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1.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The University Honors Program (UHP) is designed to be a liberal arts program set within our Flagship Research University. The mission of the Honors Program is to provide challenging opportunities for intensive interdisciplinary and cross-cultural liberal education to highly motivated, talented and creative undergraduates in all majors and to build a community of scholars. Intrinsic to this design are a broad range of responsibilities and a continuing round of activities for faculty. The responsibilities and activities fall into the realms of teaching, scholarship and service. The Honors Program considers all three areas to be important with regard to promotion and tenure. The UHP offers a community in which the full round of college life contributes to higher education. The three aforementioned areas naturally play a vital role in this community. As the following sections indicate, each element of this triad makes a special and vital contribution to the Honors Program. Consistent with the UHP emphasis on innovative and personalized liberal arts education, careful attention is to be given to qualitative aspects of teaching. In keeping with the UHP interdisciplinary curriculum, furthermore, innovative forms of scholarship within and among traditional disciplines are to be valued, as is work that challenges disciplinarity altogether. Commensurate with the UHP’s fostering of a way of life that contributes to the learning process, a varicy of service activities should also be valued. Contributions in all of these areas are vital to the production of excellence in the UHP community and so must be given their due weight in evaluating a candidate’s progress toward promotion and tenure.

The University Honors Program strives to create a collegial atmosphere to facilitate teaching and research. Collegiality, therefore, plays a role in the promotion and tenure process. Collegiality is not congeniality. It is a quality manifested in one’s willingness to serve on committees, to provide guidance and support to colleagues and to engage constructively in the collective work of the program.

The Honors Program recognizes that different areas of specialization may have different standards of evaluation of scholarly and service activities. Candidates for tenure and promotion in the Honors Program will be judged by standards of their areas of professional specialization and evaluated in light of their actual workload and responsibilities.

The UNM Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure Handbook procedures will apply to all general tenure and promotion procedures, time deadlines, procedures for confidentiality, and appeal procedures.

1.2 TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Since Assistant Professors in the Honors Program have different areas of specialization, an individual Tenure and Promotion Committee will be established for each faculty member on tenure track. The T & P Committee will consist of the director of the Honors Program, who will serve in the capacity of a department chair; at least two faculty
members from a department that best represents the disciplinary scholarly interest of the faculty member; and at least three tenured faculty in the Honors Program. The Director will meet with potential T & P Committee members, go over the guidelines, and request their assistance in the process. Once the Committee is formed, this group will mentor the assistant professor as well as submit annual evaluations to the UHP Director. The T & P Committee will also provide the Director with names and addresses of potential external reviewers. Individual members of the committee will also submit a final written evaluation with recommendations.

1.3 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE REGARDING SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

1.3.1 Candidates for tenure are required to pursue scholarship and/or creative work.

1.3.2 It is expected that, given a teaching load of five classes or equivalent per year, candidates will be able to produce significant scholarly or artistic work each year (based on the assumption that this load amounts to a reduction of one course in their teaching load for the purpose of scholarship or creative activity). Summer and intercession classes are not included in the regular load.

1.3.3 The significance of scholarly and/or artistic achievement will be evaluated in terms of the criteria stated elsewhere in these T&P Guidelines regarding the quantity and quality of a candidate’s work in relevant areas.

1.3.4 Candidates are also evaluated on personal characteristics which constitute 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 Honors Program and the University. Information used in the appraisal of personal traits may be acquired from peer evaluations.

