an evaluation including a

formal vote indicating either a positive or a negative mid-probationary, tenure, and/or promotion recommendation as well as a rating of excellent, effective or ineffective for the performance domains of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics. Each member's vote must be explicitly justified with information based on the evidence in the dossier. The vote and the rationale for the vote will be sent directly to the Department Chair.

The Faculty Panel should review an up-to-date curriculum vita following the template provided to candidates, a complete collection of the candidate's scholarship, teaching evaluations from both students and peers and other teaching related materials including a confidential assessment of the candidate's teaching, testimonial data from students and recipients of service, and letters from external reviewers which are confidential and shared only with the Panel members, College Promotion & Tenure committee and other appropriate individuals.

Expectations of Panelists

Panelists must conduct their review according to the adopted standards in the department, college and university. They must exercise a fair and just assessment and must exercise their ethical responsibility as a member of the academic community. Department Chairs are to review panelist's written evaluations for adherence to standards and policies.

Please refer to footnote A under Step 7

Step 7 The Department Chair's Roles and Responsibilities

The Department Chair will review the complete dossier and the written evaluations and votes of the Faculty Panel and any other evaluations from the college-wide review. The Chair must conduct the review according to the adopted standards in the department, college and university. The Department Chair will then prepare a letter that is included in the dossier. The letter shall summarize the faculty evaluations, Faculty Panel rationales and votes, and the contents of the dossier. The letter should include a detailed statement and recommendation from the Chair including a description of the review process that was used, the rationale of the Faculty Panel members, the recorded vote of the Faculty Panel and a comprehensive description of the grounds for the recommendation. This recommendation should incorporate evidence such as phrases from the outside letters and comments made by observers of teaching during the review process. Some information about the strength and reputation of the journals in which the candidate has published should be included. The letter includes the Chair's personal observations and evaluation based upon documented information in each of the four performance domains of teaching, scholarly work, service and personal characteristics. Finally, the Chair makes a positive or negative recommendation using the 3 scale rubric of excellent, effective or ineffective. The Department Chair must discuss the review and the recommendation with the faculty member. At the same time, the Department Chair advises the faculty member that a positive or negative recommendation has been sent to

the Dean. If the recommendation is negative, the Chair will follow the procedures of the *Faculty Handbook* [B4].

If the Chair's recommendation differs from that of the Faculty Panel vote, written explanation is required. The candidate must be immediately notified in writing of a negative recommendation by the Department Chair.

Footnote A

It should be noted that higher level reviews and processes focus on the rigor and fairness of the process, the relationship between that process and the recommendations, and the relationship between the recommendations and the larger College and University context. Thus, post-department reviewers will want to know how teaching performance was assessed and how the results of that assessment were weighed in the review process. Post-department reviewers will want to know how outside reviewers of scholarly activity were selected, what they read, and what they said about it. They will want to know what articles and materials the Faculty Panel and faculty who submitted letters read and what they said about them. They will want to know how service activities were assessed. And, they will want to know how the faculty assessed the candidate in relationship to his/her national colleagues. Post-department reviewers have the responsibility to weigh all the evidence and to make an independent assessment of that evidence.

On any of the above decisions, the Department Chair should consult with the Associate Dean as questions arise or as circumstances warrant. The Department Chair is responsible for assuring that the review process to this point is timely, thorough, fair, documented, and follows established policy.

Step 8 The College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider the reviews and recommendations from the Faculty Panel and the Department Chair as stated in the Department Chair's letter, will review and discuss the evidence in the dossier, affirm or clarify any information through reviewing evidence as needed in the supporting materials, and will record a formal vote and recommendation to the Dean. The Committee will write a summary report to the Dean that will discuss the evidence and present a rationale for the recommendation using the 3 scale rubric of excellent, effective or ineffective for each of the four performance domains of teaching scholarly work, service and personal characteristics.

Step 9 The Dean's Role and Responsibility

The Dean will review all the evidence presented in the dossier. All recommendations (Faculty Panel, Department Chair, and Promotion and Tenure Committee) are next forwarded to the Dean. The Dean considers and draws on these recommendations in the preparation of her or his own recommendation using the categories of excellent, effective or ineffective in each of the four domains. This review is then added to the electronic dossier and forwarded to the Office of the Provost. The Dean will use the

categories of excellent, effective or ineffective in each of the four domains The Dean will inform the candidate of the Dean's recommendation, according to procedures in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.3]. If the recommendation is negative, the Dean will follow the procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Step 10 The Provost's University Review Panel

The complete electronic dossier will be reviewed by members of the University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee who will, based on all of the evidence, provide a recommendation to the Provost.

