

December 2012

Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences
Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion
and Specifically Assessment of Faculty Productivity

Introduction

The Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences recognizes that faculty productivity is the single most important element of faculty review for tenure and promotion and that all faculty, regardless of their academic stature, should actively work towards improving the quality of teaching, research, and service in the department. With the recognition that the department is strengthened because each faculty member contributes differently to its mission, in 2002, the department established an objective set of guidelines to serve to evaluate faculty productivity, principally in the context of determination of annual salary increases (in the unusual circumstance that salary increases are greater than the increase in cost of living), but also in the context of evaluations for promotion and tenure. The following policy was approved by then Dean Reed Dasenbrock as an exemplary example of a rationale policy for assessing faculty productivity. The department has employed this policy since 2002.

The goal of the faculty evaluation is to recognize all contributions and evaluate and rank an "overall" contribution made by a given faculty member. To accomplish this, a departmental Faculty Productivity Assessment Advisory Committee is appointed by the chair. The Committee's charge is to use the collective judgement of its members to evaluate the performance of individual faculty members, using the rating scheme outlined below. The ratings are based on data provided in the annual summaries (principally the "Annual Biographical Supplements" as well as other materials such as ICES reports, Standing Committee Chairs input, etc.) provided by faculty members. The ratings consider three areas of assessment: 1) Research 40% (including research done with students- 10%), 2) Teaching 40% (including graduate and undergraduate mentoring-10%), and 3) Service 20% (including "recognition" -10%), discussed below.

Components of Faculty Productivity:

- 1) Research:
 - a) Publications. Peer reviewed articles in peer-reviewed journals should be given the highest rating. Non-reviewed articles or publications of a more local nature (i.e. guidebook articles, local society proceedings) have less weight. Maps should be considered as publications comparable to those in peer-reviewed journals. There should be a distinction between first and not-first authored papers, but no distinction should be made between first-authored papers and those co- authored with students. Books, including scholarly works and textbooks, should also be considered in this evaluation.
 - b) Funding. Funding success can be based on both the number of grants and dollar amounts. Carrying a student on a research grant should carry extra weight, as it not only brings in graduate students, but also relieves the Department's resources. Equipment grants to benefit the overall mission of the

- Department should carry extra weight.
- c) Laboratories. Managing and maintaining a laboratory entails considerable effort; the science stemming from these laboratories benefits the department in terms of prestige and broadens our research facilities. "Closed" facilities, if they exist, should be given far less credit than one that is open to anyone in the department.
 - d) Presentations at meetings. Presenting takes time, but benefits our department
 - e) Student research involvement:
 - Graduate students. It is important to the Department to maintain an active research program involving graduate students. The absence of graduate students in a particular program is not beneficial to the overall mission of the Department.
 - Undergraduate students. Mentoring undergraduate students through research projects is also important and should be viewed favorably by the university. It nurtures prospective graduate students (either internally or externally), and makes our program more attractive at the undergraduate level.
 - Postdoctoral fellows and visiting scientists (sabbatical visitors). Both raise the quality and prestige of our program.
 - Publications and presentations at meetings by students.
- 2) Teaching: Teaching load/Effectiveness. A faculty member can make up for less strong performance in the other fields by having an increased teaching load, assuming they are good teachers. This benefits the department by freeing-up time for those that have more active research programs, more students or large laboratory and field commitments. Student credit hour production must be considered, but is not necessarily a reflection on the quality of teaching nor the importance of a faculty member's contributions to the Department. For example, the number of students in a section of EPS 101 or ENVS 101 may simply be a reflection of the time of day, not the nature of the instructor. In principle, it can be just as difficult to teach a graduate course with 5 students as an undergraduate course with 50. Also, large classes have T.A.s or graders to help with the additional burden. IDEA scores are to be factored into teaching performance; exceptional IDEA evaluations should be further considered in section 5 (recognition). Popularity is not necessarily a measure of quality teaching, yet student credit hour production should be considered in the context of increasing enrollments.
- 3) Service:
- a) University commitments – Faculty Senate, administrative duties, committee assignments, etc.
 - b) Departmental commitments – Committees. Commitment based on effort involved. Head of a specific committee clearly deserves more recognition than that associated with being a member of that committee, or a member or a temporary standing committee. Non-university service – local. K-12 service, NMGS service, mentoring, etc.
 - c) Non-university service – national. Serving on boards (NSF panels, geological societies, editorships, etc). These could be weighted slightly according to the amount of work involved and to the benefit to the department. Associate Editors and Editors of Journals.
 - d) Fund-raising and alumni recruitment.
- Recognition (e.g., Invited talks at meetings or at other Universities, Invited papers for special issues, books, etc., Society-based awards for research and/or teaching excellence, University awards and honors for teaching and/or research excellence)