1.4 RELATIVE WEIGHTS OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

According to the mission statement above, teaching, scholarship, and service will all be important in the determination of tenure and promotion. The relative weight of the three may vary from the portfolio of one candidate to that of another. Since the fundamental mission of the Honors Program is to provide students with a quality education, it is expected that a successful candidate will have high-quality ratings in all areas of the triad. There may be cases where an individual makes truly outstanding contributions in a single area while being proficient in the others. The committee is encouraged to take into account such exceptional circumstances.
1.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANNUAL REVIEWS AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Tenure and Promotion decision legitimately may consider the degree to which the candidate’s teaching, scholarship and/or other creative activities are a cumulative body of scholarly work. Such decisions may consider efforts towards and rates of improvement in instructional performance. It may consider how each year’s accomplishments are related to the previous year’s activities. Tenure and promotion decisions may look at patterns of activity that are not evaluated annually. Therefore, UHP annual reviews will be considered in terms of both the annual and the cumulative pattern of the candidate’s accomplishments. The evaluation for promotion and tenure is not based on a simple numerical averaging of annual reports, but reflects progress over several years.

2.1 PRE-TENURE ANNUAL REVIEW

Each faculty member’s annual evaluation will be based on performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The faculty member is responsible for updating his or her vita and including copies of the work accomplished that year in the annual portfolio.

Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will evaluate the faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Each will forward a written review to the Director of the UHP, who in turn, will write an evaluation that includes the overall substantive remarks of the committee. The annual review will be sent to the Dean of University College and a copy will be provided to the candidate.

2.2 Post-tenure annual reviews are discussed in section E.1.

3.1 HONORS PROGRAM PROCEDURES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE

The evaluation which is carried out mid-way in the probationary period has a different and more specific timetable than annual reviews. The decision, which is reach by the T & P Committee, the Honors Program, the Dean, the Deputy Provost, and the Provost, is either to continue the faculty member into the second three-year portion of the probationary period, or, instead, to offer a terminal one-year contract.

The intent of the mid-probationary evaluations is to provide a careful check of progress toward the forthcoming tenure decision. This evaluation will give the faculty member a clear picture of the performance levels by which she or he is to be judged and to offer the opportunity to correct deficiencies in the second half of the probationary period.

The Code 3 evaluation also provides the University an opportunity to examine its own needs for programmatic flexibility, in that it is possible to offer only a one-year contract to a faculty member deemed meritorious but for whom the University anticipates no further need because of changing academic circumstances. This decision must be made and communicated to the faculty member by June 30 of the third year of service.
The Code 3 evaluation is carried out essentially as described for ordinary annual review. The areas of teaching, scholarship and/or creative projects, and service are analyzed. The Chair’s statement, which is based on the T & P committee’s review, is forwarded to the Dean along with the candidate’s portfolio. The Dean forwards the materials to the Deputy Provost and then the Provost. The Chair will outline the strengths and weaknesses revealed by the evaluation process, and should indicate the expectations which must be met before tenure will be awarded. This document must be straightforward in noting that meeting these minimal expectations does not guarantee a positive later tenure decision.

The Third-Year Review will be completed in the spring term of the faculty member’s third year of employment. Materials must be presented to the Deputy Provost by the second Friday of February.

The candidate will assemble the Third-Year Review portfolio containing all of the materials required in the Honors Program tenure portfolio. Letters of reference from outside the Honors Program are optional. The candidate’s self-evaluation will contain a detailed section on research and/or creative activity. Fore research, candidates should describe their research agenda including published and unpublished work, grant proposals, and fellowships. For creative activity, candidates should include descriptions and reviews of exhibitions or performances, published work, and the status of current projects. The self-evaluation should state the significance of the faculty member’s work as a contribution to one or more of the following areas: disciplinary research, interdisciplinary research, the Honors Program curriculum, and professional development. For teaching, because two peer evaluations are required for the tenure portfolio, one peer evaluation of teaching will be included in the Third-Year Review portfolio. Candidates are expected to meet with the peer evaluator before the visit to discuss the course design and pedagogical strategies. The evaluation will be placed in the candidate’s file. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the peer evaluation.

In addition, the self-evaluation will detail the faculty member’s teaching and service contributions to the Honors Program. With regard to teaching, the self-evaluation should address student and peer teaching evaluations, new course preparation, thesis supervision, direction of independent studies, curriculum development, and other contributions to Honors Program teaching.

