

Mentoring Guidelines; and Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion Guidelines
Department of Economics, University of New Mexico
2012/2013

I. Introduction and Background

The Department of Economics at the University of New Mexico (UNM) is located in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S). The following provides background context, and then sets out:

- Mentoring Guidelines (for junior faculty), and
- Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion Guidelines,

It closes with considerations specific to continuing non-tenure track Lecturer appointments.

All Department faculty members, tenured or tenure track (T/TT) and non-tenure track, are guided by a collective vision statement (adopted August 23rd, 2011):

“Our department (faculty, staff, and students) is an applied economics program. We value collegiality, intellectual diversity and excellence. We work to improve the well-being of communities. Collectively, we aspire to:

- *Provide quality learning experiences that produce intellectually curious and highly capable graduates*
- *Conduct policy-relevant and high-quality research*
- *Serve the community, university, and discipline.”*

All faculty members (T/TT and non-tenure track) in the Department are subject to two primary governance documents:

- The UNM *Faculty Handbook* (<http://handbook.unm.edu/>)
- The Department’s *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* (effective as of January 1, 2001)¹

Where there are questions or conflicts, the *Faculty Handbook* is recognized as taking precedence. *Inter alia*, the *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* sets out the function of all committees in the Department, including the Tenured Committee and annual Salary Committee. The Salary Committee operates under the provisions of the current *Salary Determination Process* (as adopted by the faculty effective 12/1/2001, and appended to the *Rules of Governance and Decision Making*). Additionally, the Department has a *Variable Teaching Load Policy* (see Appendix), as required by the College A&S in 2011; that policy was adopted on February 3, 2011, with review set for 2014 in the Department. Finally, it is recognized that all Department faculty members are subject to A&S faculty rules and any changes, and any external

¹ The *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* document is available in the Department upon request from Unit Administrator, and also can be found online in the Department’s 2011 Academic Program Review (APR) Self Study Report (<http://www.unm.edu/~apr/Economics.html>).

revisions in the UNM *Faculty Handbook*, or internal revisions (under required voting rules) to the Department's *Rules of Governance and Decision Making*.

All full-time faculty members (T/TT and non-tenure track) in the Department are subject to meeting minimum faculty workload (teaching load equivalent) requirements as set out in the *Faculty Handbook* (see section C 110 on teaching load units and allowable reductions [and B 1.2.1 on definition of teaching], and C 100 on total workload unit requirements for all faculty).

As discussed in the Department's 2011 Academic Program Review (APR) Self Study Report [www.unm.edu/~apr/Economics.html] (pg. 24):

“According to the UNM Faculty Handbook ...the normal Academic Year (AY) teaching load for a T/TT faculty member is 9 formula unit loads per semester, Fall and Spring. This could be simply composed of three courses of 3 credits each, but the UNM formula (from 1975, and recently re-implemented in 2010 for the first time since the 1970s) allows for adjustments due to class size, readings and problems courses, dissertation and thesis supervision. Further, reductions in the 9 unit load requirement can be made on the basis of research productivity, grant preparation, curriculum development, special administrative assignment, and overload compensation from prior semesters. For approximately the last 20 years, a 2+2 (Fall + Spring) annual classroom-assignment teaching load has been the expectation in the Department of Economics for all T/TT faculty members maintaining active research programs. With respect to variable teaching load assignments, as reviewed by Department faculty in 2010, a faculty member may request a teaching focus and go to 3+3 classroom-teaching assignment, and have this considered in annual evaluations, etc. Administrative duties in the Department have historically been associated with a lower teaching load for the Department Chair (1+1), as assigned by the Dean, and are also allocated to the Undergraduate Director (1+2, or 2+1) and Graduate Director (1+2, or 2+1). Faculty may also obtain classroom teaching reductions (no more than one per semester) due to “course buyouts” from approved external research grants (e.g., with graduate student funding support) administered through UNM...”

