

Spring 2014

TO: Faculty, College of Education

FROM: Viola E. Florez, Interim Dean

SUBJ: **FACULTY REVIEWS (ANNUAL, MID-PROBATIONARY,
TENURE, PROMOTION, POST-TENURE)**

Note: This document provides the College of Education and its Departments a policy, procedures, and implementation plan for faculty reviews (annual, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure) as set forth by faculty governance articulated in the Faculty Handbook.

<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*, (December 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, and Maeroff, (1997). *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*]. 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 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. You should clearly

understand, 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, process (steps to be followed), and compilation of the dossier for faculty reviews.

I. STANDARDS

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*]. This document sets forth College of Education standards for tenure and/or promotion in accordance with University policy in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Teaching

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 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. Stimulating lectures, productive discussions, effective laboratory sessions, constructive assessment, innovative teaching strategies, and challenging assignments call for a multitude of skills and techniques. Teaching is more than mere performance; its effectiveness is measured in terms of results – results partially mediated by factors beyond the control of the teacher. Despite these difficulties, we as College of Education faculty have an obligation to appraise teaching as thoroughly as we can in the peer review process. Universities, and ours is no exception, are requiring better evidence to justify recommendations about faculty performance and student outcomes in the area of teaching. The College has made significant progress in this area and the College's Assessment Committee members should be consulted for suggestions to assist with this 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 practicums, 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 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. Teaching is evaluated by students and faculty through formal questionnaires (IDEA) as well as peer review.

Evidence to be evaluated during annual, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty members, and written reports of peer observations of teaching [B1.2.1 (c), *Faculty Handbook*]. There are three principal ways that this data is organized and made available to reviewers:

1. Peer Evaluations. Faculty members must have their teaching appraised by other faculty members. Reviews should be done at least once every semester, but not less than one per year, and by more than one colleague. These peer reviews 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 or other materials associated with the class.
2. Student Evaluations. The University provides opportunities for obtaining student ratings of instructors and courses. The IDEA rating form provides quantified indicators of student perceptions; these may have special value in the review process when an individual's ratings are compared to the ratings of department/program faculty or the College as a whole. Although College policy does not require ICES and/or IDEA ratings, anyone who anticipates being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion or post-tenure must ask students to complete ICES and/or IDEA ratings in each course and section taught. Failure to do so may compromise the tenure/promotion review or the post-tenure review. In addition to the standardized ratings, many faculty keep more qualitative indicators of student perception, such as open-ended questionnaires. In either case, collection of student evaluation should be done in a way that ensures anonymity. Student rating forms are often used to make awards to the teachers they judge to be outstanding. Solicited and unsolicited letters from former students also provide indicators of teaching quality.
3. Self Evaluations. 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, 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.

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 education, literature, the arts, or the professions. 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. 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 [B1.2.2, *Faculty Handbook*].

Scholarship and research in the College of Education encompass both understanding and technique, both theory and practice, both "why" questions and "how" questions. Using the conception of scholarship articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Ernest 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 scholarship, 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.

Faculty have the responsibility to engage in their own, original scholarship and then to share that with the profession. To qualify as scholarship or creative work, the results of the endeavor must be shared with professional educators and/or other peers. This dissemination must be subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the particular field of scholarship or creative work.

Publication normally is the most important vehicle for reporting scholarship 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.

There is no way to set a minimum number of publications that will qualify a faculty member for tenure or promotion; 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. In some academic disciplines and in some professional schools, the peer review process is highly institutionalized. For example, publication in the *American Sociological Review*, the *Yale Law Review*, or the *New England Journal of Medicine* may be accepted as powerful evidence of the quality of one’s scholarship. However, in education, things are not so simple, partly because education encompasses so many specializations that we have no single predominant journal, or even a small set of journals, which leading scholars routinely consult. Education also, to a unique extent, has at least two types of audiences: the scholars who read our work and the practicing educators who read journals focused on practice and published for the practitioner. This does not mean that there are no distinctions among various publications. A paper published in the nationally circulated *American Educational Research Journal* or *Teachers College Record* will have met higher review standards than one published in a regional or local journal. A paper accepted for presentation at a national conference, such as the American Educational Research Association, is more likely to have had rigorous review than a paper delivered at a regional meeting or some national meetings. A report prepared for a commission may have more weight than one published in an obscure journal. A curriculum guide or set of educational materials with wide dissemination such as adoption by a state, district, or an agency may have more influence than a professional paper or obscure journal article. The point is that an important aspect of the review process is to assess the significance and potential impact of the places where the faculty member publishes or disseminates his or her work. That assessment is an integral and necessary part of the review process.