The T & P Committee will evaluate the portfolio. Each member will write a letter evaluating the candidate’s progress towards tenure, considering the candidate’s record, and relevant criteria. This letter will include a rating of excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory of each of the areas in the triad. The letter will also include (if necessary) specific suggestions about what the candidate needs to do to be recommended for tenure. The Director of the Honors Program will give a copy of the narrative account and the letter to the candidate. The candidate will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to the letter and narrative account. All materials will be submitted to the Honors Director who will compose a summary evaluation of the file evaluating the candidate’s progress.
toward tenure and forward it to the Dean. The Honors Director and the candidate will meet to discuss the evaluation and sign final versions of Third-Year Review materials. A copy of all third year materials will go into the candidate’s file.

4.1 THE TENURE PROCESS

To assist in the evaluation of a candidate’s portfolio, the Honors Program, like other units of the University, uses letters of evaluation from both within and without the University. At least six letters must come from evaluators who are outside the University. Other letters will be solicited from University colleagues. These letters will be expected to address the entire portfolio and more specifically the candidate’s contributions to the University of New Mexico community.

The candidate will prepare a portfolio as described in section D.4. The T & P Committee and the candidate will submit potential referees to the Honors Director. The Director will contact at minimum six referees and solicit external reviews of the candidate’s scholarship as described in the section on scholarship.

The candidate will also solicit letters recommendation from within the University.

The T & P Committee will review the portfolio including the letters of recommendation from external reviewers as well as those from within the University. The committee will meet to vote on the tenure and promotion decision. Each T & P Committee member will then write a report to the Honors Director endorsing tenure and promotion or opposing tenure and promotion. The Honors Director will then write a letter to the Dean, summarizing the reports and the vote by the T & P Committee and submit the letter with the candidate’s portfolio. The Dean will receive the materials and write a recommendation to be forwarded with the portfolio to the Deputy Provost.

4.1 TEACHING

The fundamental mission of the Honors Program is to provide students with a quality education. UHP instructors take an active interest in teaching as they work together formally and informally with their colleagues to create a culture with a high awareness of teaching. Candidates for promotion and tenure will be expected to achieve a high rating in teaching. In addition, the Honors Program recognizes the importance of team teaching, the development of interdisciplinary courses, writing-intensive courses, and the sustained work involved in mentoring seniors during their thesis year. For the purposes of Promotion and Tenure evaluations of teaching includes student (ICES) and peer teaching evaluations, as well as an evaluation of curriculum development and innovative pedagogy. Candidates will write a self-evaluation, stating their teaching philosophy and efforts they have made to improve their teaching.

The evaluation of teaching will be both additive and cumulative, combining the information from annual evaluations over the entire period of evaluation, peer evaluation, self-assessment, and other information. Candidates for tenure are required by the Honors
Program to have two peer evaluations in which the candidates invites a tenured faculty member to observe her/his teaching (one of which will have been done for the Third-Year Review).

Activities and Indicators of excellence in teaching may include:

- Excellent student evaluations, particularly as indicated by the narrative component of evaluations.
- Teaching Awards.
- Excellent peer and/or supervisor evaluations.
- Innovative curriculum development
- Innovative pedagogical approaches.
- Participation in team teaching.
- Supervision of independent study, research, theses/dissertations.
- Successful grant applications in support of curriculum and pedagogical development.
- Guest lecturing in another professor’s class.

4.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates for tenure must demonstrate that they are active and creative participants in the scholarship or artistry of both their professional discipline and in Honors. The successful candidate must demonstrate that he or she can develop new research/creative projects and bring them to successful conclusion. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the Honors Program, it is expected that interdisciplinary scholarship will be given the same weight in tenure considerations as discipline-specific scholarship. The Honors Program recognizes that outstanding interdisciplinary scholarship may be published in various forms and venues including electronic media.