Under the Department's formal *Variable Teaching Load Policy* adopted in February 2011, all tenured faculty may move to a higher base teaching load (3+3) either voluntarily (as discussed above), or be shifted to that under a triggering mechanism. That triggering mechanism is set off by reduced research productivity (e.g., submits and acceptances on peer-reviewed publications and/or grants). Any faculty member's move to a higher base teaching load would be taken into consideration in annual evaluations, and Salary Committee determinations (see Appendix).

It is expected that the minimum total workload requirements in the UNM *Faculty Handbook* will typically be exceeded by Department faculty members. Thus, it is recognized that meeting minimum total workload (or teaching load equivalent) requirements, as set out in the *Faculty Handbook*, does not equate to meeting an accepted threshold for justifying positive support at the Department level for a tenure and promotion, or a promotion decision for a T/TT faculty member. (These guidelines are discussed in Section III below.)

II. Mentoring Guidelines

The *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* sets out the Department's mentoring guidelines for junior faculty:

“The mentoring of junior faculty can greatly improve the atmosphere for, and productivity of, junior faculty. To this end a formal system of mentoring of junior faculty will be established. Each junior faculty member will be asked to select a mentor from the tenured faculty. It is also possible that a 2-3 person mentoring committee would play this role-and that one member of the committee may be from another department.

The mentor (or the mentoring committee) will meet at least twice a semester with the junior faculty member and be available for more informal interaction. The mentor (or the mentoring committee) will hold these conversations confidential and will not share the content with any other member of the faculty. These conversations must not play a negative role in the annual evaluation of junior faculty. The mentor (or members of the mentoring committee) should be willing to read the academic papers of the mentee and offer advice; make suggestions on outlets for research; perhaps provide academic opportunities for the mentee; and be willing to be an advocate for the mentee with the Department Chair regarding committee assignments, workload, etc.”

While written prior to any continuing non-tenure track faculty appointments in the Department (e.g., Lecturers), these mentoring guidelines can be viewed as general enough to apply to any junior faculty (i.e., in their first six years), whether a tenure track appointment or a non-tenure track, teaching-centered appointment.

III. Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines

As discussed in the Department’s 2011 APR Self Study Report (pg. 32):

“All T/TT faculty members are subject to regular performance reviews and workload reporting requirements. Annual reviews are conducted for all faculty members, and forwarded to the Dean’s Office. Junior faculty members are evaluated annually by the Chair, with input from senior tenured faculty members. Assistant professors meet multiple times annually with the chair, and are also asked to identify one of more mentors, from the Economics faculty, to help provide counsel and feedback on research, teaching and service questions that might arise. Under the University’s post-tenure review policy, all senior faculty members are also evaluated annually by the Chair. Of course, the keenest assessments of are made in conjunction with personnel decisions for Code 3 renewal, tenure and promotion to associate professor (Code 6), and promotion to full professor.

Annual reviews are conducted by the Chair subsequent to the deliberations of the annual Salary Committee, and include discussion of any assessment of performance and merit recommendation from the Salary Committee. The required information collected from all faculty members each Spring semester includes an updated CV, as well a Calendar Year Salary Document (CYSO). The following shows the 2011 CYSO format as an example:

- I. Publication(s) accepted in 2011 (include title, name of journal, names of authors and acceptance date).**
 - A. Journal Article(s):**
 - B. Book(s):**
 - C. Book Review(s):**
- II. Manuscript(s) submitted. (A manuscript should be listed only once in its lifetime; do not list again -- whether it is a resubmission at the invite of the editor or a submission to another journal. Include title, name of journal and date submitted.)**
- III. Paper(s) presented at professional meetings. (Include title of paper and name and date of the meeting.)**
- IV. Grant proposal(s)**

A. Submitted (full title, agency, etc.; no repeats from year to year that are substantively the same)

B. Accepted (full title, agency, etc.)

C. Accepted with graduate student support (full title, amount of student support and period of that support).

V. Committee work and other service (nature of service and dates of participation)

College or University:

Community Service:

Professional:

MA Thesis Committee

Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Chair

VIII. Journal Editor/Board (name of journal and dates of service)

IX. Courses taught and IDEA scores (raw and adjusted) for items A (Progress on Objectives), B (Teacher) and C (Course overall), from the summary evaluation of teaching:

A. Spring Semester 2011

B. Fall Semester 2011

As stated in the *Salary Determination Process*, individual faculty members may include any additional information (e.g., honors and awards, future plans, missing activities, etc.) in the CYSD the individual feels pertinent. Finally, in addition to providing to the annual Salary Committee, the Unit Administrator makes all annual Salary Document binders (with all faculty information) from the current and past years available for faculty review. The Unit Administrator also makes a spreadsheet of all faculty base salaries (since late 1980's) available annually to all faculty members prior to the start of the annual Spring salary determination process. All faculty members, including junior faculty members, are encouraged to review current and past years' information.

As stated in the Department's 2011 APR Self Study Report (pp. 32-33):

"In making recommendations to the College of Arts and Sciences, tenure and promotion cases are considered and voted on by the tenured faculty members, for tenure and promotion decisions to associate professor, and by the full professors for promotion cases to full professor. The quantity and quality of publications or other scholarly works expected for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, and promotion to professor relies on the expertise and wisdom of the internal and external evaluators. Since the adoption of the current *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* in 2001, the Department faculty have not endorsed or used any single list of appropriate journals or journal ranking list in making annual reviews, salary recommendations or tenure and promotion decisions. Rather, the Department has chosen to rely on the individual and collective judgments of both internal and external reviewers for disciplinary standards, and expectations on the portfolio of peer-reviewed publications and the research pipeline.

The Department Chair is evaluated annually by the Dean of the College of A&S with input provided by faculty.

All faculty reviews are conducted under the guidelines of the UNM Faculty Handbook.”

Further, the UNM *Faculty Handbook* identifies the four categories for faculty performance evaluation (section B 1.2), and establishes the tenure and promotion requirements of achieving “effectiveness” in all four areas, and “excellence” in either teaching or research:

“1.2 CATEGORIES FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

(a) The categories in which faculty performance will be evaluated are the following:

- (1) Teaching
- (2) Scholarly Work
- (3) Service
- (4) Personal Characteristics

The University's general expectations in each of these categories are set forth below.

(b) 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. Service and personal characteristics are important but normally round out and complement the faculty member’s strengths in teaching and scholarly work.”

The *Faculty Handbook* sets out general expectations for each of these categories, including: defining “effective teaching” criteria, and requiring both student and faculty evaluations of teaching; defining research as the “systematic, original investigation directed toward the generation, development, and validation of new knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems,” subject to the criterion of critical peer review and publication; and recognizing that evidence of scholarly works may include evidence of integration of research and teaching:

“1.2.1 Teaching

(a) Due to the variety of subject matter and student populations at the University, teaching occurs in various settings and via a diversity of forms of instruction, such as didactic lecturing, small group seminars, problem-based learning, and clinical practicums. 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, post-doctoral, and professional students. Library faculty, in the discharge of their professional duties, shall be regarded as engaged in teaching. Teaching also includes the direction or supervision of students in reading, research, internships, residencies, or fellowships. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that confer no University credit should also be considered as teaching.

(b) Effective teaching is one of the primary qualifications for promotion and tenure. The educational experience provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning. An effective teacher is best characterized as an individual who successfully promotes these goals. Although individual teachers bring to bear different sets of talents in pursuit of these goals an effective teacher, at a minimum, should:

- 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.
- Demonstrate a commitment to the discipline.

(c) Teaching is evaluated by students and faculty. Evidence to be evaluated for teaching during mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member, and written reports of peer observations of teaching.

1.2.2 Scholarly Work

(a) The term *Scholarly Work*, as used in this Policy, comprises scholarship, research, 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.

(b) The faculty member's scholarly work should contribute to the discipline and serve as an indication of professional competence. The criteria for judging the original or imaginative nature of research or creative work must reflect the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. 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.