A special note is in order concerning the assessment of college textbooks, program development, and teaching materials for use in the schools. Should they be judged as indicators of teaching performance or of scholarship? They may serve as indicators of both and should be judged in terms of both pedagogical and scholarly criteria. It is required, however, that the work be

presented in either the Teaching or Scholarship section of the dossier, but not both, to avoid any question of redundancy. 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 also can be subjected to peer review. The character of the peer review process and evidence that it has been built into the internal review process are major determinants of the outcome of the faculty review. The expectation is that if written materials such as program development, school materials, and so on are to be valued as part of the total dossier for tenure/promotion, *they must have been submitted and documentation provided for their external assessment.*

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.

Service

Service occurs in two broad categories: professional and public. Service is both a right and an obligation of faculty. Professional service consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession [B1.2.3 (a) (1), ***Faculty Handbook***]. *Within the University*, it includes both the extraordinary and the routine service necessary for the regular operation of programs, departments, the College, and the University as a whole, including, for example, facilitating the day-to-day operations of academic life and mentoring students and colleagues. 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 scholarly work, "service" is an essential element of faculty performance and duties. Faculty members, particularly senior faculty members, have a responsibility to contribute to the governance of the University through timely participation on committees and other advisor 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. This can include membership, participation, or election to office in professional associations; it could include membership on editorial boards of professional journals. Service with national groups brings individuals and the University national recognition and the benefits of such recognition.

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. Public service has special significance for the College of Education in fulfilling the expectations that many communities hold for education. Service to school districts and other educational agencies has particular significance, for these agencies often seek assistance and leadership from College faculty.

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.

Personal Characteristics

The *Faculty Handbook* [B1.2.4] states:

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.

The 1987 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics [Section B, Appendix V, *Faculty Handbook*] may provide additional insight in this category.

Work in the Schools

As a College of Education, a significant number of faculty conduct research, teach, and provide service in school settings. However, 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 schools 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

Faculty reviews take two basic forms: UNM Performance Reviews, including Annual and Merit reviews which are internal review processes and Mid-Probationary, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Reviews, which often involve broader evaluation audiences, both internal and external to UNM.

The two types of 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, the College, and the University.

Responsibilities for all faculty reviews are widely shared. The individual faculty member is responsible for maintaining a current curriculum vitae, for compiling evidence of scholarly work, and for submitting data pertaining to teaching performance and service activity.

UNM Performance Reviews

Annual Reviews

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:

- Curriculum vitae
- Teaching evaluations and other materials reflecting teaching performance
- Copies of scholarly works completed or submitted during the previous year and other materials reflecting scholarly work
- Statement of self evaluation based upon goals set for the previous year
- Statement setting goals for the coming year

The annual review is conducted by the Department Chair, in consultation with at least the tenured members in the program/department and, where appropriate, with any other faculty who are well 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/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 evaluation of all components (teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics) shall be summarized by the Department Chair in the written annual review provided the faculty member. 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.

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].

Merit Reviews

At this time, the procedure for merit reviews is being re-considered.

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

Mid-Probationary Reviews

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 categories of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics. 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 Reviews

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 service in the rank of assistant professor is six years.

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.

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. The recommended number of individuals to be contacted is 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. 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.

Mid-Probationary, Tenure/Promotion Procedures

General procedures for the mid-probationary, tenure and/or promotion faculty review process were developed in 1993 by a task force of faculty (representing all ranks and tenured and non-tenured faculty) named by the then Faculty Policy Committee currently known as the Faculty Governance Committee.