The candidate will be expected to provide a statement on scholarship in both the Third-Year Review dossier and in the tenure and promotion dossier. The statement should include a description of the impact or influence on the scholarly record. In addition, the candidate should provide copies of the scholarship in the dossier. Scholarship will be evaluated on impact in the field, quantity of publications, and venue of publication. It is important to stress quality rather than mere quantity, but a sufficient number of publications are necessary. Appropriate materials may include the following depending on the candidate’s field:

1) Books (one or two in either the candidate’s field, or interdisciplinary areas including Honors, or a textbook)
2) Articles (may be in the candidate’s field, in honors education, or interdisciplinary areas—at least one per year while on tenure track).
3) Creative works (novels, short stories, poetry).
4) Grants
5) Presentations (professional conferences in the discipline or in Honors).
6) New forms such as digital and electronic media
Articles should be in journals or magazines of high reputation in the field. In Honors, candidates may publish in the *NCHC Journal* (refereed) or *Honors in Practice* (refereed).

**Activities and Indicators used to evaluate excellent scholarly achievements include:**

- The publication of scholarly work in peer-reviewed and regionally, nationally or internationally distributed journals, including traditional and electronic formats.
- The publication of a scholarly book or textbook.
- Exhibition or performance of peer-reviewed creative work at the national or international level, or the curatorship of such an event.
- Editorship of a book accepted by contract for publication.
- Frequent citation of the candidate’s work by other scholars.
- Pattern of success in obtaining significant extramural funding through grants, awards, or fellowships.
- Editorship of a journal.
- The publication of a peer reviewed chapter in edited collections.
- Awards and prizes received in competitions for research or creative activity.
- Patent awarded.

**4.3 SERVICE**

Given the nature of the Honors Program, which demands extraordinary amount of service from assistant professors, the service component should play a role in evaluation of tenure and promotion.

Service plays a fundamental role in the Honors Program community. Teaching and scholarship are augmented by a range of responsibilities and activities orchestrated to enhance education: from lectures and events in the community to recruiting that takes place throughout the academic year to the full round of Program and University committee work necessary to the functioning of the institution. The Honors Program considers this range of service to be vital to the unique form and high quality of education in our community. Contributions of faculty in the area of service are therefore to be respected and weighed accordingly.

**Examples of service activities fulfilling faculty responsibilities in this area appear below.**

Service includes, but is not limited to, the following activities. Depending on the individual circumstances and Honors Program assignments, some of these activities may count as teaching rather than service (such as UHP Forum talks, guest lectures, etc.) These may include the following:

- Service on an Honors Program Committee
- Service on a search committee
- Participating in the national and regional Honors community
  - Attending NCHC conferences
  - Attending WRHC conferences
- Participating in professional organizations
- Service on a University committee
- Advising/assisting student organizations
- Participating in University governance
  University Faculty Senate
  Faculty Senate Committees
- Participating in recruitment activities
  Meeting with visiting students/parents/counselors
  Participating in recruitment fairs such as UNM Hispanic Day
  Participating in Lobo Orientation
- Elected or appointed offices in professional associations
- Involvement in community service
- Mentoring students with theses

As in other areas, the T & P committee will take into account both the quality and quantity of activity in deciding the overall rating. For example, chairing a committee (or serving on a particularly labor-intensive committee) should be given more weight.

4.4 TENURE AND PROMOTION PREPARATION

The materials below provide the outline and instructions for the preparation of tenure and promotion portfolios. All participating parties are encouraged to review the UNM Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure Handbook to be certain of compliance.

The Candidate shall prepare a portfolio. Materials are to be organized in the order listed below, with indexed separations. Many candidates prefer using a cardboard box or plastic container with hanging file folders rather than a loose-leaf binder especially if they will be including books and other bulky materials.

Any packet delivered to Academic Affairs that fails to meet stated requirements will NOT be accepted for consideration.

The label on the box should have: the candidate’s name; University Honors Program; University College; the nature of the application (e.g. “tenure and promotion to Associate Professor”). When appropriate, the packet may include material that requires viewing or listening. If A/V equipment is necessary, please be sure to indicate this on the label.