Evaluation (Ranking) Procedure:

A. Establish four (4) "bins" as generic measures of faculty productivity:

#4 excellent productivity (all salary raises, as lump sums, in this bin are equal, and decided by chair)

#3 quality (good) productivity (all salary raises, as lump sums, in this bin are equal, and decided by chair)

#2 average productivity (salary raises, comparable to cost of living)

#1 low (inadequate) productivity** (salary raise should be less than cost of living)**

** Assigned under the rarest of circumstances; a formal assignment of a negative post-tenure review occurs when a faculty member receives an average Bin 1 determination over a 3-year period.

B. Productivity measurement (WEIGHTING FACTOR IN PARENTHESES)***

1. Research (40 of 100) (Includes graduate and undergraduate student involvement)
2. Teaching (40 of 100) (Includes graduate and undergraduate student involvement)
3. Service and recognition (20 of 100)

*** Note that the weighting factors for each category remain fixed through promotion to Full Professor; after this, the weighting factors may vary and are to be agreed to by the Chair and each faculty member. The weighting factor for categories 1-3 may vary by up to 50 percent.

C. Assignment of Scores

1. Each of the three categories above (B) is assigned 4,3,2, or 1.
2. The category scores are multiplied by appropriate weighting factor (with the maximum number of points as $160+160+80 = 400$).
3. Points are totaled and assigned to one of four "bins" (A).

D. Assignment of scores to each category by a committee

1. The committee consists of five individuals (Chair, one assistant chair, and three additional faculty, each of whom serves a two-year term. The three rotating faculty should represent a wide range of sub-disciplines in the Earth sciences and should reflect both junior and senior levels).
2. Each committee member will not be involved in an evaluation of her/his file or their spouse's file.
3. All productivity estimates will be based on a three-year average. For new faculty, the committee will use all available data.
4. Faculty are encouraged to prepare annual biographical supplements that are as accurate and as detailed as absolutely possible (e.g., include problem "courses", each and every miscellaneous involvement that is consistent with the educational/outreach mission of the University).

E. Challenges to Final Ranking

The process through which faculty members may challenge or clarify the basis for the final ranking is as follows:

1. Discussion of Faculty Productivity Assessment Advisory Committee (FPAAC) ranking with the Chair. Redacted written comments of individual FSC members and their assigned rankings in key areas are available. Chair discusses the ranking, offers suggestions for improved, future performance.
2. If results of step 1 are deemed unsatisfactory, additional discussions concerning the relevant issues of disagreement with the Associate Chair who is on the FPAAC are held.
3. If steps 1 and 2 do not produce a satisfactory resolution, the faculty member prepares a formal statement of his/her grievance and presents it to the FPAAC for discussion. The FPAAC will produce a formal response to the grievance.
4. If step 3 does not produce a satisfactory resolution, the faculty member can bring the grievance to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences per UNM policies on compensation-related grievances.

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion:

Tenure (and promotion) is largely based on the assessment of the same data base used to address annual productivity. An average productivity ranking of "3" over the five year period leading to the sixth year during which a tenure decision made, following a successful midprobationary review, would normally lead to a positive decision by the Department. Under normal circumstances, the Department would look unfavorably on a situation where the candidate's productivity significantly decreased during the fourth and fifth years prior to a tenure decision. The content of external review letters is also, however, critical evidence for successful academic achievement and recognition by ones peers as a contributing member to the field and thus is also be considered by the Department as a critical component of the tenure review. The evaluation of a candidate for promotion to full professor follows a similar approach, in that an average productivity ranking of "3" over several years leading to a decision for promotion to full professor is highly desirable, if not a Department requirement, for initiating the promotion process to full professor. Overall, the bin 2 category plays more of a role in addressing post-tenure review and salary considerations.