Step 11 The Provost's Role and Responsibility

The Provost will render a final decision by June 30.

Appeals

Appeal procedures open to faculty members are described in the *Faculty Handbook*.

III. Dossiers

Dossier development should begin very early in a faculty member's probationary period and be an ongoing process. The candidate, with the assistance of a mentor or the Department Chair, if desired, is responsible for providing information and documentation for a professional dossier. Annual review processes within the departments should assist faculty to build a dossier toward the mid-probationary, tenure & promotion, and promotion reviews.

The mid-probationary, tenure and promotion, and promotion candidates are responsible to ensure that dossiers adhere to department, college and university guidelines for the year in which they are being reviewed. The Department Chair assures that evidence is collected, reviewed and presented in an orderly fashion. The Department Chair and the Associate Dean are available to clarify expectations and guidelines.

The dossiers submitted for mid-probationary, tenure and promotion, and promotion reviews must follow the guidelines found in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines memo from the Provost's Office. Candidates are responsible for organizing their portion of the dossier in the following format. **Please see the RPT Organizational Requirements Section of the Provosts Memo for a complete description of the dossier format.**

Candidate Portion of the Dossier

1. An Opening Section that includes:
 - a. An Opening Statement
 - b. A complete and current curriculum vita prepared by the candidate. The vita should follow the college template, be formatted according to the standards of the

profession, and provide information about the candidate's training, experience, professional work, scholarly production, and service activities.

2. A Teaching Section that includes:
 - a. A teaching statement
 - b. A table listing peer reviewers as well as written peer reviews of teaching as described in Section I.
 - c. The confidential reviewer of teaching letter
 - d. A table summarizing student evaluations of teaching which follows the College template.
 - e. Evidence of any teaching awards and their bases.
 - f. Two to three unsolicited letters from students if available
 - g. Original student evaluations.
 - h. Teaching artifacts, which must include **only the last syllabus for each course taught**. Other syllabi as supporting evidence of growth in teaching are permitted.
 - i. Evidence of advising activities including advisee list.
 - j. Evidence of other teaching activities [*Faculty Handbook* B1.2.1a]
 - k. A table summarizing dissertation, thesis and comprehensive exam activities (Chair and committee member)

3. A Scholarly Work Section that includes:
 - a. A scholarship statement
 - b. A list of scholarly works

4. A Service Section that includes:
 - a. A service statement
 - b. A list of service activities

5. A Supplemental Materials Section that includes:
All publications such as:
 - a. Refereed journal articles
 - b. Book Chapters (indicate whether or not peer reviewed)
 - c. Books
 - d. Grant Awards (proposal abstracts and award letters)
 - e. Submitted grant proposal abstracts
 - f. Summary of reviews of submitted grant proposals or manuscripts
 - g. In consultation with the Department Chair, any other evidence that reflects the overall performance of the candidates work

Department Portion of the Dossier

1. An Annual Review Section that includes:
 - a. Chair's summary of candidate's annual reviews
 - b. Individual annual reviews from each previous year
 - c. Any previous mid-probationary, tenure or promotion recommendations letters from Chair, Dean and Provost

2. An External Review Section that includes:
 - a. Each reviewer letter
 - b. External Reviewer CV's (optional)
3. A Department Faculty vote and Comment Section that includes:
 - a. Report of departmental reviewer committee
 - b. Separate summary of faculty vote
 - c. Individual departmental reviewer recommendations
4. A Department Chair Recommendation section that includes:
Chair's recommendation letter

A Note on Review: It should be noted that for evaluation purposes, only materials produced and or developed during time at the University of New Mexico should be submitted for tenure and promotion review. Similarly, only materials produced or developed following the tenure decision should be submitted for promotion to full professor review. Exceptions to this procedure will be discussed in consultation with the Dean and Department Chair.

Guiding Documents/References

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Faculty and the Board of Regents (December 1998). Policy on academic freedom and tenure: Partial revision of the October 1999 edition of the *Faculty Handbook*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico, Office of the Secretary.

Glasick, C., M. Huber, and G. Maeroff (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. An Ernest L. Boyer Project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.