4.4.1 The Ordering of Materials in the Tenure/Promotion Portfolio
(Refer to the following pages for explanation)

Part A  Program/College recommendations
  1. UNM signature form
  2. Chair’s recommendation letter
  3. Dean’s recommendation letter

Part B  Materials reviewed by the T & P Committee
1. CV, complete and in discipline-appropriate format (including brief narrative description of research, teaching and service goals)
2. Candidate’s expanded statement of professional achievements and future goals in teaching, scholarship, and service (as would have been sent to outside reviewers)
3. Evaluation of Teaching
   a. Summary of teaching evaluations (UNM approved instruments, e.g. ICES or FACE)
   b. Peer evaluations of teaching
4. Evaluation of Research/Scholarship
   a. List of external reviewers
   b. Sample letter sent to external reviewers
   c. Letters received from external reviewers
5. Evaluations by Honors Program faculty
6. List of supplemental materials (All documents and materials in this section have been provided by the candidate to the Chair. This list should be signed by the Chair, indicating that all items have been received and placed in the file.)

Part C Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation
1. Summary of T & P Committee vote

Part D Supplemental Materials (Many of the items that could be included in the supplemental materials are considered optional. In most cases the candidates will suggest what is to be included and will provide this material after consultation with the T & P Committee)
1. Books
2. Articles
3. Research Grants
4. Teaching evaluation (UNM approved instrument) summary analyses—course by course
5. Course syllabi and exams, original teaching materials
6. Letters describing contributions to community, awarding of prizes, gratitude of students and professional colleagues; contracts for future publications
7. Student comments received on UNM approved teaching evaluation forms
8. Reviews of grant proposals or manuscripts
9. Other materials relevant to substantiate teaching, scholarship, and service

5.1 Promotion to Full Professor
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.

5.2 Post-Tenure Review
The Board of Regents of the University of New Mexico adopted the post-tenure review policy in 1996. The policy applies to all tenured faculty members at the University. The policy states that a tenured professor who performs well should be rewarded, and one
who performs inadequately should seek or accept help and improve or be subject to
dismissal. The purpose of the UNM post-tenure review is to determine levels of
performance efficiently, equitably, and to encourage and promote professional
development. Post-tenure review is in conformity with tenure rights expressed in the
Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

5.3 Data Collection and Annual Review
Biographical updates and other pertinent information are to be provided by the faculty
member to the Honors Director. The Director will submit in writing (normally 50-100
words for most faculty members) a description and critique of performance during the
past year to the Dean. A copy will be made available to the faculty member.

5.4 Promotion to Full Professor Process
The process begins in the fall semester a year in advance of the request by an associate
professor for consideration for review of advancement in rank by the Honors director.
The director will convene a promotion committee composed of professors from relevant
departments on campus until such time as there are a sufficient number of professors in
Honors.

5.4.1 Appointment or promotion to Professor represents a judgment on the part of the
Honors Program 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.

5.4.2 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.

In keeping with the interdisciplinary curriculum, the Honors Program will recognize
scholarship and teaching contributing to traditional disciplinary as well as innovative
interdisciplinary areas. Criteria for the evaluation of the triad will include those indicated
in this document for promotion to Associate Professor, as well as further
accomplishments contributing to the candidate’s standing in appropriate academic
communities. Associate Professors are encouraged to develop mentor relationship(s)
with appropriate faculty on campus.

5.5 Sabbatical
The principle of sabbatical leave has been approved by the Faculty and the Regents of the
University as a basic policy. Its main purpose is to encourage professional growth and
increased competence among faculty members by subsidizing significant research,
creative work, or some other program of study which is judged to be of equivalent value.
The University Honors Program follows the procedures for implementing sabbatical
leave policy as established by Academic Affairs.
APPENDIX A

EXPLANATION OF ITEMS LISTED IN PORTFOLIO SECTION

1) UP-TO-DATE VITA with sequentially numbered pages. In that section of the vita devoted to Research and Other Creative Activity, please
   A. Provide complete citation
   B. Categorize as follows unless the nature of the scholarly activity requires additional categories:

   **Refereed Works**
   - Books
     - Authored
     - Chapters in Books
     - Edited
   - Journal Articles
     - International
     - National
     - State
     - Local
   - Conference Papers (indicate whether or not refereed on basis of abstract full paper and if the paper resulted in publication)

   **Competitive Grants**

   **Patents**

   **Non-Refereed Works**

2. Instruction: classroom teaching, dissertation/thesis committees, senior projects, advising of student clubs; curriculum and course development; peer evaluation; professional development of teaching; other documentable contributions to the quality of instruction at the University or in the profession. Provide this information for the entire period under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure; applications for promotion to Professor should provide the information for the period since promotion to Associate Professor.

Provide the information in the following order.
   A. Teaching and/or advising awards. Explain the nature of the selection process.

   B. Quantitative data on teaching (At a minimum, for the years that the candidate has been employed in the UHP). Scores on evaluation should be compared to appropriate summary statistics.

   C. Peer evaluation.

   D. Advising
4. Scholarship, research and/or other creative activity

This section is an annotated version of the parallel section of the candidate’s vita. It should provide detailed information on each published or public work including, if appropriate, presentations at conferences and symposia. This information should permit a colleague outside of the candidate’s field to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments in his or her discipline(s). For all publications, the candidate should explain the type of refereeing used (e.g., blind peer review; reviewed by an editorial board; solicited by the editor); the type of journal or press (e.g., “The official publication of the National Collegiate Honors Council”). For creative activities, the candidate should provide information on the significance of the venue or exhibition in which the work appeared. This information should be sufficiently detailed to permit an out-of-discipline colleague to evaluate the significance of the performance or other creative activity.

Complete information must be provided on all publications, including page numbers and publication dates. If any work has multiple authors, the candidate should explain his or her role (e.g., co-author, senior author). This is particularly important in those disciplines in which it is necessary to establish one's self as an independent scholar or researcher prior to tenure and promotion.

Include critical reviews of your work, if they exist.

Include letters of acceptance for any forthcoming work.

5. Service/Administrative activities.

This section is a narrative with additional information about service/administrative activities. This narrative should explain each activity, if it is not clear from the CV. If possible, this narrative section should refer to evidence of the quality of the candidate’s work. This is particularly important if service and/or administration were a significant part of the candidate’s assignment.

6. LETTERS OF EVALUATION addressed to the Director of the Honors Program.
   A. At a minimum, six current letters from referees outside this University chosen by the candidate and the T & P Committee. These should be letters from independent experts in the field who can evaluate the faculty member’s work; letters from co-authors, dissertation advisors, and personal friends generally are not appropriate. The Chair’s letter should request a brief vita or summary of each referee’s credentials; this should be appended to the letter from the outside evaluator.

   B. At a minimum, three letters from colleagues within the University. While these letters may evaluate all aspects of the candidate’s contributions, they should especially evaluate the quality of the candidate’s service to the institution. Letters from junior colleagues in one’s department/college are rarely appropriate.

   C. Only letters solicited by the chairperson are to be included.
7. CHAIRPERSON’S LETTER, a copy of which is to be sent to the faculty member and is to include:

A. (1) for tenure and promotion— the numerical results of the poll by secret ballot by the T & P Committee.

B. The Chairperson’s recommendation (a clear statement of support or non-support).

C. A detailed analysis and evaluation of the work of the faculty member to include teaching, scholarship and/or creative projects, and service.

8. DEAN’S LETTER must include a clear statement of support or non-support for tenure and promotion.
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Dear:
Thank you for agreeing to evaluate _________’s scholarly activity for inclusion in his/her portfolio for promotion and tenure at the University of New Mexico.

Currently, _________ is an untenured Assistant Professor in the University of New Mexico’s Honors Program. The University Honors Program is a university-wide, interdisciplinary studies program for high-achieving undergraduates at the University of New Mexico. Although we value research, particularly as it informs our teaching, we do place a high value on teaching itself. You will find that some of _________’s work has been in the area of teaching.

Enclosed are copies of _________’s publications along with a copy of the “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the UNM Honors Program.” In your evaluation of his/her scholarly production, we ask that you comment on the quality of his/her research and the contribution to the field of study.

(The Chair may add information here regarding the specific nature of the candidate’s work in Honors, e.g., “Although Dr. XYZ is a biologist, her work as a full-time faculty member in the Honors Program is different than a biologist working in a biology department. She does not, for example, have access to her own laboratory, nor does she work primarily with biology majors).

We will be forwarding _________’s promotion tenure portfolio to the Deputy Provost’s office in early spring, so we would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by the first of November. Please send an abbreviated copy of your CV to include in the tenure portfolio along with your letter.

We realize that it takes considerable effort to evaluate a candidate’s scholarly record, and we would like to thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Rosalie C. Otero, Ph.D.
Director

Enclosures
APPENDIX C

CALENDARS

ANNUAL REVIEWS
Candidate submits updated CV and materials to T & P Committee and Chair  April 5
T & P Committee submits the annual review to Chair/Honors Director  April 25
Chair/Honors Director forwards summary letter to Dean  May 1

CODE 3 (MID-PROBATIONARY) REVIEW
Portfolio ready for review December 1
T & P Committee letters of recommendation/review to Chair by January 30
Portfolio and report to Dean  February 10
Portfolio to Deputy Provost  February 25
Letter to candidate from Provost  June 30

FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

External Reviewers (name, addresses, email, phone)  August 10
Chair sends email requests to potential reviewers
Packet to be sent to External Reviewers  September 10
Deadline for External Reviewers is November 10
Portfolio ready for review November 30
Email to T & P Committee reminding them that portfolio is ready for their review
T & P Committee meeting  January 10  (if needed)
T & P Committee letters of recommendation/review to Chair by January 30
Portfolio to Dean  February 10
Portfolio to Deputy Provost  February 25
Letter to candidate from Provost June 30
APPENDIX D

SABBATICAL LEAVE REQUEST GUIDELINES

Packets Must Contain Both:
1. An original
2. A duplicate set of information, and
3. Must consist of the following sections (insert colored paper between sections):

Section I. Request for Sabbatical Leave Form
A completed "Request for Sabbatical Leave Form" signed by the faculty member and director and forwarded to the dean.

Section II. Director’s Memo
A memo from the Honors Program Director which states that the director has consulted with the faculty member regarding the coverage of duties during the faculty member’s absence.

Section III. Sabbatical Leave Proposal
Generally 3 to 5 pages long, the proposal provides specific information about activities to be achieved during the sabbatical period.
   a. Title of project
   b. Dates of sabbatical request: Semester I (fall) or Semester II (spring) or both.
   c. Where and when the project will be completed.
   d. Detailed description of the project, including statement of purpose and the expected results of the project. (When applicable the description should include travel plans; planned participation in professional activities such as conferences, symposia or educational programs; and if the project depends on external funding, a brief statement about funding sources and availability.)
   e. Explanation of how sabbatical leave will promote completion of project.
   f. Benefits of the sabbatical leave to the Honors Program.

Section IV. Supporting Materials
An outline by the faculty member, in consultation with the director, how the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities, service activities, and committee duties will be covered during the leave period.

Section VI. Previous Five Year Workload Report
A workload report written by the faculty member which states how the plan relates to the individuals teaching/research/service duties in the five years preceding the request.
   a. Dates of last sabbatical.
   b. Statement of work completed since last sabbatical.
   c. Report of courses taught on the preceding five years.
   d. Report of other professional and relevant duties in the preceding five years.
Section VII. Letter of Invitation/Confirmation
If applicable, a letter of invitation/confirmation from the person with whom the faculty member will be working.

Section VIII. Current C.V.
The faculty member's current curriculum vitae.