(c) 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. Written evaluations from colleagues and experts in the field, both on campus and at other institutions, may be used at the discretion of the department for the mid-probationary review (Sec. 4.5 and 4.6). Such evaluations must, however, form part of the dossier for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks (Sec. 4.5, 4.7, and 4.8).

1.2.3 Service

(a) There are two broad categories of faculty service: professional and public.

(1) Professional service consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession. Within the University, it includes both the extraordinary and the routine service necessary for the regular operation of departments and colleges and the University as a whole, including, for example, facilitating the day-to-day operations of academic life, mentoring students and colleagues, and, in the Health Sciences Center, providing patient care. Universities, and their component colleges and departments, rely to a great extent for their operation and advancement on the active participation of faculty members in their administration and governance. Although service is not weighted as heavily as teaching and research or creative works, "service" is an essential element of faculty performance and duties. Faculty members, particularly senior faculty members, have a responsibility to contribute to the government of the University through timely participation on committees and other advisory groups at the department, college, and University levels. Beyond the University, professional service includes service to professional organizations and other groups that engage in or support educational and research activities.

(2) 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 in which the University is located.

(b) Service to the University, to the faculty member's profession and to the local, national, and international communities beyond the University is reviewed in this category. Evidence of performance in this area includes committee work at the University, college and department levels, and participation in professional organizations of the discipline and in the community in the faculty member's professional capacity.

1.2.4 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 a 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."

The *Faculty Handbook* further defines T/TT faculty ranks and titles (section B 2.2):

“2.2 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY RANKS AND TITLES

Faculty members with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or distinguished professor may be awarded tenure (for an exception in the Health Sciences, see Sec. 2.3.1). Probationary appointments potentially leading to tenure ("tenure-track" appointments) are made at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor levels.

2.2.1 Assistant Professor

Individuals who are demonstrably competent in the subject matter of the courses to be taught and who have indicated a serious commitment to a faculty career may be considered for this faculty rank. This appointment is typical for most faculty who are beginning their probationary service. While it is not expected that persons appointed at this rank shall have acquired an extensive reputation in their field, it is expected that they will continue to increase their knowledge, to improve their teaching ability and to present the results of their scholarly work in ways appropriate to their field.

2.2.2 Associate Professor

(a) Individuals who have acquired significant experience beyond the terminal degree are appropriate for this faculty rank. They shall have demonstrated competence as teachers and have shown a conscientious interest in improving their teaching. They shall have demonstrated a basic general understanding of a substantial part of their discipline and have an established reputation within

and outside the University in their fields of scholarly work. This implies scholarly work after the terminal degree sufficient to indicate continuing interest and growth in the candidate's professional field.

(b) Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of associate professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions to teaching, scholarly work, and service. The appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments and promise in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership.

2.2.3 Professor

(a) Individuals who have attained high standards in teaching and who have made significant contributions to their disciplines may be considered for this faculty rank. They shall also have developed expertise and interest in the general problems of university education and their social implications, and have shown the ability to make constructive judgments and decisions. It is expected that the professor will continue to develop and mature with regard to teaching, scholarly work, and the other qualities that contributed to earlier appointments.

(b) Appointment or promotion to Professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college/school, and University that the individual has made significant, nationally recognized scholarly or creative contributions to his or her field and an expectation that the individual will continue to do so.

(c) Professors are the most enduring group of faculty, and it is they who give leadership and set the tone for the entire University. Thus, appointment or promotion should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership."

Further the *Faculty Handbook* (section B 4) sets out the provisions for all faculty reviews including the specific provisions for T/TT faculty for mid-probationary reviews, tenure reviews and promotion:

"4.6 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

4.6.1 Purpose and Standards

(a) The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to enable the department to evaluate progress towards tenure, to inform the probationary faculty member of his or her strengths and weaknesses, and to decide whether or not to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in the four categories of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit.

(b) The mid-probationary review requires identification of the specific areas of strength and weakness demonstrated by the faculty member and the evidence supporting conclusions to that effect. The aim of the required identification of areas of strength and weakness is to give the faculty member a clear picture of the performance levels by which he or she is to be judged and offer the opportunity to correct any noted deficiencies prior to subsequent reviews. The existence of some identified deficiencies in this review are considered normal, as it is not anticipated that the probationary member will have fully attained the standards required for the award of tenure by the time of the mid-probationary review.

(c) For a positive mid-probationary review there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, the competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty, as well as promise of excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. If the University concludes that insufficient progress towards tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and necessary.

4.7 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR TENURE REVIEW

4.7.1 Purposes of the Tenure System

The academic freedom of teachers and scholars is the means by which society is protected from hindrances to the search for knowledge and from limits on the dissemination of knowledge. The system of tenure for faculty members is the preeminent means of fostering and protecting academic freedom of the faculty. The tenure system consists of rules and procedures that establish an essentially self-regulated body of scholars, researchers, and creative artists enjoying the continuity of existence and economic security within which academic freedom is both fostered and protected. The protection of academic freedom shall be extended to all members of the faculty during their terms of appointment. The tenured faculty of a university serve the institution by providing continuity to the university and to its mission of instruction, scholarly work, and service. The awarding of tenure carries both benefits and responsibilities to the individual so recognized. As the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) notes, "freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." It is the responsibility of faculty members, supported by the tenure system, to use the opportunities thus provided for the advancement of the purposes of the University and of the community it serves. These purposes include teaching, scholarly work, and service.

4.7.2 Purpose of the Tenure Review and Standards for Tenure

The awarding of tenure is the most serious commitment the department, college/school, and 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 tenure review consists of evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit. For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas, and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. Faculty in the

School of Medicine are required to demonstrate excellence in two of the following categories of teaching, scholarly work, or service/administration as described in the Medical School tenure and promotion guidelines.

4.8 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR ADVANCEMENT IN RANK: PROMOTIONS

4.8.1 Purpose

(a) The promotion process is the mechanism by which the University promotes and recognizes the professional development of faculty members, and thereby maintains the quality of the University. A description of the faculty ranks is provided in this policy (Sec. 2) to set a framework for the promotion process. The promotion review consists of evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics (Sec. 1), according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit, both as appropriate for the promotion level.

(b) Decisions to promote a faculty member are made after a thorough evaluation of his or her performance in all the areas of faculty professional activities and the corresponding categories of performance evaluation specified in this Handbook. The candidate's performance is judged by all recommending parties in the light of the categories and definitions set forth in this Policy, the assignments of the candidate, and any special conditions pertaining to the candidate's appointment.

4.8.2 Promotion to Associate Professor

(a) It is the policy of the University that tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will normally be granted together. A candidate for tenure who does not already hold the rank of associate professor shall simultaneously be considered for promotion to the associate professor rank. A favorable decision on promotion to associate professor rank shall normally be a basic prerequisite for the awarding of tenure. Requests for departures from this policy must be made prior to the initiation of the tenure or promotion review process with the concurrence of the department, the dean, and the Provost/VPHS.

(b) Timetable for promotion to associate professor: The anticipated length of service in the rank of assistant professor is six years, with review for promotion to the rank of associate professor occurring in the sixth year. The review process for advancement to associate professor is normally conducted at the same time as the review for tenure (i.e., Fall semester of the final academic year of the probationary period). Recommendations for promotion in less time are to be carefully weighed and justified. Notification of the outcome of the review shall be made during the Spring semester no later than June 30 of that year.

4.8.3 Promotion to Professor

(a) Qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor include attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly work, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank in comparable universities. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.

(b) Timetable for promotion to professor: 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 in less time must be carefully weighed and justified. The review for advancement in rank to that of professor is initiated during the Fall semester. Notification of the outcome of the review is made during the Spring no later than June 30 of that year."

Consistent with the *Faculty Handbook's* general guidelines, established protocols in the Department include seeking 8-12 external reviewers for T&P, or promotion files, with half from names provided by candidate and half from names provided by the eligible review faculty, and the final set of reviewers selected by the Department Chair according to those proportions.

As a benchmark for student evaluation of teaching, the 2011 APR Self Study Report (pg. 56) also provides summaries of recent Department performance with respect to the percentage of economics courses at or above IDEA averages. In addition to the regular collection and annual reporting (e.g., in our CYSD) of student evaluations of teaching, all junior faculty are encouraged annually by the Department Chair to receive regular written faculty peer reviews of their classroom teaching (e.g., at least annually if not every semester). It is expected that these written peer reviews of teaching would be included in both T&P and promotion files.

Similar to prior 10-year reviews, the 2011 APR Self Study Report also provides: measures of average research productivity per UNM economics faculty member (2000-2010) of peer reviewed publications (pg. 35), with comparisons to recent NRC national averages for PhD economics programs (pg. 194); measures of external grant funding (pg. 42); and references to at least seven recent independent ranking of economics-related journals, with total departmental

productivity across various top-10, top-20, top-40 and top-100 journal rankings lists (pg. 38). These figures help to provide benchmarks. Faculty members are further encouraged to stay current with various disciplinary and interdisciplinary journal rankings as indicators of quality assessments.

Finally, the Department's 2011 APR Self-Study Report includes statements on the valuing co-authorship (especially with students), collaboration and interdisciplinary scholarly activity:

“Collectively, as a key part of the teaching and mentoring of graduate students, Department faculty members value the co-publication of peer-reviewed publications (journal articles and book chapters) with department graduate students.” (pg. 36)

“While sole-authored publications are always highly valued, there is a strong collective culture in the Department of not penalizing research co-authorship. For example, co-authorship is not penalized in any form in the faculty salary guidelines or committee reviews. This perspective is consistent with a focus on developing collaborative and often applied or interdisciplinary research programs.” (pg. 36)

Economics Department faculty members value interdisciplinary scholarship, and commonly seek interdisciplinary outlets for their research (across broad areas such as environment, poverty, health, and education).” (pg. 40)

IV. Considerations for Continuing, Non-tenure Track Lecturer Appointments

Continuing non-tenure track faculty (e.g., Lecturer) appointments in the Department are guided by the same collective vision statement, and subject to the same governance documents as all T/TT faculty members. They are subject to meeting UNM *Faculty Handbook* minimum workload requirements, consistent with the terms of their individual appointments (e.g., specific teaching and service appointments).

As noted, Department **Mentoring Guidelines** (section II above) are flexible enough to incorporate teaching-centered faculty Lecturer appointments.

The UNM *Faculty Handbook* (section B 2.3) explicitly identifies non-tenure track faculty titles including Lecturers:

“2.3.2 Lecturer

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.”

The *Faculty Handbook* sets out the provisions for appointments for continuing non-tenure track faculty Lecturers (Section B 3.4.2):

“3.4.2 Lecturers

Lecturers are initially appointed to annual terms renewable at the discretion of the University. Written notice regarding the status of a lecturer shall be given according to the following minimum periods of notice: (1) not later than March 31 of the first academic year of service or (2) not later than December 15 of the second or subsequent academic year of service. Lecturers who have completed at least three academic years of continuous service are eligible for renewable two-year term appointments. Senior

Lecturers serve on renewable two-year term appointments, and Principal Lecturers serve on renewable three-year term appointments. Two- and three-year term appointments are renewable at the discretion of the University. Notice of the status of these term appointments will be given no later than December 15 of the final year of the term appointment.”

The *Faculty Handbook* establishes the requirement for the Department to conduct annual reviews of these faculty members (Section B 4.10).

It is expected that annual reviews for Lecturers will be conducted by the Department Chair, with input from tenured faculty. It is expected annual Salary Document information for Lecturers will be collected and reviewed by the Department’s annual Salary Committee, with recommendations made under provisions of the Department’s *Salary Determination Process*. It is expected that all evaluations will take into account individual appointments (e.g., teaching load) and other assignments (e.g., specific service appointments or duties).

It is expected that opportunities for promotion for continuing non tenure-track Lecturers (i.e., from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer) under the UNM *Faculty Handbook*, would follow a consistent time frame (e.g., expectations on minimum years) as set out for opportunities for promotion for tenure-track positions (i.e., assistant professor to associate professor to professor). The promotion opportunity is available at each level, but is not a required step (as is the tenure decision in the typical move from assistant to associate professor). The promotion process would be initiated at the request of the individual in writing to the Department Chair in the preceding Fall semester prior to the AY of any proposed promotion. The candidate would prepare a professional dossier for departmental review. The dossier would be due at the start of the subsequent Spring Semester, and the review would be conducted in that Spring Semester. Candidates would be free to include letters of support from any source, but the process would only include internal reviews. Specifically, the tenured faculty members would provide their individual written reviews of the dossier materials, and their support decisions, as requested by the Department Chair. The Department Chair would then summarize those reviews and the aggregate level of support and submit his or her written recommendation, along with the complete dossier (as supporting materials for the decision), to the Dean of A&S.

Finally, the Department process for annual reviews and promotion decisions for continuing non tenure-track Lecturers would be subject to any guidelines or rules set out by the College of A&S or the Provost’s Office at UNM.

Appendix

Department of Economics, UNM

Variable Teaching Load Policy

Effective Date: February 7, 2011 - (With re-evaluation required in 2014)

The standard classroom teaching assignment (annually) for all faculty in the Department of Economics at UNM has been a base 2+2 load (two assigned classroom courses in both Fall and Spring semesters), with the assumption of an active research program. This can be reduced through administrative or contractual agreements, and through signed course buyouts for external research grants (maintaining at least one classroom course each semester). Higher teaching loads for individual faculty members can also be implemented based on a reduced focus on research (a voluntary choice), or reduced research productivity (a triggering mechanism):

A. Any tenured faculty member, with their salary line in the department budget, may voluntarily choose to move to a higher classroom teaching load (e.g., 3+3) through a signed agreement with the Department Chair (kept on file in Department and forwarded to College of A&S). The signed agreement would be expected to articulate any reduced research expectations, as well as the increased teaching expectations including more than just additional course assignments. As previously noted by faculty meeting and review consensus, such a voluntary change can be accommodated within the current Rules of Governance and Decision Making and annual Salary Determination Process, and Annual Review process in the Department.

B. An increased teaching load can also be assigned for the next academic year (AY) to any tenured faculty member, with their salary line in the department budget, who fails to meet at least one of the following conditions, excluding time during approved leaves of absences (not sabbaticals):

- (i) at least one accepted or published piece, as author or co-author, in a peer-reviewed professional outlet (professional journal, edited book chapter or book) within the last 3 years (as listed, and verified, on annual salary data)
- (ii) at least one accepted or active external research grant, as listed Co-PI or PI, administered through UNM within the last three years (as listed, and verified, on annual salary data)
- (iii) at least two current submissions (under review consideration) of either manuscripts for publication (as author or co-author to peer-reviewed professional outlets) or external research grants (as listed Co-PI or PI) within the last year.
- (iv) other scholarly accomplishments of noteworthy distinction, within the last 3 years.

C. If the conditions in B are triggered for an increased teaching load for any faculty member, the increase in the first year will be to a 3+2 (or 2+3) assigned classroom-teaching load. Absent meeting the conditions in the B in the subsequent year, this will then increase to a 3+3 teaching load. The 3+3 teaching load would continue until the conditions in B are met. Notification of the faculty member of any increase in base teaching load for the next AY should be made within the required Annual Review process (kept on file in Department and submitted to College of A&S).

D. For the first time that the increased teaching load assignment in C is triggered for any faculty member, the individual may request in writing to the Department Chair a one year delay to the initial increase in the base teaching load. The faculty member would work with the Chair to identify current plans for moving their research program forward. It is expected that this request would be granted, conditional on the faculty member submitting a plan for current and future research activities. If the conditions in B are not subsequently met after the additional year, then the initial increase in the base teaching load in C would be triggered.