Individual faculty candidates for probationary reviews of mid-probationary and tenure/promotion and individual faculty candidates for promotion will work with their Department Chair to identify a colleague who will assist the candidate to prepare materials for the review and the compilation of the dossier. The contents of the dossier will be in both paper and electronic format. Chairs, department staff, and the Dean's offices also are available to work with candidates on how the dossier should be compiled. 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 in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.5.1 (a) and (b)]. Note: the dossier must possess such qualities as: "standardized"; "combining clarity, convenience, and effectiveness"; and includes those materials that "best represent" the candidate's work. Any materials removed in the construction will be placed in the supporting materials that should be easily accessible if needed. The candidate provides the Department Chair a table of contents that identifies the number of pages in each section of the dossier (sections 4 through 8), which both the Department Chair and the candidate sign to acknowledge that materials received are complete and appropriate.

Procedures for Mid-Probationary, Tenure and Promotion

Step 1 Creation of the "Faculty Panel" for Program review purposes. The Panel should consist of Program faculty and other faculty within the department who

- are knowledgeable about the candidate's field of work;

- will be able to exercise a fair and just assessment;
- are willing to exercise their normative responsibility as a member of the academic community.

Tenured faculty in a candidate's program areas if available must be included on the Faculty Panel and are expected to participate and to vote. At their discretion, or if there are no tenured faculty from the program available to serve, Department Chairs may request that faculty from other programs within the department or from other departments in the College serve on this Panel if they meet the three general criteria given above. All faculty members of the Panel must be tenured and at a rank equal to or higher than the candidate. There is no upper limit on the number of individuals who serve on the Panel, but there may be no fewer than six members. Department Chairs are responsible for assuring that Panel membership meets the standards and criteria.

Step 2 Names of faculty who are to be reviewed for mid-probationary, tenure/promotion, or promotion will be made available to College faculty in September each year by the Dean.

Step 3 All candidates' dossiers, excluding confidential letters and the confidential Reviewer of Teaching evaluation, will be available at designated times in the Fall and Spring 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 then will add these evaluations/letters along with the outside reviewers' letters to the dossier. From this point on, all confidential evaluative information will be available only to the Panel, the Department Chair, the P & T Committee, the Dean and subsequent reviewers. As of academic year 2011-2012 a committee affiliated with the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) and comprised of faculty from across the University was constituted as part of the evaluation process.

Step 4 The dossier and all supporting materials are then available to the members of the Faculty Panel, who individually review the dossier and any back up material that they choose to examine. The dossier now includes all materials and information from Step 3. With the exception of acceptance of a submitted manuscript, no new information may be added to the dossier, other than relevant forms and any formal letters from the Panel, Department Chair, PT Committee, Dean, and the Provost. In the case of an accepted manuscript, the candidate may request that the Department Chair submit a copy of the acceptance letter and a signed memo asking the Associate Dean in charge of promotion and tenure to add these materials to the dossier.

The purpose of the Faculty Panel review is to provide the formal critique by those faculty who are most knowledgeable regarding the candidate's work. The Faculty Panel discussion will be chaired by a member of the Panel appointed by the Department Chair.

- Step 5** The Faculty Panel will meet formally and discuss the evidence in the dossier. After the meeting each Faculty Panel member will individually write a letter of assessment including a formal vote on mid-probationary, tenure, and/or promotion. Each member of the Faculty Panel must provide information based on the evidence as to the rationale/justification for his/her vote. The vote and the rationale for the vote will be sent directly to the Department Chair. (That is, there must be no opportunity for any member of the Panel to review the vote/rationale and then attempt to influence or persuade faculty to change their votes.) Also note: The Faculty Panel Chair writes an individual letter just as every other member; there is no summary letter of the collective discussion.
- Step 6** The Department Chair will review the complete dossier and the rationales and votes of the Faculty Panel. The Department Chair then will prepare a letter that is included in the dossier. The letter shall summarize the faculty evaluations, Faculty Panel rationales and vote, external letters as required, teaching evaluations and other documented evidence. The Department Chair includes in the letter his or her personal observations and evaluation based upon documented information. Finally, the Chair makes a positive or negative recommendation. 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].
- Step 7** The Department Chair delivers the dossier and the supporting materials to the Dean's Office, which prepares the forms, pagination, and the table of contents of the dossier. The dossier and the supporting materials are placed in a secured room to which only the College Promotion and Tenure Committee members have access.
- Step 8** The College's 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.
- Step 9** All recommendations (Faculty Panel, Department Chair, and Promotion and Tenure Committee) are next forwarded to the Dean. These recommendations are

considered by the Dean who then prepares his/her recommendation which is added to the electronic dossier and forwarded to the Office of the Provost. The Dean will inform the candidate of his/her recommendation to the Deputy Provost, according to procedure in the *Faculty Handbook* [B4.3].

Step 10 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.

Appeal

Appeal procedures open to faculty members are described in the *Faculty Handbook*. Some appeals have tended to emphasize procedural errors rather than individual merit. Decisions made on the basis of technicalities are problematic to the individuals, the program/department, and the College. The *Handbook* – and common sense – places primary responsibility for the conduct of reviews at the faculty level. Program faculty together with other Faculty Panel colleagues and the Department Chair, must exercise great care to assure that the review process is thorough, fair, and procedurally correct.

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: biographical updates, student evaluations of teaching (supplemented by periodic but not necessarily annual peer evaluations 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, Section One* [pages B-5, B-6, B-7]. COE Administrators who hold tenured faculty rank shall also be reviewed on the performance of their current administrative positions.

The review, which may be combined with merit and salary review and may be performed by the Chair or the Chair and a committee of 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 of all faculty members for most faculty, more for those with special achievements or identified deficiencies) and the full text of any comment or rebuttal.

III. Dossiers

The candidate, with the assistance of a mentor if desired, is responsible for providing information and documentation for a professional dossier for all Mid-Probationary Tenure and/or Promotion review processes. The Department Chair normally assures that evidence is collected and reviewed in an orderly fashion, although by mutual agreement this responsibility may be assumed by another (tenured) faculty member. The Faculty Panel should see an up-to-date *curriculum vitae* following the template provided to candidates, a complete collection of the candidate's scholarship, ICES and/or IDEA data 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, P & T committee and other appropriate individuals. The Department Chair is responsible for assuring that the review process is timely, thorough, fair, and documented.

The subsequent 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.

Normally the dossier forwarded to the Dean will include only the following:

1. The appropriate University form giving biographical data, a brief recommendation, and the signature of the Department Chair. The form is available from the Dean's Office.
2. A detailed statement and recommendation from the Department 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, gathered during the review process. Some information about the strength and reputation of the journals in which the candidate has published should be included. 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.

3. A section discussing the evidence used to review teaching performance, such as faculty observation reports, summaries of the ICES and/or IDEA data and other rating devices, and evidence of teaching awards and their bases. Include a summary matrix of all the ICES and/or IDEA evaluations. Individual letters from students should be kept to a very few (2-3) examples, although a summary may be provided. Original ICES and/or IDEA forms and other extraneous materials belong in the supporting materials.
4. A section discussing scholarship, such as sample publications, reports from internal and external reviewers (where they are confidential, they should be submitted in a separate folder), and any other evidence reflecting the peer review process used to appraise scholarly performance. Please note that post-Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews are not designed to make original assessments. Instead they emphasize the veracity and significance of the reviews conducted and solicited by the College. Judgments about veracity and significance will be affected by such matters as (a) indications that the reviewers and faculty read and assessed all of the scholarly work produced by the candidate; (b) the reviewers' and faculty members' relationship to the candidate (reviews from friends and relatives tend to be discounted); (c) evidence that the outside reviewers themselves are experts in the field; (d) indications that the Review Panel and P&T Committee faculty have studied and considered the outside reviewers' assessment.

Included in the opening statement section of the dossier should be a complete and current curriculum vitae prepared by the candidate. The vitae should provide information about the candidate's training, experience, professional work, scholarly production, and service activities.

5. A section discussing the candidate's service activities.
6. A separate, confidential, and removable section containing the solicited outside peer reviews.

Documents not included in the dossier are placed in the supporting materials. The Department Chair sends all supporting materials along with the dossier to the Dean's Office. The dossier and all information files are secured in a room accessible only to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The supporting materials will remain and be available if requested by any succeeding review of the dossier at the Dean, or Provost levels. The dossier and the supporting materials will stay secured and available for any of these reviews until the entire University process is completed.

List of References

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

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.

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.

Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (August 1, 1998). *Tenure and promotion at the University of New Mexico*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico.