



**UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY
AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES**

**GUIDELINES FOR
DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE**

**Adopted by vote
of the GES faculty
(September 2016)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEPARTMENTAL MISSION	1
DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE	
I. MEMBERSHIP	1
II. MEETINGS	2
III. ADMINISTRATION	2
A. <i>Department Chair</i>	3
B. <i>Associate Chair</i>	4
C. <i>Undergraduate Program Director</i>	5
D. <i>Graduate Program Director</i>	5
E. <i>Computing & Facilities Coordinator</i>	6
F. <i>Physical Geography Coordinator</i>	6
G. <i>Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator</i>	6
H. <i>Website Coordinator</i>	7
I. <i>Speaker Series Coordinator</i>	7
J. <i>Outreach Coordinator</i>	7
IV. COMMITTEES	8
A. <i>Committee of the whole</i>	8
B. <i>Standing Committees</i>	8
C. <i>Ad hoc Committees</i>	10
V. STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR GES FACULTY	11
A. <i>Research</i>	11
B. <i>Teaching</i>	15
C. <i>Professional Service</i>	19
VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	21
A. <i>Subject faculty</i>	22
B. <i>Timeline for annual evaluation processes</i>	22
C. <i>Reporting documents</i>	22
D. <i>Committee evaluation of analytical table</i>	27
E. <i>Evaluation processes</i>	27
F. <i>Evaluation report of the Personnel Committee</i>	33
G. <i>Contests</i>	35
H. <i>Department Chair's evaluation process</i>	35
VII. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE & PROMOTION	38
A. <i>Criteria</i>	38
B. <i>Procedures</i>	44
VIII. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION OF LECTURES	45
A. <i>Continuing, Non-tenure Track Lecturer Appointments.</i>	45
B. <i>Annual Performance Reviews of Lecturers.</i>	46
C. <i>Opportunities for Promotion</i>	47

IX. FACULTY MENTORING	47
A. <i>Purpose, Mission</i>	47
B. <i>Procedure</i>	48
C. <i>Content</i>	49
X. EMERITUS POLICY	49
XI. AMENDMENTS TO THIS DOCUMENT	49
XII. List of Digital Appendices	49
A. <i>Documents included within this Governance Document</i>	49
B. <i>Documents external to this Governance Document</i>	49

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

This document describes the working protocol for the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at the University of New Mexico. It provides both directives and guidelines for shared faculty governance in the Department, and it is updated periodically to reflect the evolution of faculty concerns and values. Policies adopted by the University of New Mexico always take precedence over this document whenever differences occur.

DEPARTMENTAL MISSION

We are an energetic and revitalized department that is passionate about our teaching and research in human geography and the environment, and in Geographic Information Science. We provide innovative curricular programs that are relevant to current, real-world problems, and that are strongly coupled with our individual research expertise. This synergy is nurtured by our commitments to intellectual diversity, collegiality and scholarly excellence in coherent focus areas within the disciplines of geography and environmental studies.

The Department has the following goals:

1. To be an integral part of the workings and be an active contributor to the mission of the University of New Mexico.
2. To improve its recognition and reputation amongst departments of Geography and Environmental Studies in the region and nationally.
3. To maintain a high level of research and teaching.
4. To provide academic leadership at UNM, particularly in the areas of Geographic Information Science and environmental understanding.
5. To provide a comprehensive offering of degree programs including professional certificates, undergraduate majors and minors, and graduate degrees.

Achieving this mission requires effective teaching, excellent research, active participation in university governance, and leadership in professional associations.

DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE

I. MEMBERSHIP

- A. Membership in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies includes the following academic ranks: Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor and Lecturer.
- B. Faculty in the above categories, including those who have joint appointments with other units, shall be considered voting members of the department only if 50 percent or more of their budgeted salary is administered through the Department of Geography & Environmental Studies.
- C. Faculty members on leave from the department shall retain voting privileges in decisions on the retention or appointment of Chair and on amendments to this governance document.

II. MEETINGS

- A. Meetings of the department faculty shall be held on a regular basis during the academic year, provided that department affairs require faculty discussion, consent, or decision-making. In the absence of stated agenda items, planned meetings may be cancelled.
- B. In addition to the regular meeting schedule, meetings may be called at other times by the Chair or by any two members of the faculty.
- C. The Department Chair will act as moderator of each faculty meeting, and the Associate Chair will serve as moderator in cases where the Chair is absent.
- D. Minutes will be recorded at each meeting alongside the agenda, to create a general record of attendance, actions taken, and vote tallies where applicable. In general, minutes will be recorded by the Department Administrator, except when personnel issues or other matters of a sensitive nature are discussed. Minutes will be reviewed and approved at the beginning of the subsequent meeting.
- E. Committee reports and recommendations will either be (a) submitted to the chair for inclusion on an upcoming faculty meeting agenda or (b) sent directly to the whole faculty by email and thereby proposed for the consent agenda at an upcoming meeting scheduled at least one week after the notice is provided. Any faculty member can request that items proposed for the consent agenda be moved to the regular agenda for discussion, as long as this request is made at least 24 hours before the scheduled faculty meeting.
- F. Meetings generally use a modified version of Robert's Rules of Order in that decision-making proceeds via motion, second, discussion, and call for consensus.
- G. Consensus decision-making is a strongly shared value and is the fundamental basis of the faculty's shared responsibility for departmental governance. When consensus cannot be reached on a motion, the agenda item will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting if at all possible. If no consensus can be reached in the subsequent meeting, or in cases where the item is time-sensitive and cannot be tabled, the meeting moderator will proceed to majority voting via Robert's Rules of Order.
- H. Votes will normally be taken by a show of hands, but any faculty member can request an anonymous written vote.
- I. Each year, the faculty will invite graduate students to nominate a representative to attend all faculty meetings. This representative will not vote but will otherwise be invited to participate fully, except when personnel issues or other matters of a sensitive matter are discussed.

III. ADMINISTRATION

The administration of the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies is carried out by a combination of elected/appointed administrators and faculty committees. This section describes the expectations for all administrative positions, including Chair, Associate Chair, Undergraduate Program Director, Graduate Program Director, and the Coordinators for: Computing & Facilities, Physical Geography, Learning Outcomes Assessment, Website, Speaker Series, and Outreach. It is preferred that these positions are held by different faculty members, but it is possible that some positions may overlap. The expectations for each position are described below.

A. DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The Chair of the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies will generally be a senior member of the department faculty. In case no senior faculty members are available to serve, the Dean of Arts and Sciences will be consulted for an alternative solution.

1. Selection

The Chair is selected with the consent of the faculty and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The voting members of the department's faculty will submit to the College Dean the name of their preferred candidate. If more than one candidate is acceptable to the faculty and is willing to serve, a list will be submitted to the Dean. These may be listed in order of preference. The Dean will accept or reject a single candidate. If there is more than one, the Dean will choose from among the candidates or refer the list back to the faculty. The candidate or list of candidates will be voted on during an open faculty meeting by secret ballot. The results will be forwarded to the Dean. The normal term of office for a Chair will be four years. A Chair is eligible to succeed him or herself if he or she so desires, the faculty members so indicate and the Dean concurs. The Chair shall be reviewed by the faculty and Dean annually.

2. Duties:

- a) To serve as the chief administrative officer of the department. The Chair shall administer the operation of the department by implementing the policies established by the university, the college, and department faculty members.
- b) To be the official representative of the faculty to the University and to the wider community.
- c) To be the liaison between higher levels of university administration and the departmental faculty, responsible for ensuring both (1) adequate communication of administrative priorities and actions to the departmental faculty, and (2) proper reporting of departmental activities and decisions to the administration.
- d) To advocate for departmental resources at the College and University levels.
- e) To engage in strategic planning that supports the department's academic mission.
- f) To report regularly to the department, summarizing the business of his/her office and the business of department members. The Chair shall make available on a regular basis any information which he/she and/or the faculty deems appropriate to the efficient operation of the department.
- g) To recruit and nominate faculty for administrative and committee service.
- h) To propose course offerings and faculty teaching assignments, in consultation with the Curriculum Committee.
- i) To prepare budget requests and propose distribution of allocations, in consultation with the Budget Committee.
- j) To manage personnel issues, in consultation with the Associate Chair and Personnel Committee.
- k) To manage student complaints or issues, in consultation with the Undergraduate Program Director or Graduate Program Director, as appropriate.
- l) To provide pre- and post-tenure evaluations of faculty members each spring, in consultation with the Personnel Committee.

- m) To oversee annually the merit review and salary adjustment process, in consultation with the Personnel Committee.
- n) To prepare faculty hiring and retention plans, in consultation with the faculty as a whole.
- o) To manage the confidential personnel files of all faculty and staff members, in accordance with University policies.
- p) To recruit, hire, and supervise staff as necessary to manage the Department's administrative and academic operations.
- q) To provide a written evaluation of the Department Administrator and other staff for which the Chair is the direct supervisor each year according to University regulations.

3. *Notes*

In general, it is expected that the chair will work collaboratively and in consultation with the department's faculty committees and with its other elected administrators to enact governance policies. The department chair, however, bears final responsibility for ratifying all documents, decisions, and policies. The Chair is normally given a reduced teaching load each semester to offset the expected workload associated with effective administration of these functions.

B. ASSOCIATE CHAIR

The Associate Chair plays a significant role in the administration of the department. In addition to the specific duties outlined below, the Associate Chair is also expected to serve informally as a liaison between the Department Chair and the faculty.

1. *Selection*

The Chair will recommend an Associate Chair to the faculty members who will then vote on the appointment in a written ballot. The term of office for the Associate Chair will be two years. An Associate Chair is eligible to succeed him or herself if he or she so desires, and the faculty members so indicate.

2. *Duties*

- a) To represent the department when the Chair is absent.
- b) To assist in the management of departmental operations when the chair is not available.
- c) To provide input to the chair on strategic initiatives.
- d) To serve as chair of the Personnel Committee, with direct responsibility for documenting the work and decisions of that committee.
- e) To provide input to the Chair on the annual pre- and post-tenure evaluations of all faculty, in consultation with the Personnel Committee.
- f) To implement annually the merit review process, in consultation with the Personnel Committee.
- g) To supervise the faculty mentoring program, in consultation with the Personnel Committee.
- h) To convene the Personnel Committee when necessary to advise the Chair on the appropriate resolution of personnel issues involving faculty or staff.

3. *Notes*

The Associate Chair is normally given a reduced teaching load in the spring semester to offset the expected workload associated with the effective administration of the Personnel Committee's annual review procedures.

C. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTOR

1. *Selection:*

The Undergraduate Program Director shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. *Duties:*

- a) To recruit undergraduate students as majors and minors in the Department's degree programs.
- b) To conduct orientation and advising sessions for new students.
- c) To oversee communications between the department and undergraduate student body.
- d) To foster an active undergraduate student group.
- e) To review student petitions for program of study exceptions.
- f) To manage student complaints and issues in consultation with the Chair.
- g) To review the results of student learning assessment for the undergraduate programs.
- h) To make recommendations on strategic initiatives related to undergraduate programming.
- i) To oversee the departmental program for Undergraduate Honors.
- j) To serve as a member of the Curriculum Committee.

D. GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTOR

1. *Selection:*

The Graduate Program Director shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. *Duties:*

- a) To recruit graduate students.
- b) To oversee the graduate admissions process and facilitate review of graduate applicants by the committee of the whole.
- c) To conduct orientation sessions for new students.
- d) To allocate and oversee the use of graduate office space.
- e) To oversee communications between the department and the graduate student body.
- f) To review student petitions for program of study exceptions.
- g) To manage student complaints and other issues in consultation with the Chair.
- h) To review the results of student learning assessment for the graduate programs.
- i) To make recommendations on strategic initiatives related to graduate programming.
- j) To supervise Teaching Assistant assignments.
- k) To serve as a member of the Curriculum Committee.

E. COMPUTING & FACILITIES COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Computing & Facilities Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties:

- a) To conduct regular assessments of teaching and research lab facilities, including hardware, software and physical infrastructure.
- b) To work with appropriate staff members and research faculty to plan and coordinate facilities maintenance.
- c) To prepare annually a budget proposal for purchase, maintenance and replacement of the department's computing equipment, infrastructure and facilities.
- d) To solicit and review faculty proposals for spending on instructional infrastructure and advise the budget committee regarding appropriate course fee expenditures.
- e) To communicate to the student body all decisions regarding the allocation of course fees.
- f) To serve as an ex-officio member of the budget committee.

F. PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Physical Geography Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties

- a) To ensure basic coordination between the Physical Geography lab sections and lectures.
- b) To review and update lab materials and equipment on a regular basis.
- c) To supervise Teaching Assistants assigned to the Physical Geography labs.
- d) To ensure that student learning outcomes are assessed appropriately in all physical geography labs.
- e) To communicate with the curriculum committee regarding the scheduling needs of lab sections for physical geography.
- f) To prepare annually a budget proposal for purchase, maintenance and replacement of the department's physical geography lab equipment.

G. LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties

- a) To collect and report data on student learning to the Curriculum Committee
- b) To assemble and submit all required assessment reports to the College and university

- c) To regularly review and revise assessment procedures, in consultation with the instructors of Gen.Ed. core courses and the directors of degree programs.

H. WEBSITE COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Website Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties

- a) To maintain and update the departmental website, in consultation with appropriate staff.
- b) To produce an annual strategic plan regarding the potential evolution of web-based functions and communications to support departmental priorities.
- c) To work with the speaker series coordinator and outreach coordinator to promote departmental visibility & foster scholarly exchange.

I. SPEAKER SERIES COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Speaker Series Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties:

- a) To recruit, host, and publicize speakers in the department's colloquium series.
- b) To provide input to the Budget Committee regarding the costs of speaker events and potential sources of external funding.
- c) To work with the website coordinator and outreach coordinator to promote departmental visibility & foster scholarly exchange.

J. OUTREACH COORDINATOR

1. Selection:

The Outreach Coordinator shall be appointed by the Chair of the department with the consent of the faculty and will serve for two years. The term is renewable.

2. Duties:

- a) To work with the department chair on strategic initiatives related to the Department's relationship with other units and administrators on campus.
- b) To coordinate outreach programs in Albuquerque and New Mexico to generate a greater awareness of geography as a field of university study.
- c) To work with the department chair to develop relationships with alumni from both the graduate and undergraduate programs.
- d) To work with the speaker series coordinator and website coordinator to promote departmental visibility & foster scholarly exchange.

IV. COMMITTEES

In addition to the appointments outlined above, the Department uses a simple committee structure to perform many duties related to academic and administrative affairs.

A. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies will for some issues act as a committee of the whole.

1. The committee of the whole will review and provide recommendations on strategic initiatives reported by the chair and standing committees.
2. The committee of the whole will select applicants for acceptance to the graduate program and will make recommendations to the graduate program director concerning the priorities for graduate student funding.
3. The committee of the whole will also review and provide recommendations on all hiring plans and will provide detailed feedback to ad hoc hiring search committees for all faculty positions.

Most of the department's work, however, will be conducted in smaller committees, in which a subset of appointed faculty members make recommendations to the Chair or to the committee of the whole.

B. STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing committees will be convened each year at the beginning of the fall semester. Each committee will report throughout the year to the faculty as a whole on their activities through a notice-and-consent model, in which committee recommendations are communicated to the entire faculty in advance of faculty meetings and simultaneously proposed for a consent agenda at an upcoming meeting scheduled at least one week after the notice is provided. Any faculty member can request that items proposed for the consent agenda be moved to the regular agenda for discussion, as long as this request is made at least 24 hours before the scheduled faculty meeting. In general, the Department Chair will refrain from acting on matters being decided or recommended by departmental committees until after the first faculty meeting during which discussion of the relevant committee decision or recommendation could have been raised, except where earlier action by the Chair is required to protect departmental interests. In that case, the Chair will make every effort to implement an expedited notice-and-consent procedure that enables faculty feedback on committee decisions and recommendations within a shorter timeframe.

The Department Chair may annually develop a charge for each committee, which the committee members will review, modify and adopt as they see fit in accordance with this document. Each committee will elect its own chair, unless otherwise specified below, and will determine annually its intended procedures for meeting format, meeting frequency, and decision-making. Committee members shall be appointed by the chair with the consent of the faculty, except as noted specifically below. In general, a term of committee service will last two years, but shorter and longer durations are also possible with the consent of the faculty. The Chair will propose each fall a set of committee appointments for faculty consent.

1. Curriculum Committee

a) Selection:

The Curriculum Committee will include the Graduate Program Director, the Undergraduate Program Director, and a minimum of one (1) additional appointed faculty member.

b) Duties:

- i. To review annually the curricula for all existing degrees, minors, and certificates and to recommend curricular changes to the committee of the whole for review and approval.
- ii. To engage in strategic planning for curricular development of new programs, in consultation with the faculty as a whole and to oversee the formal proposal process for any new programs that have the support of the faculty.
- iii. To review and provide recommendations to the chair on planned course schedules and faculty teaching assignments.
- iv. To solicit and review annually faculty proposals for new courses and course formats, providing direct feedback to the chair as to whether new or revised courses should be approved.
- v. To review all student petitions for exceptions to the program of study and to make decisions on whether each should be approved.

2. Budget Committee

a) Selection:

The Budget Committee will include three (3) appointed faculty and the Computing & Facilities Coordinator as an ex-officio member.

b) Responsibilities:

- i. To solicit budget requests from all Directors and Coordinators on an annual basis.
- ii. To develop a list of budget priorities each year, and to submit this list to the chair as a guide for the development of the department's budget request.
- iii. To make recommendations to the chair on strategic planning for budgetary needs as well as on the development of new funding sources.
- iv. To review and provide feedback to the Chair on annual resource allocation plans.
- v. To solicit and review faculty feedback on budget plans and initiatives as part of the regular budget cycle.

3. Personnel Committee

a) Selection:

The Personnel Committee will include the Associate Chair and two (2) additional appointed faculty. The Associate Chair will serve as chair of the committee.

b) Duties

- i. To implement the Department's mentoring program.
- ii. To review personnel management issues and provide advisory feedback to the chair on appropriate resolution strategies.

- iii. To conduct annual reviews of faculty performance, in accordance with University policy, and to provide judgments to the chair as to whether departmental standards for scholarship and workload have been met or exceeded by each individual faculty member.
- iv. To implement the annual merit review process and provide feedback to the chair about the relative performance of faculty members as a basis for salary adjustment.
- v. To regularly review and propose necessary revisions to the department's procedures for annual review of performance, workload, and salary.

C. AD HOC COMMITTEES

Ad hoc committees will be convened periodically, according to the guidelines below. Members shall be appointed by the chair with the consent of the faculty.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

a) Formation:

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will be convened in the fall semester of each year in which a departmental faculty member is slated for one of the following milestone reviews: midprobationary review, tenure & promotion review, promotion review, or post-tenure review.

b) Composition:

- i. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members in the department.
- ii. The Chair of the department will not be a member of this committee.
- iii. The committee members will elect their own committee chair.
- iv. In lieu of at least three eligible voting members, the Chair of the department with concurrence of the faculty and the candidate will appoint interim Promotion and Tenure Committee members.
- v. The Chair of the department will submit the candidate's file to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least three weeks before the written evaluation has to be submitted by the Chair of the department to the College of Arts and Sciences.

c) Duties:

- i. Evaluate materials, review supportive documents, and make recommendations for the department on candidates for the third year review of non-tenured faculty members.
- ii. Evaluate materials, review supportive documents, and make recommendations for the department on candidates for promotion and tenure.

2. Hiring Search Committee

a) Formation:

A hiring search committee is convened whenever the Dean of A&S authorizes a new faculty search.

b) Composition:

- i. The Chair will, with the consent of the faculty, appoint a search Committee consisting of at least three faculty members from within the department, one graduate student, and one additional member from outside the department. Diversity in membership is a key factor in committee selection. Additional members will be added if necessary to achieve diversity.
- ii. The Chair appoints one of the three faculty members from within the department as Chair of the Search Committee.

c) Duties

- i. The Search Committee meets to write the job description and circulates this to the whole department for additional input. In addition the job description will be submitted to OEO for approval.
- ii. The Search Committee will advertise the job description widely, including in the AAG Newsletter.
- iii. The Search Committee will be responsible for the selection of candidates for interview and organizing the interviewee's schedules. Candidates will make at least one public presentation and all faculty members will be given an opportunity to meet with the candidates.
- iv. The Search Committee will seek input from all department faculty members on the acceptability of each candidate.
- v. The Search Committee will meet after all selected candidates have been interviewed and make a formal recommendation to the faculty members regarding acceptability of candidates.

V. STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR GES FACULTY

(This section adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 14 January 2015.)

In the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies (GES), standards and expectations for faculty performance are independently defined for three aspects of work effort: research, teaching, and service.

A. RESEARCH

Faculty members in GES normally have appointments that identify research as the dominant component of professional work effort, normally specified as 40% of work effort. It is expected that faculty members, through consultation and coordination with the department Chair, maintain this level of effort throughout each reporting period. Lecturers and other faculty members whose appointment does not include research are not expected to conduct, publish, or present research.

It is expected that GES faculty will maintain an active research agenda, and that research products will be publicly available to the greatest degree possible. Scholarly productivity will be assessed in three areas of activity: publishing, seeking research funding, and presenting research publicly. Excellence in these areas of activity may be evident in the quality, impact, and/or quantity of research products. Faculty members who consistently do not meet departmental expectations for research may be assigned an increased teaching load, as described in section 2, below.

1. *Publishing*

a) Minimum expectations for publishing.

All faculty with research appointments are expected to publish research findings actively, whether in printed or electronic formats. Given the breadth of geography and of environmental studies as fields of scholarly research, and the varying publication practices characteristic of subfields within geography and environmental studies, a range of media types are suitable for the publication of research findings. These media types might include, but are not limited to: research monographs, normally published as books; peer-reviewed journal articles; law-review journal articles; peer-reviewed book chapters; other types of journal articles and book chapters (such as book reviews or encyclopedia entries, and full papers in volumes of conference proceedings); maps; edited volumes, whether published as books or special journal issues; textbooks; data sets and/or databases; or substantial creative, interpretive, or popular works relevant to geography and environmental studies. Exclusions to this list are research summaries (such as abstracts published in volumes of conference proceedings), personal or informal web sites (such as blogs), practical exercise manuals for teaching applications, and news media editorials or opinion essays. Excluded publication types may be included in evaluations of other aspects of a faculty member's work effort.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating publication records, because attainment of minimum expectations may be evident through different numbers or types of combinations of publications depending upon the subfield of research in which a faculty member normally participates. Additionally, multi-year time periods should be considered in evaluating publication achievements because scholarly research productivity is in many cases cyclical due to the normal progression of research projects.

b) Evidence of excellence in publishing.

Excellence in publishing is not certainly evident in the absolute number or length of publications; publication quality is at least as important as quantity. However, publication quality may be difficult to assess, especially within a short period after publication, which is a constraint imposed by the normally annual basis of faculty performance evaluation. Further, contextual information is necessary to identify excellence in publishing, such as: a) the relationship of a published work to other works published by the same faculty member; b) the number of authors listed on a published work; c) the role of the faculty member in the production of a multi-authored published work; and d) publication practices characteristic of relevant subfields within geography and environmental studies.

Given these considerations, some indications of excellence in publishing may include:

- the breadth, depth, and/or complexity of a given work; ***or***
- awards from professional organizations for particular publications or a broad body of work; ***or***
- publications in scholarly journals that have relatively high measures of impact (all impact measures are methodologically imperfect, but each provides some basis for comparing journals); ***or***
- number of citations of a particular publication (all measures of the number or quality

of citations are methodologically imperfect, but each provides some basis for comparing journals); or

- potential impact within a field of study, due to the novelty, originality, or scope of a particular publication; or
- number of publications, especially if the number substantially exceeds average output characteristic of scholars within relevant subfields of research.

Evaluation of the quality of a publication is inevitably subjective. The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair, may require input from other faculty members (not including a faculty member under review) if the Committee and/or Chair do not have appropriate expertise to evaluate a publication.

In all cases, the Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating excellence in publication because this may be evident through a combination of publication quality and quantity that is impossible to define in general terms.

2. Seeking research funding

a) Minimum expectations for seeking research funding.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating achievements in seeking research funding, because funding is not equally important in all fields within geography and environmental studies. Additionally, if a faculty member's current academic research projects are adequately funded for continuance, it may be unnecessary to seek research funding actively.

Given these considerations, minimum expectations in seeking research funding are necessarily qualitative:

- each faculty member must seek sufficient funding support to enable active pursuit of his/her research agenda; and
- each faculty member must seek and pursue opportunities to generate the indirect benefits possible through funding awards, such as funded graduate assistantships and overhead cost support; and
- any and all funding applications must represent genuine efforts to gain research support.

b) Evidence of excellence in seeking research funding.

Excellence may be especially evident in the form of successful funding applications, but depending on a faculty member's field of research and years of experience as a faculty member, excellence may be shown even through unsuccessful funding applications. Multi-year evaluation periods should be considered in seeking evidence of excellence because any need to seek research funding is normally cyclical because the receipt of an award is normally followed by a period of funded research.

Additionally, several aspects of any individual application/award must be considered in evaluating evidence of excellence in seeking research funding, such as: a) the total amount

of the application/award; b) the total length of the funding period; c) the importance of funding within the relevant field of research; d) the complexity and/or collaborative nature of the application/award; e) the faculty member's proposed role (such as PI, Co-PI, consultant, etc.) in the proposed or funded research; f) the type and amount of indirect benefits of the application/award; g) the importance of funding support to the faculty member's research agenda; and h) the competitiveness of a funding program.

3. *Presenting research publicly*

In rare cases, a faculty member may be unable to present all or part of his/her research publicly, due to the topic and/or funding conditions of the research. In such cases, the Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must decide on an individual basis how to evaluate achievements in presenting research.

It must be specified that presenting research publicly is not the same as providing public education, such as through guest lectures, continuing education events, or similar outreach activities, in which the content of a public presentation is not directly focused on a faculty member's research agenda. Providing public education may contribute to a faculty member's service work effort.

a) Minimum expectations for presenting research publicly.

It is expected that all faculty members will present research publicly outside the UNM, primarily in professional venues. At least one presentation per calendar year is expected in any of the following venues and formats, listed in approximate descending order of significance:

- invited or peer-reviewed oral presentation at a national or international professional meeting; ***or***
- invited or peer-reviewed presentation in a non-oral format (such as a poster or an abstract) at a national or international professional meeting; ***or***
- invited or peer-reviewed oral presentation at a regional or local professional meeting; ***or***
- non-invited or non-peer-reviewed presentation in any format at a national or international professional meeting; ***or***
- non-invited or non-peer-reviewed presentation in any format at a regional or local professional meeting; ***or***
- any public presentation in any format, such as through articles or editorials in popular news media, whether published in printed or electronic formats.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating research presentations, because other venues and formats of public presentation of research are possible, and because a faculty member's ability to travel to professional meetings may be constrained by factors beyond the faculty member's control.

b) Evidence of excellence in presenting research publicly.

The quality of individual research presentations may be difficult to evaluate, because many

presentations will not be viewed by any departmental faculty members other than the presenter. As a result, excellence may be most readily evident in the number of research presentations, and in the characteristics of the venue in which research is presented. Peer-reviewed and invited participation, national and international venues, and oral formats generally suggest greater excellence. However, the Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in inferring the quality of any research presentation based on contextual factors.

B. TEACHING

Tenure-track faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify teaching as a significant component of professional work effort, normally specified as 40% of work effort. Full-time Lecturers in GES normally have appointments that specify teaching as 80% of work effort. It is expected that faculty members, through consultation and coordination with the department Chair, maintain these levels of effort throughout each reporting period.

Expectations for other faculty categories must be determined on an individual basis in employment contracts, and in compliance with all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies.

1. Minimum expectations for teaching.

Expectations for teaching are specified in relation to teaching load, accessibility to students, learning outcomes assessment, and teaching assessment and evaluation.

a) Teaching load.

All faculty members who have teaching appointments are expected to teach their assigned number of organized courses each year. Organized courses have regularly scheduled meetings with multiple students enrolled, and thus generate student credit hours. Faculty members are also expected to engage in additional instructional activities, which might generate credit hours (such as supervising students in independent study, honors research, and thesis research), or might not (such as advising students, and serving on graduate or undergraduate thesis committees). These additional instructional activities constitute part of a faculty member's teaching work effort and are taken into consideration in performance and workload evaluations (particularly recognizing that faculty members may engage in additional instructional activities in support of other academic units on campus). However, these activities do not replace the expectation to teach organized courses.

Additionally, it must be specified that providing public education, such as through guest lectures, continuing education events, or similar outreach activities, is not considered to contribute to a faculty member's teaching work effort. Providing public education may contribute to a faculty member's service work effort.

The standard teaching expectation for full-time tenure-track faculty with a 40% teaching appointment is four organized courses per academic year of three or four credit hours each, with a typical distribution of two courses during the fall semester and two courses during the spring semester. For full-time Lecturers with an 80% appointment the standard teaching expectation is eight organized courses per academic year of three or four credit hours each, with a typical distribution of two courses during the fall semester and two courses during the

spring semester. Courses taught during the summer semester or during intersession periods do not satisfy normal teaching expectations. This standard teaching load may be modified with the written approval of the department Chair, and the UNM College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), according to all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies.

Course preparation and delivery are together expected to comprise 75% of teaching work effort, or 30% of total work effort for full-time tenure-track faculty members. Additional instructional activities are expected to comprise 25% of teaching work effort, or 10% of total work effort for full-time tenure-track faculty members. For full-time Lecturers, course preparation and delivery are together expected to comprise 90% of teaching work effort, or 72% of total work effort; additional instructional activities are expected to comprise 10% of teaching work effort, or 8% of total work effort. The difference in expected composition of teaching work effort between tenure-track faculty and Lecturers reflects the influence research activity is expected to have on teaching:

- faculty with combined research and teaching appointments are expected to incorporate aspects of their research-based expertise in teaching, and thus require less time to prepare course materials and content; and
- faculty with combined research and teaching appointments are expected to participate in additional instructional activities, particularly those activities that support student training in research, to a greater degree than Lecturers (or other faculty with teaching-only appointments) because of the importance of professional mentorship in both undergraduate and graduate education.

Faculty members, including Lecturers, who have either a reduced or an increased teaching load should normally have a corresponding change in their teaching work effort corresponding to 10 percentage points per course. Thus, a faculty member who is on research leave during a semester should have an expected teaching work effort of 0% for that semester. However, any specified, percentage-point change in expected teaching work effort related to increased or reduced teaching loads must be determined through discussion among the effected faculty member, the Personnel Committee, the department Chair, and the CAS.

Common rationales for reducing teaching load are: a) formal leaves, including sabbaticals, identified in the UNM Faculty Handbook; b) administrative assignments (such as department Chair, or director of an academic unit); c) course releases for new hires and pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty; d) family-related leaves; e) course buy-outs (made possible through funded research grants, fellowships, or other sources of funding); and f) class size and credit hours (for classes with very high enrollment, or courses of more than four credit hours). Any actual reduction in teaching expectations for these or any other reasons must be agreed upon by the faculty member, department Chair, and the CAS, and must adhere to all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies.

Increased teaching loads may occur for two reasons. First, faculty members, including Lecturers, may seek increased teaching loads in order to focus work effort on teaching, if this is a verifiable professional strength. Second, faculty members who consistently do not meet departmental minimum expectations for research *and/or* service may be assigned increased teaching loads, at the discretion of and following consultation between the Personnel

Committee, the department Chair, and the CAS. Any actual increase in teaching expectations for these or any other reasons must adhere to all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies.

A faculty member whose normal in-load course is cancelled because of low enrollment or other circumstances will be expected to make up that course by teaching an additional in-load course during the same semester, or the subsequent semester. If a make-up course is taught during a subsequent summer semester or intersession period, the faculty member shall receive no additional compensation that may be normally associated with teaching summer or intersession courses.

b) Accessibility to students.

To ensure that students at all levels have the opportunity to learn directly from faculty members, and that all students have an opportunity to take courses from any faculty member, it is expected that full-time, tenure-track faculty:

- teach undergraduate students, primarily through organized courses, but also through credit-generating instructional activities;
- teach graduate students, primarily through organized courses, but also through credit-generating instructional activities;
- participate on undergraduate honors thesis committees, and graduate thesis and dissertation committees, particularly within the department but also in support of other academic units at the UNM;
- post and hold office hours for students, whether these are at regularly scheduled times or by appointment, and whether in person or through real-time (“live”) interaction via telephone, the Internet, or some other means;
- make reasonable attempts to respond to appropriate student inquiries in timely manners;
- make reasonable attempts to accommodate student learning needs, particularly in coordination and communication with the UNM Accessibility Resource Center; ***and***
- teach a minimum average of 60 students per academic year through organized course sections, and other credit-generating instructional activities, unless the faculty member has approved, reduced teaching expectations.

Expectations for accessibility for students are similar for Lecturers, although:

- emphasis should be placed upon undergraduate teaching;
- emphasis should be placed upon organized courses rather than additional instructional activities; and
- the minimum average number of students taught per year should be 120, reflecting the higher teaching load expected of Lecturers.

c) Learning Outcomes Assessment

All teaching faculty must contribute as necessary to departmental learning outcomes assessment. Not all courses are included in the departmental assessment plan, but all faculty are encouraged to assess learning outcomes in individual courses. For faculty who teach courses that are included in the departmental assessment plan, necessary contributions may include:

- collection of assessment data, as specified by the departmental Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator;
- reporting of assessment data to the departmental Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator;
- assistance in interpreting assessment data, in collaboration with the departmental Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator; **and**
- responding to requests for information from the departmental Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator.

d) **Teaching Assessment and Evaluation.**

All teaching faculty must participate in assessments and evaluations of teaching effectiveness. This means: a) in every course, faculty members must provide students the opportunity to evaluate teaching, particularly through the standardized, end-of-semester assessments provided by the CAS; and b) tenured faculty members must participate in department efforts to provide peer evaluations of teaching to non-tenured faculty.

Additionally, all teaching faculty are expected to achieve, on average for all courses during a reporting period, quantitative scores from student evaluations that are minimally equivalent to a score of three out of five, with five being the highest (best) rating. It is recognized that teaching evaluation systems and criteria change, so that achievement of this minimum expectation must be within the context of whatever evaluations system may be in effect for a particular reporting period.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in interpreting student evaluations, because: a) evaluation scores may be lower for large courses, all other factors being equal; b) evaluation scores may be lower for more technical courses, all other factors being equal; c) evaluation scores may be affected positively or negatively by factors beyond a faculty member's control (such as condition of teaching facilities, or availability of teaching assistants); and d) student evaluations do not provide a complete measure or estimate of teaching effectiveness. For non-tenured faculty, peer teaching evaluations will serve alongside student evaluations as means of assessing teaching performance.

e) **Evidence of excellence in teaching.**

Excellence in teaching may be evident in:

- awards for teaching excellence; **or**
- high quantitative scores on student evaluations; **or**
- highly positive written comments on student evaluations; **or**
- highly positive peer teaching evaluations from other faculty; **or**
- the development of new courses, or the adaptation of existing courses to new formats; **or**
- the adoption or development of new pedagogical techniques or technologies; **or**
- student achievements, such as the publication of a student's paper in the UNM 'best student essays' periodical/web site; **or**
- exceptional participation in instructional activities other than regular courses, such as

a large number of graduate or honors student advisees, or extensive instructional activities in support of other academic units.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in evaluating evidence for excellence in teaching, because: a) excellence may be evident in different ways depending on the manner and structure of course delivery (such as large lecture-based courses, smaller discussion-based courses, hybrid online/in-person courses, entirely online courses, and laboratory courses); b) factors beyond a faculty member's control may affect teaching effectiveness; and c) class size may affect student evaluations independently of teaching effectiveness.

C. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Full-time, tenure-track faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify professional service as the minor component of total work effort, normally specified as 20% of total work effort. Full-time Lecturers in GES normally have appointments that specify service as 20% of work effort. It is expected that faculty members, through consultation and coordination with the department Chair, maintain this level of effort throughout each reporting period.

It is expected that professional service contributions are shared as equally as possible amongst faculty members at each rank. Professional service should be pursued within the department, within the UNM, and more broadly through local, state, national, and international efforts. However, service within the department is particularly important to ensure its effective and efficient operation and governance. In only rare cases may a faculty member meet his/her service expectations entirely or primarily through service outside the department.

1. Minimum expectations for service.

The minimum service expectations for all faculty are: 1) attend all faculty meetings, unless impossible due to professional travel or some other professional responsibility, or a major personal event; 2) participate actively in departmental governance; and 3) contribute generally to educational and professional outreach within and beyond UNM.

There are no additional service expectations for non-tenured, first-year faculty.

For non-tenured faculty, additional expectations for the second and subsequent years are that during the reporting calendar year the faculty member must:

- participate for two semesters as a member (or chair) in one departmental committee (Personnel Committee, Budget Committee, Hiring Committee, or a major ad hoc committee); ***or***
- serve for two semesters as a titled Coordinator within the department (Computing and Facilities, Physical Geography Labs, Learning Assessment, Website, Speaker Series, or Outreach);
and
- participate for at least one semester as a member (or chair) in one major campus committee; ***or***
- serve for at least one semester as a leading, elected officer in a regional, national, or international professional organization (normally president, vice-president, secretary,

treasurer, or councilor); **or**

- show some other evidence of substantial community or professional service, such as through editorship of a peer-reviewed academic journal, organizing a major professional conference, providing peer reviews of journal articles or funding proposals, providing public education on topics not directly related to a faculty member's research agenda, supporting public education in some other manner, or providing expertise to a government agency.

The Personnel Committee and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating service contributions by non-tenured faculty, because service contributions may be reduced to help improve research productivity or teaching effectiveness. Additionally, minimum service contributions may be evident through some combination of responsibilities not specified above, and many activities may be considered in the "some other evidence" category in addition to those listed above.

For tenured faculty additional expectations are that during the reporting calendar year the faculty member must:

- participate for two semesters as a member (or chair) in one departmental committees (Personnel Committee, Budget Committee, Hiring Committee, or a major ad hoc committee);
- serve on the departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, if this is convened; **and**
- serve for two semesters in a titled role as Associate Chair, Graduate Program Director, or Undergraduate Program Director within the department; **or**
- serve for two semesters as a titled Coordinator within the department (Computing and Facilities, Physical Geography Labs, Learning Assessment, Website, Speaker Series, or Outreach); **and**
- serve for at least one semester (or the equivalent) as Chair of one major committee outside the department, at UNM or within a professional organization; **or**
- participate for at least one semester (or the equivalent) as a member in three major committees outside the department, whether at UNM or within a professional organization; **or**
- serve for the equivalent of two semesters as a leading, elected officer (normally president, vice-president, secretary, or treasurer) in a regional, national, or international professional organization; **or**
- show some other evidence of substantial community or professional service, such as through editorship of a peer-reviewed academic journal, organizing a major professional conference, providing peer reviews of journal articles or funding proposals, providing public education on topics not directly related to a faculty member's research agenda, supporting public education in some other manner, or providing expertise to a government agency.

The Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating service contributions by tenured faculty, because minimum contributions may be evident through some combination of service responsibilities not specified above, and many activities may be considered in the "some other evidence" category in addition to those listed above. Additionally, tenured

faculty may be asked by the department Chair or some other administrator at UNM to undertake major, ad hoc service tasks that reduce other service expectations. Finally, it may not be possible for all tenured faculty members to hold a titled role within the department during a calendar year.

In all cases, the minimum expectation is that a faculty member successfully completes all service duties, including compliance with deadlines and other requirements. Faculty members who consistently do not meet departmental minimum expectations for service may be assigned an increased teaching load, as described in Section 2, above.

Faculty who are awarded leave, a sabbatical, or are otherwise authorized to be absent from UNM during the reporting period are not expected to make service contributions for the semester(s) for which authorized absence has been granted. Regardless of leave status, all faculty are expected to generally contribute to educational and professional outreach as appropriate and possible.

2. Evidence of excellence in professional service.

Excellence in professional service may be difficult to evaluate, because many service responsibilities entail administrative tasks whose work products are difficult to evaluate qualitatively. Additionally, the quantity (or number) of service responsibilities or titles may not accurately correspond to the quantity of service-related tasks. For instance, the demands of service as a member of some committees may be very low, while in other committees the demands may be very high. As a result, the Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in evaluating achievements in professional service.

Excellence in professional service may be evident in:

- awards for service from professional organizations; ***or***
- appointment to service positions by UNM administrators outside the department, or by other public officials; ***or***
- clear importance and/or impact of a service responsibility (such as chairing the CAS Tenure and Promotion committee); ***or***
- visibility of service responsibility (such as serving as an expert consultant to a public agency, or an elected officer of a national or international organization); ***or***
- resolving a longstanding or significant problem through completion of a service responsibility.

In some cases, the Personnel Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair, may require input from other faculty members (not including a faculty member under review) or other individuals (such as UNM administrators or members of professional organizations) to identify evidence of excellence in professional service.

VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

(This section adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 14 March 2016.)

Three forms of evaluation shall be conducted each year: annual review of work performance and goals; merit review for allocating merit-based salary adjustments; and workload reporting. These annual evaluation processes are distinct from the milestone evaluation processes for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.

A. SUBJECT FACULTY

All continuing faculty shall be subject to the annual evaluation processes described herein. This includes professors (at all ranks) and lecturers whose employment status is probationary, tenured, or continuing non-tenure-track. The Department Chair may choose to receive evaluation through the annual evaluation processes, with the exception of the merit review process (as described below), but normally the Chair is exempt from these evaluation processes.

B. TIMELINE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESSES

Faculty evaluations shall be conducted annually. The period of evaluation and reporting is the calendar year. Specific deadlines shall be:

1. Before January 31 each year, each faculty member must submit to the chair of the departmental Personnel Committee an evaluation dossier, as described below. Annual evaluation processes for faculty members who fail to provide a complete dossier, or provide a complete dossier after January 31, may be delayed.
2. The Personnel Committee will begin evaluating faculty dossiers no earlier than February 1 annually, and will normally conclude its evaluations before March 1 by submitting an evaluation report to the Department Chair.
3. The Chair will complete the evaluation processes by reporting any required results to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) or other UNM administrative units if required. The Chair's reporting will normally be concluded before the end of the spring semester, depending on deadlines established by the CAS or other UNM administrative units.

Any changes to annual evaluation procedures or documents must be approved by the departmental faculty before the end of fall semester.

C. REPORTING DOCUMENTS

1. Faculty dossiers

Each faculty member shall provide in one evaluation dossier the information necessary to complete all three annual evaluation processes. Each faculty member shall annually submit an evaluation dossier to the chair of the Personnel Committee consisting of the following documents:

- a full curriculum vitae that summarizes professional work accomplishments in research, teaching, and service;
- a statement of professional goals for the current calendar year;
- a statement of self evaluation based upon goals set for the prior calendar year;
- a completed and annotated copy of the evaluation analytical table (described below and attached to the departmental governance document) that places all work products in the appropriate categories in the table, assigns point values to each work product, and provides justification as necessary or desired for the placement of and point values assigned to work products entered into the analytical table.

Additionally, all probationary faculty shall submit:

- copies of classroom materials, peer teaching evaluations, and other materials reflecting on teaching performance; and
- copies of scholarly works completed or submitted during the previous year and other materials reflecting on scholarly work.

Dossiers will be maintained in accordance with the Faculty Handbook in order to protect confidentiality (*see* Faculty Handbook C70: Confidentiality of Faculty Records).

a) Curriculum vitae

It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to ensure that the curriculum vitae accurately and fully records professional outputs and accomplishments. As much as possible, the format and contents of the curriculum vitae should be aligned with the analytical table described below and attached to the departmental governance document. This table identifies “work output categories”, which represent types of work product commonly produced by departmental faculty. The curriculum vitae should clearly and honestly describe all aspects of a faculty member’s professional work effort. This means the document should provide complete, accurate, and verifiable:

- i. bibliographic information for all publications;
- ii. date information for all items (including the semesters during which service or administrative responsibilities were undertaken);
- iii. information on all aspects of funding proposals submitted and of funding awards received;
- iv. information on public presentations of research;
- v. information on all service contributions, both within and outside the department;
- vi. information on any awards or recognitions received; and
- vii. information on any other professional work product.

The chair of the Personnel Committee and/or the Department Chair may request a faculty member to supply more complete information on, or to provide verification of, any item on the curriculum vitae if additional information is deemed necessary to conduct a fair evaluation. The curriculum vitae shall be used in all three yearly evaluations: annual review of work performance and goals; merit review for the purpose of allocating merit-based salary adjustments; and workload review.

b) Statements of annual goals and progress toward goals

Statements of annual goals and progress toward goals are self-assessments of professional work outputs and accomplishment. The statements included in each evaluation dossier shall be concise, normally no more than about 250 words each.

The statement of annual goals should realistically anticipate intended outputs and accomplishments for the current calendar year, in terms of research, teaching, and service. These intended outputs and accomplishments should relate clearly to recently past professional work efforts, and should provide evidence of a desire to continue a trajectory of professional achievement appropriate to a faculty member’s career stage.

The statement of progress toward goals should honestly evaluate the degree to which the prior year’s goals, in terms of research, teaching, and service, were achieved. The statement

should identify contextual factors and direct events that aided in or hindered the accomplishment of previously stated goals.

These statements shall be used in the annual review of work performance and goals.

c) Completed analytical table

A primary tool used in annual evaluations is the analytical table, described below and attached to the departmental governance document. As part of his/her evaluation dossier, each faculty member shall complete the analytical table based on his/her work output during the prior calendar year, in order to:

- ensure that the Personnel Committee receives notice for all work output items that the faculty member wishes to have included in his/her annual evaluations;
- recommend to the Personnel Committee where each work output item should be placed with regard to the categories listed on the table;
- propose a point value that should be assigned to each work output item; and
- provide information that the Personnel Committee may use to assign point values to work output items during its independent analysis of evaluation dossiers.

The work output categories in the analytical table are not exhaustive. The point values indicated for each work output category are recommendations only. However, individual faculty members, the Personnel Committee, and the department Chair should seek to maintain standard categories and point values to the greatest extent possible, so that evaluation reports are closely comparable between faculty members within an evaluation period, and so that evaluation reports from different years are as closely comparable as possible.

The assignment of point values to work products within the analytical table is inherently subjective. A purpose of the self-completion of the analytical table is for individual faculty members to justify as necessary or desired the point values assigned to individual work product items. In the appropriate column of the analytical table, each individual faculty member should provide brief explanations of the actual work effort, scholarly impact, or other characteristics of each work output item, for those items for which the individual faculty feels this information is necessary.

Specific limitations to material that may be entered into the analytical table are:

- i. The only publications that may be included are those that have been published in final form during the reporting calendar year. However, if a faculty member can report no publications, he/she may claim credit for potential publications that exist only in early stages of the publication process, as a means of demonstrating effort toward publishing research. These publications shall receive points as a group, not as individual works, as specified on the analytical table. If such potential publications are reported for one calendar year, the faculty member must provide a statement of progress and expected timeline to publication, and make available a copy of the potential publication(s). Any potential publication once reported may not again be reported until it is published in final form.

- ii. Funding awards may be included only for the year in which an award was received, and for each year in which funds are actually received.
- iii. For publications and research presentations, “peer reviewed” means that the pre-published manuscript or the presentation proposal has been evaluated by peer reviewers, that is, people who have broadly similar expertise and competency as the publishing or presenting researcher. Publications that are not peer reviewed normally include: book chapters or journal articles that are reviewed only by the volume editor; invited review articles, editorials, or letters in scholarly media; any publication in popular media; and most creative works that are published primarily for aesthetic value. “Law review” means a scholarly journal that is normally published by a law school or bar association.
- iv. Data sets and databases may be reported only if published in a dataset journal, or published as or on a searchable, publicly available Internet site.
- v. Non-load courses taught at the UNM or any other institution for additional remuneration (normally, courses taught during a summer session or intersession, or online) will not be included in presenting the number of credit hours or number of students instructed during a review period. However, such courses increase the number and/or variety of learning opportunities for students, and thus should be reported. The analytical table shall clearly and correctly identify all non-load courses taught at the UNM.

In all cases, analytical tables completed by individual faculty members and included in evaluation dossiers are only the recommendation of an individual faculty member to the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee shall independently evaluate all dossiers as described below; the consensus analytical tables produced by the Personnel Committee may not agree in whole or in part with the analytical tables completed by individual faculty members.

d) Peer teaching evaluations

Probationary instructors in the department, and tenured instructors upon request, receive peer evaluations each semester. Evaluation dossiers shall include full copies of all teaching evaluations received during the prior calendar year, regardless of the calendar year in which an evaluated course was taught.

These evaluations shall be used in the annual review of work performance and goals, and in the merit review for the purpose of allocating merit-based salary adjustments.

e) Materials reflecting on teaching performance and scholarly work

The annual review process enables probationary faculty to present material evidence of their scholarly work and teaching performance, and receive feedback on these materials from tenured faculty in the department. As part of the annual evaluation dossier, probationary faculty shall submit documentation such as:

- i. course materials including syllabi, assignments, and exams;
- ii. evidence of teaching trainings attended;
- iii. publications;
- iv. publications in review;
- v. funding awards received;
- vi. funding proposals submitted for competition;

- vii. papers, posters, or slide shows presented at professional meetings;
- viii. awards or recognition received; or
- ix. any other documentation of teaching performance or scholarly work.

The annual review process leads toward the tenure review process for probationary faculty. The annual preparation and submission of an evaluation dossier that includes such documents should contribute directly toward the completion of a tenure file.

2. Documents supplied by department

In addition to the documents supplied in faculty dossiers, the department shall provide supplemental information for the Personnel Committee to use in its review process.

a) Courses Taught and Course Enrollments

The Department Chair shall provide to the chair of the Personnel Committee a list of all courses taught in the department during the prior calendar year, including regular courses, independent studies (GEOG 491, 591), thesis credits (GEOG 597, 599), and internships (GEOG 493, 593). This list shall include for each course the name of the instructor of record, the number of credit hours assigned to the course, and the 21-day enrollment for the course.

b) Graduate Thesis Committees

The Department Chair will provide a list of all graduate thesis committees in GES, using signed graduate committee forms from the departmental file to verify faculty service as committee chair or as committee member during the preceding year.

c) Statement of Goals from Preceding Year

The Department Chair will provide a copy of each faculty member's statement of goals from the preceding year. These will be extracted from the archived individual dossiers that were submitted by each faculty member during the most recent Personnel Committee review. The Department Chair will not submit goal statements for new faculty members until the second annual review.

d) Course Evaluation Data

The Department Chair will provide student evaluation data for every course, including both summary scores and written student comments, as collected in the standard package used by the UNM. The departmental annual evaluation processes shall use the "overall teaching effectiveness" rating from these reports as its primary numeric indicator of teaching performance. The overall instructor effectiveness rating shall be used to: a) identify one aspect of the achievement of minimum teaching expectations for departmental faculty (as defined in the faculty standards and expectations portion of the departmental governance document); and b) identify meritorious and less-than-meritorious teaching performance. In the first case, the achievement of minimum performance standards is an important component of the annual review of work performance and goals. However, student evaluations provide only one type of information in assessing the achievement of minimum performance standards, and other sources of information shall also be used in evaluating annual teaching performance. In the second case, student evaluations provide a measure of success in teaching performance that should be considered in identifying work efforts that should be either rewarded or rectified.

The information provided by the department shall be used in all three yearly evaluations: annual review of work performance and goals; merit review for the purpose of allocating merit-based salary adjustments; and workload review.

D. COMMITTEE EVALUATION OF ANALYTICAL TABLE

A source of information used in annual evaluations is the analytical table, attached to the departmental governance document as an appendix. Each member of the departmental Personnel Committee shall evaluate each dossier and complete the analytical table in order to:

1. identify instances in which a faculty member appears to have failed to meet minimum expectations, which is used in the annual review of work performance and goals;
2. produce a numerical score that contributes to the merit review process; and
3. produce a numerical score that is used in workload reporting.

The work output categories in the analytical table are not exhaustive. The point values indicated for each work output category are recommendations only. However, individual faculty members, the Personnel Committee, and the department Chair should seek to maintain standard categories and point values to the greatest extent possible, so that evaluation reports are closely comparable between faculty members within an evaluation period, and so that evaluation reports from different years are as closely comparable as possible. The assignment of point values to work products within the analytical table is inherently subjective, and the Personnel Committee and the department Chair must strive to provide fair and justifiable evaluation of every work product recorded in every evaluation dossier.

E. EVALUATION PROCESSES

The three annual evaluation processes are distinct yet share several components. The purpose of linking the evaluation processes is to minimize the administrative tasks required to complete the annual evaluation processes.

1. Evaluation timeline

First, each faculty member shall provide a complete evaluation dossier to the chair of the Personnel Committee before January 31 each year.

Second, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall determine whether each faculty member has submitted a complete dossier. If any faculty member has not submitted a complete dossier, the Personnel Committee chair will request any missing document(s). If missing documents are not supplied in a timely manner, the merit review process will continue, but the committee's report to the Department Chair will clearly identify any limitations to the report due to incomplete dossiers.

Third, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall review all dossiers in comparison to those submitted in previous years in order to identify any professional work products that have multi-year relevance within the annual evaluation processes. Specifically:

- a) authored research books are used in evaluations for a period of five years, including and beginning with the copyright year of the book;
- b) edited research volumes are used in evaluations for a period of four years, including and beginning with the copyright year of the volume;

- c) authored textbooks are used in evaluations for a period of four years, including and beginning with the copyright year of the book;
- d) large-format, original maps are used in evaluations for a period of three years, including and beginning with the copyright year of the map;
- e) edited special issues of scholarly journals are used in evaluations for a period of two years, including and beginning with the copyright year of the book; and
- f) peer-reviewed or law-review journal articles are used in evaluations for a period of two years, including and beginning with the publication year of the final version.

For faculty members who have such publications in their record, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall add to the faculty member's dossier a document that completely identifies each work with multi-year relevance, and that specifies which of the above categories each work shall be placed.

Fourth, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall consult with the department Chair to identify any approved changes to the expected work effort of any faculty member. Based on this consultation, the committee chair shall add to each faculty member's dossier a document that completely identifies the per annum expected work effort of the faculty member. Normal expected work effort for tenure-track faculty is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service per annum. Any changes in expected work effort must be determined on a per annum basis. For example:

- a) a one-semester, one-course teaching release means that expected teaching work effort per annum (assuming a normal 40-40-20 load in the non-leave semester) is 30%, with a concomitant 10% increase in either research or service, depending on the terms of the release;
- b) a one-semester sabbatical means that the expected work efforts per annum (assuming a normal 40-40-20 load in the non-sabbatical semester) are 70% research, 20% teaching, and 10% service; and
- c) a one-semester leave without pay means that the expected work efforts per annum (assuming a normal 40-40-20 load in the non-leave semester) are 20% research, 20% teaching, and 10% service.

Fifth, the chair of the Personnel Committee will provide all members of the committee full copies of each dossier submitted (including incomplete dossiers). Each committee member shall independently evaluate each dossier, with exceptions made to avoid conflicts of interest. In particular:

- a) no faculty member shall independently evaluate his/her own dossier (although each faculty member will have completed an analytical table as part of his/her dossier); and
- b) no spouse shall evaluate his/her spouse's dossier.
- c) As a component of the committee analysis described below, Personnel Committee members may discuss the independent evaluations of their own dossiers.

Sixth, to avoid conflicts of interest, the committee chair shall provide full copies of relevant evaluation dossiers (that is, the dossiers of Personnel Committee members, and spouses of committee members) to a faculty member not on the Personnel Committee, who will review these dossiers and complete analytical tables for each. The purpose of this external review

is to avoid conflicts of interest and to ensure that all evaluation dossiers receive the same number of independent analyses.

2. Independent analysis of dossiers

Every evaluator—that is, each Personnel Committee member and the external reviewer—shall conduct an independent analysis of each evaluation dossier. In performing his/her analyses, every evaluator shall be aware of the UNM Faculty Handbook section B1: Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation. Every evaluator shall employ the principles embodied in the UNM Faculty Handbook in performing evaluations.

All evaluators shall complete their independent analyses with minimal delay, normally less than two weeks after having received the dossiers for review.

Evaluators shall fully analyze each evaluation dossier. If any evaluator requires further information, clarification, or verification of C.V. contents in order to conduct a fair and complete analysis of any dossier, he/she shall request this information from the chair of the Personnel Committee, who shall seek any necessary information directly from the relevant faculty member.

Evaluators shall carefully consider point values assigned to individual work products entered into the analytical table. The faculty standards and expectations section of the departmental governance document suggests general characteristics of evidence of excellence in research, teaching, and service. Due to the range and variety of research, teaching, and service efforts departmental faculty commonly undertake, more specific guidelines for assigning point values to individual work products are not feasible. The committee analysis of evaluation dossiers, described below, is expected to reduce the subjectivity inherent to the evaluation process.

An evaluator has completed his/her independent analysis when: a) he/she has considered all work output items listed on the curriculum vitae and analytical table completed by the individual faculty member; b) assigned point values in the analytical table to all work output items; c) assigned point values for teaching based on the 21-day enrollments in each course; d) assigned point values for teaching performance based on the “overall teaching effectiveness” score on the formal teaching evaluations; e) read the statements of work goals and progress toward work goals; and f) calculated summary scores for research, teaching, and service on the analytical table.

Importantly, point values indicated in the analytical table for research, teaching, and service are not inter-comparable. For example, a score of five points earned for research is not comparable to scores of five points earned for service or teaching. Additionally, summary scores based on these point values are indices of work effort, and are also not inter-comparable between research, teaching, and service.

All evaluators shall return their completed analytical tables to the chair of the Personnel Committee prior to the committee analysis of the dossiers.

3. *Committee analysis of dossiers*

The chair of the Personnel Committee shall convene a meeting of the committee after all evaluators have returned completed analytical tables. The purpose of this meeting is to reach consensus on the specific information on each faculty member that should be included in the committee's evaluation report to the Department Chair. In particular, the committee shall complete a consensus analytical table based on discussion of the individual evaluations. The consensus analytical table shall be included in the committee's evaluation report to the Chair.

Once the Personnel Committee has completed its consensus analytical tables, the committee must make specific decisions in relation to each annual evaluation process, and develop justifications for all decisions. The decisions are specified in the following subsections.

a) Annual review of work performance and goals

The committee must decide if any faculty members have failed to meet minimum expectations for research, teaching, and/or service. This decision shall be based upon:

- minimum expectations for faculty that are specified in the departmental governance document;
- scores generated through the independent analyses of evaluation dossiers; and
- statements of annual goals and progress toward goals provided in evaluation dossiers.

The minimum expectations described in the governance document are mostly general in form, but provide some specific criteria for identifying minimum performance expectations. The summary scores generated from the analytical table through analyses of evaluation dossiers represent indices that can serve as criteria for different levels of professional work performance, including the attainment of minimum performance expectations. In principle, the following summary scores indicate the achievement of minimum expectations:

- i. for research, for a 40% expected work effort, any score ≥ 3 (or 0.075 earned points per expected work effort percentage point) represents the attainment of minimum performance expectations;
- ii. for teaching, for a 40% expected work effort, any score ≥ 12 (or 0.3 earned points per expected work effort percentage point) represents the attainment of minimum performance expectations; and
- iii. for service, for a 20% expected work effort, any score ≥ 2 (or 0.1 earned points per expected work effort percentage point) represents the attainment of minimum performance expectations.

If the Personnel Committee finds that a faculty member has not achieved these specified scores, this does not automatically mean that he/she has failed to meet minimum expectations. The Personnel Committee must discuss every instance in which any faculty member does not achieve these specified scores, and decide if there are contextual factors, which may be identified in a faculty member's statement of progress toward annual goals, that suggest that a faculty member has met minimum expectations despite a non-attainment score. In any case, if the committee's has found analytical table scores that suggests that a faculty member has not attained minimum expectations, the committee must write a

statement that justifies its final decision that a faculty member has or has not attained minimum standards.

For instances in which committee members disagree on whether a faculty member has or has not attained minimum standards, the Personnel Committee must identify the source of discrepancy, and seek consensus on the decision. If no consensus can be reached, the committee's majority opinion shall be indicated in the evaluation report. In such cases, the evaluation report shall also indicate that the committee did not reach its decision through consensus.

b) Merit review for allocating merit-based salary adjustments

The merit review for allocating merit-based salary adjustments shall be conducted during all annual evaluation cycles, regardless the availability of a merit raise pool of funds.

The Personnel Committee must decide the categorical level (not monetary value) of recommended merit-based salary adjustment each faculty member shall be recommended to receive. This decision shall be based upon:

- i. minimum expectations for faculty that are specified in the departmental governance document;
- ii. analytical table scores generated through the independent analyses of evaluation dossiers;
- iii. statements of annual goals and progress toward goals provided in evaluation dossiers; and
- iv. peer teaching evaluations provided in evaluation dossiers.

If the Personnel Committee has decided that a faculty member has failed to meet minimum expectations for research, teaching, or service, through the process of annual review of work performance and goals (described in the previous sub-section), this faculty member shall not be eligible to receive a merit-based salary adjustment. However, all faculty members shall receive cost-of-living salary adjustments.

For all faculty who have met minimum performance expectations in research, teaching, and service, the Personnel Committee must assign each faculty member to a meritorious category. These meritorious categories are:

- *Meets minimum expectations*: Faculty in this category have met minimum expectations for research, teaching, and service.
- *Exceeds expectations*: Faculty in this category clearly exceed minimum expectations for research, teaching, and service by showing some distinction in the quantity or quality of professional work output.
- *Shows extraordinary accomplishment*: Faculty in this category clearly exceed minimum expectations for research, teaching, and service and have achieved clearly exceptional distinction in the quantity or quality of professional work output.

In its evaluation report to the Department Chair, the Personnel Committee must produce a written statement about every faculty member that identifies and justifies its decision to place each faculty member in a particular category.

For instances in which committee members disagree on the appropriate category to which to assign a faculty member, the Personnel Committee must identify the source of disagreement, and seek consensus on the appropriate category for the faculty member. If no consensus can be reached, the committee's majority opinion shall be indicated in the evaluation report. In such cases, the evaluation report shall also indicate that committee did not reach consensus on the specified category.

Funds available for merit-based salary adjustment shall be allocated as follows. First, all faculty members eligible for merit-based salary adjustments shall be allotted shares in the merit raise pool of funds:

- Each faculty member assigned to the category "*Meets minimum expectations*" shall be allotted one share.
- Each faculty member assigned to the category "*Exceeds expectations*" shall be allotted two shares.
- Each faculty member assigned to the category "*Shows extraordinary accomplishment*" shall be allotted three shares.

Second, available funds shall be divided by the total number of shares allotted, and each faculty member shall be recommended a salary adjustment equivalent in value to the number of shares he/she has been allotted.

If the University determines that faculty salaries will not be increased, or that the increase shall be limited only to cost-of-living adjustments, the Personnel Committee's reports will be filed to help determine appropriate allocation of merit-based salary adjustments in future years when applicable. The allotment of funds for faculty raises is described further below.

c) Workload reporting

The committee must decide the number of "load units" (a concept explained in the UNM Faculty Handbook section C100: Academic Load) each faculty member has carried during the reporting period. This decision shall be based upon:

1. analytical table scores generated through the independent analyses of evaluation dossiers; and
2. any relevant guidelines that may be given from the CAS or another UNM administrative unit.

As stated in the UNM Faculty Handbook section C100: Academic Load, the "typical" academic load is 23 load units, composed of 9 scholarly work load units, 9 teaching load units, and 5 service load units. However, the actual number of workload units per faculty member will likely vary in each of the three categories, within these ranges: 0-18 units for scholarly work; 0-18 units for teaching; and 0-10 units for service. All faculty members are normally expected to carry 23 total workload units through different combinations of load units from the three categories.

The Personnel Committee shall determine the raw number of workload units each faculty member has carried in the following manners:

- For research, a summary score on the evaluation analytical table of three equals nine scholarly work load units.
- For service, a summary score on the evaluation analytical table of two equals nine service load units.
- For teaching, each three-unit, regular course equals three teaching load units; each four-unit regular course equals three and one-third teaching load units.

The Personnel Committee shall adjust the raw number of workload units according to these guidelines:

1. For each one-course teaching release, the raw number of teaching load units shall be reduced by three (or three and one third). To account for this decrease in earned teaching load units, three load units shall be added to the raw score for scholarly work or service, based on the terms of the teaching release.
2. For faculty members that have greater than average (in comparison to the faculty group as a whole) productivity in terms of research, teaching, or service, additional workload units may be assigned to the faculty member in any category, in order to more accurately reflect actual workload.

Based on the adjusted number of workload units identified for scholarly work, teaching, and service, the total number of workload units shall be determined.

For instances in which Personnel Committee members disagree on the number of workload units to award a faculty member, the committee must identify the source of disagreement, and seek consensus on the appropriate number of workload units for the faculty member. If no consensus can be reached, the committee's majority opinion shall be indicated in the evaluation report. In such cases, the evaluation report shall also indicate that committee did not reach consensus on its assignment of workload units to the faculty member.

d) Determinations for variable workload policy recommendations.

Based on the evaluation processes in this section, the Committee will make recommendations to the Chair regarding whether to increase or decrease a faculty member's teaching load for the following year:

- If a faculty member "*shows extraordinary accomplishment*" in research based on the evaluation processes in this section, the Committee will recommend that he or she is eligible for course load reduction at the discretion of the Chair under the variable workload policy.
- If it is determined that a faculty member does not have an active research program based on the evaluation processes in this section, the committee will recommend that he or she be considered for a course load increase under the variable workload policy. An "active research program" will be determined qualitatively based on all of the information included in the faculty dossier as outlined in this section.

F. EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

1. Contents of the report

The Personnel Committee shall report its evaluation decisions to the department Chair in a written format. This report will clearly identify any limitations in the committee's

evaluations, including documentation of incomplete faculty member dossiers. Additionally, the report shall include as an appendix copies of the consensus analytical table completed by the committee.

The committee's evaluation report shall, for the purpose of the annual review of work performance and goals, include the following information:

- for each departmental faculty member, a statement whether the faculty member has attained minimum standards for research;
- for each departmental faculty member, a statement whether the faculty member has attained minimum standards for teaching;
- for each departmental faculty member, a statement whether the faculty member has attained minimum standards for service;
- for any faculty member who has been determined on an analytical table to have not attained minimum expectations, a statement that justifies the committee's final decision whether a faculty member has or has not attained minimum standards; and
- for any instances in which the committee did not reach consensus on its necessary decisions but instead reported the committee's majority opinion, a statement that identifies the point on which consensus was not reached.

The committee's evaluation report shall, for the purpose of the merit review for allocating merit-based salary adjustments, include the following information:

- for each departmental faculty member, a statement whether the faculty member is eligible for merit-based salary adjustment;
- for each eligible departmental faculty member, a statement placing the faculty member into one of the three meritorious categories;
- for each eligible departmental faculty member, a statement of the rationale for placing the faculty member in the relevant meritorious category;
- for each eligible departmental faculty member, a statement of the number of shares that the faculty member shall be allotted of the available funds; and
- for any instances in which the committee did not reach consensus on its necessary decisions but instead reported the committee's majority opinion, a statement that identifies the point on which consensus was not reached.

The committee's evaluation report shall, for the purpose of the workload reporting, include the following information:

- a completed copy of the workload reporting form (or other document) that may be required by the CAS and/or other administrative units at UNM; and
- for any instances in which the committee did not reach consensus on its necessary decisions but instead reported the committee's majority opinion, a statement that identifies the point on which consensus was not reached.

2. Circulation of aggregate performance indicators

After the Personnel Committee's report is received and accepted by the Department Chair, an aggregate summary of faculty performance in research, teaching, and service will be circulated to the faculty. The purpose of this document is to make it possible for individual faculty members to ascertain how their own performance compares to the performance of

the GES faculty as a whole on key performance indicators. The subset of performance indicators to be aggregated and the methods of aggregation are shown below. Any changes to this list must be approved by faculty vote.

a) Research Indicators

- Number of publications appearing in review year (not including in press or forthcoming works)
 - Peer-Reviewed: minimum, maximum, median
 - Non-peer-reviewed: minimum, maximum, median
- Total dollar amount of grants in review year, regardless of share to GES faculty member
 - Submitted in review year: minimum, maximum, median
 - Awarded in review year: minimum, maximum, median
- Number of presentations given in review year, including international, national,
 - Invited or refereed: minimum, maximum, median
 - Contributed or non-refereed: minimum, maximum, median
- Overall research score, from the personnel committee review: minimum, maximum, median

b) Teaching Indicators

- Advising during review year
 - Total grad committees chaired in review year: minimum, maximum, median
 - Total advisees graduating in review year: minimum, maximum, median
- Instructor effectiveness rating from all student evaluations during review year
 - GES 100-level courses: minimum, maximum, mean
 - GES undergrad-only courses: minimum, maximum, mean
 - GES grad/undergrad courses: minimum, maximum, mean
 - GES grad-only courses: minimum, maximum, mean
 - All GES courses: minimum, maximum, mean
- Overall teaching score, from the personnel committee review: minimum, maximum, median

c) Service Indicator

Overall service score, from the personnel committee review: minimum, maximum, median

G. CONTESTS

Although faculty members will not have direct access to the Personnel Committee report, any faculty member may contest the Personnel Committee's evaluation of his/her own performance, as reported in the chair's annual review letter, by making a written contest to the Department Chair.

H. DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S EVALUATION PROCESS

The Department Chair shall annually review the annual evaluation report of the Personnel Committee as well as the individual dossiers submitted by each faculty member, seeking clarification from the Personnel Committee chair, other committee members, and from individual faculty members where necessary to ensure that complete, accurate, and fair information and analysis is included in the committee's evaluation report. The Department Chair

has final responsibility for providing individual faculty members with annual reviews of their performance, for adjusting faculty salaries each year in accordance with university guidelines governing cost-of-living increases and merit-based raises, and for reporting faculty workloads to the UNM administration. In all of these tasks, however, the Department Chair is expected to rely substantially on the findings of the Personnel Committee, as developed through the procedures described above.

1. Annual review of work performance and goals

The main purpose of written annual reviews is to notify each faculty member explicitly whether he/she has met minimum performance expectations in research, teaching, and service, based on the stated departmental standards for each category. It is not expected that the Department Chair's written review will depart substantively from the findings of the Personnel Committee, although clarifications or additional information received after the Personnel Committee completes its evaluation report may lead to a change in the overall finding of whether a faculty member has or has not met minimum expectations. In such cases, the Personnel Committee shall be asked to provide feedback to the Chair on this new information before the annual review is completed.

As described above, the Department Chair shall solicit comments from all tenured faculty members on the performance of pre-tenure faculty members, as reported in their individually submitted dossiers. The Chair shall use these comments as necessary and appropriate in writing the annual evaluations of pre-tenure faculty members.

The Chair shall write annual reviews for each faculty member in accordance with the required formats and timelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook and by the CAS, and shall subsequently request a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the findings of the annual review. Annual reviews of pre-tenure faculty shall explicitly address whether the faculty member is "on track" to meet departmental expectations at the time of the next scheduled milestone review and will provide substantive feedback on the faculty member's statement of goals for the coming year.

As stated in the UNM Faculty Handbook, faculty members have the right to rebut the findings of the annual review and to submit materials in support of any such rebuttal.

Once completed, written annual reviews shall be placed in the department's confidential personnel files for each individual faculty member.

2. Salary Review and Merit-Based Adjustments

In years when the UNM administration determines that funds are available for faculty salary increases, the Department Chair shall rely on the Personnel Committee's reports as a basis for allocating the merit-based portion of any increase. The Department Chair shall announce to all faculty members as soon as possible if a merit raise pool is available, and, if so, the size of the pool.

In years when a raise pool of funds is available, the raise pool shall be divided into two portions: one portion for cost-of-living raises, and one for merit-based raises. Cost-of-living

raises are normally set at 1.5 to 2 percent, and are often set by the UNM as a minimum salary increase. All faculty salaries shall be adjusted for cost of living, regardless of whether the faculty member met minimum performance standards in the categories of teaching, research, or service.

The remainder of the raise pool shall be allocated on a merit basis to only those faculty members who attained minimum performance standards in teaching, research, *and* service. The Department Chair is explicitly excluded from the departmental raise pool. Allocation shall be calculated as follows:

- a) The Department Chair shall review the Personnel Committee's calculation of faculty shares, making adjustments only in exceptional cases where it is necessary to account for clarifications or information submitted after the committee's evaluation report was completed. Any such adjustment in the assignment of shares shall be reported both to the Personnel Committee and to the individual faculty member concerned.
- b) Eligible faculty members shall then be allocated merit-based salary increases in strict accordance with the number of shares as assigned in the Personnel Committee's evaluation report (and as adjusted by the Chair).
- c) The merit-based portion of the raise pool shall be divided by the total number of shares generated by eligible faculty to determine a dollar value per share. If funds for merit-based salary adjustments become available after one or more year when no funding has been available, merit-based raises shall be determined based on the total number of shares assigned in the Personnel Committee's evaluation reports (and as adjusted by the Chair) for all faculty members during the unfunded year(s).
- d) Each eligible faculty member shall receive a salary increase that reflects the total number of shares multiplied by their dollar amount.
- e) Given that each share shall be set as a fixed dollar amount, rather than as a percentage, the total amount of each eligible faculty member's merit-based salary increase will not be mathematically tied to his or her existing salary.

In years when the Dean of CAS or the Provost of the University makes available additional funding to adjust faculty salaries for purposes of equity adjustment or faculty retention, the Chair shall determine such adjustments separately from either the cost-of-living or merit-based increases. In this event, the Department Chair shall announce to all faculty members the total amount of funds available and seek feedback from the Personnel Committee before determining salary adjustments and submitting the final adjusted faculty salaries to the CAS.

3. Workload reporting

The Department Chair shall generally adopt the exact workload numbers determined by the Personnel Committee for purposes of reporting overall faculty workload to the UNM administration. Exceptions shall be discussed with the chair of the Personnel Committee and will generally be limited to across-the-board adjustments intended to ensure that the report meets administrative expectations above the department level.

VII. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE & PROMOTION

(This section adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 09 December 2015.)

A. CRITERIA

The Faculty Handbook outlines the categories in which faculty performance is evaluated for the purpose of tenure and promotion:

- Teaching
- Scholarly Work
- Service
- Personal Characteristics

The University's general expectations in each of these categories states that, “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” (Faculty Handbook B1: Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation, *Approved by Regents December 8, 1998; Approved by Faculty December 7, 1998*).

These criteria are reflected in the GES’s Standards and Expectations for faculty that provide the basis for the annual review of each faculty member’s contributions each year (see Standards and Expectations for GES faculty, *adopted January 14, 2015*). For pre-tenured faculty, they also serve as guidance regarding progress toward tenure and promotion. These standards are reflective of the GES’s interpretation of the Faculty Handbook’s categories in which faculty performance will be evaluated.¹

The annual review assesses faculty performance for research, teaching, and service, and GES uses the same criteria used in the promotion and tenure context to evaluate whether a candidate for tenure has (1) proven effective in the areas of teaching, scholarly work, and service and (2) demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. Personal characteristics are not assessed annually but are discussed below.

GES is interested in the entire research record of the faculty member. However, the decision for tenure and promotion to associate professor is based primarily on work done since the completion of the PhD.

Promotion from associate to full professor is reserved for “individuals who have attained high standards in teaching and who have made significant contributions to their disciplines” (Faculty Handbook B.2.2.3). The Faculty Handbook further states: “Appointment or promotion to

¹ Opportunities are provided for exceptions to established criteria. These must, however, be formally requested by the person under review, and approved by both the Chair of GES and a majority of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In the case of joint appointments with other units on campus, other evaluative measures may apply as specified in the letters of appointment.

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.” In considering candidates for promotion to full professor, the GES will undertake a careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership.

1. Research

In terms of research and scholarly work, faculty members in GES normally have appointments that identify research as the dominant component of professional work effort. It is expected that GES faculty maintain an active research agenda, and that research products will be publicly available to the greatest degree possible. Scholarly productivity is assessed in three areas of activity: publishing, seeking research funding, and presenting research publicly. Excellence in these areas of activity may be evident in the quality, impact, and/or quantity of research products.

a) Publishing

- i. Effective scholarly work is reflected in the publication of research findings whether in printed or electronic formats. Given the breadth of geography and of environmental studies as fields of scholarly research, and the varying publication practices characteristic of subfields within geography and environmental studies, a range of media types are suitable for the publication of research findings. These media types might include, but are not limited to: research monographs, normally published as books; peer-reviewed journal articles; law-review journal articles; peer-reviewed book chapters; other types of journal articles and book chapters (such as book reviews or encyclopedia entries, and full papers in volumes of conference proceedings); maps; edited volumes, whether published as books or special journal issues; textbooks; data sets and/or databases; or substantial creative, interpretive, or popular works relevant to geography and environmental studies. Exclusions to this list are research summaries (such as abstracts published in volumes of conference proceedings), personal or informal web sites (such as blogs), practical exercise manuals for teaching applications, and news media editorials or opinion essays. Excluded publication types may be included in evaluations of other aspects of a faculty member's work effort.
- ii. Excellence in publishing is not certainly evident in the absolute number or length of publications; publication quality is at least as important as quantity. Contextual information is often necessary to identify excellence in publishing, such as: a) the relationship of a published work to other works published by the same faculty member; b) the role of the faculty member in the production of a multi-authored published work; and c) publication practices characteristic of relevant subfields within geography and environmental studies.

Given these considerations, some indications of excellence in publishing may include:

- the breadth, depth, and/or complexity of a given work; or
- awards from professional organizations for particular publications or a broad body of work; or

- publications in scholarly journals that have relatively high measures of impact (all impact measures are methodologically imperfect, but each provides some basis for comparing journals); *or*
- number of citations of a particular publication (all measures of the number or quality of citations are methodologically imperfect, but each provides some basis for comparing journals); *or*
- potential impact within a field of study, due to the novelty, originality, or scope of a particular publication; *or*
- number of publications, especially if the number substantially exceeds average output characteristic of scholars within relevant subfields of research.

b) Research Funding

Funding is not equally important in all fields within geography and environmental studies. Additionally, if a faculty member's current academic research projects are adequately funded for continuance, it may be unnecessary to seek research funding actively.

- i. Given these considerations, expectations in seeking research funding include:
 - each faculty member must seek sufficient funding support to enable active pursuit of his/her research agenda; *and*
 - each faculty member must seek and pursue opportunities to generate the indirect benefits possible through funding awards, such as funded graduate assistantships and overhead cost support; *and*
 - any and all funding applications must represent genuine efforts to gain research support.

ii. Excellence in research funding.

Excellence may be especially evident in the form of successful funding applications, but depending on a faculty member's field of research and years of experience as a faculty member, excellence may be shown even through unsuccessful funding applications. Multi-year evaluation periods should be considered in seeking evidence of excellence because any need to seek research funding is normally cyclical and because the receipt of an award is normally followed by a period of funded research.

Additionally, several aspects of any individual application/award must be considered in evaluating evidence of excellence in seeking research funding, such as: a) the total amount of the application/award; b) the total length of the funding period; c) the importance of funding within the relevant field of research; d) the complexity and/or collaborative nature of the application/award; e) the faculty member's proposed role (such as PI, Co-PI, consultant, etc.) in the proposed or funded research; f) the type and amount of indirect benefits of the application/award; g) the importance of funding support to the faculty member's research agenda; and h) the competitiveness of a funding program.

c) Presenting research publicly

- i. It is expected that all faculty members will present research publicly outside the UNM, primarily in professional venues. At least one presentation per calendar year is expected

in any of the following venues and formats, listed in approximate descending order of significance:

- invited or peer-reviewed oral presentation at a national or international professional meeting; *or*
- invited or peer-reviewed presentation in a non-oral format (such as a poster or an abstract) at a national or international professional meeting; *or*
- invited or peer-reviewed oral presentation at a regional or local professional meeting; *or*
- non-invited or non-peer-reviewed presentation in any format at a national or international professional meeting; *or*
- non-invited or non-peer-reviewed presentation in any format at a regional or local professional meeting; *or*
- any public presentation in any format, such as through articles or editorials in popular news media, whether published in printed or electronic formats.

ii. Excellence in presenting research publicly.

The quality of individual research presentations may be difficult to evaluate. As a result, excellence may be most readily evident in the number of research presentations, and in the characteristics of the venue in which research is presented. Peer-reviewed and invited participation, national and international venues, and oral formats generally suggest greater excellence.

2. Teaching

Tenure-track faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify teaching as a significant component of professional work effort. Expectations must be determined on an individual basis in employment contracts, and in compliance with all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies. Expectations for teaching are specified in relation to teaching load, accessibility to students, learning outcomes assessment, and teaching assessment and evaluation.

a) Teaching load

All faculty members who have teaching appointments are expected to teach their assigned number of organized courses each year. Organized courses have regularly scheduled meetings with multiple students enrolled, and thus generate student credit hours. Faculty members are also expected to engage in additional instructional activities, which might generate credit hours (such as supervising students in independent study, honors research, and thesis research), or might not (such as advising students, and serving on graduate or undergraduate thesis committees). These additional instructional activities constitute part of a faculty member's teaching work effort and are taken into consideration in performance and workload evaluations (particularly recognizing that faculty members may engage in additional instructional activities in support of other academic units on campus). However, these activities do not replace the expectation to teach organized courses.

Public education, such as through guest lectures, continuing education events, or similar outreach activities, is not considered to contribute to a faculty member's teaching work

effort. Providing public education may contribute to a faculty member's service work effort.

The standard teaching expectation for full-time tenure-track is four organized courses per academic year of three or four credit hours each, with a typical distribution of two courses during the fall semester and two courses during the spring semester. Courses taught during the summer semester or during intersession periods do not satisfy normal teaching expectations. This standard teaching load may be modified with the written approval of the department Chair, and the UNM College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), according to all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies.

b) Teaching Assessment and Evaluation

All teaching faculty must participate in assessments and evaluations of teaching effectiveness. This means: a) in every course, faculty members must provide students the opportunity to evaluate teaching, particularly through the standardized, end-of-semester assessments provided by the CAS; and b) tenured faculty members must participate in department efforts to provide peer evaluations of teaching to non-tenured faculty.

Additionally, all teaching faculty are expected to achieve, on average for all courses during a reporting period, quantitative scores from student evaluations that are minimally equivalent to a score of three out of five, with five being the highest (best) rating. It is recognized that teaching evaluation systems and criteria change, so that achievement of this expectation must be within the context of whatever evaluations system may be in effect for a particular reporting period.

Discretion in interpreting student evaluations is often necessary because: a) evaluation scores may be lower for large courses, all other factors being equal; b) evaluation scores may be lower for more technical courses, all other factors being equal; c) evaluation scores may be affected positively or negatively by factors beyond a faculty member's control (such as condition of teaching facilities, or availability of teaching assistants); and d) student evaluations do not provide a complete measure or estimate of teaching effectiveness. Peer teaching evaluations will serve alongside student evaluations as means of assessing teaching performance.

c) Evidence of excellence in teaching.

Excellence in teaching may be evident in:

- awards for teaching excellence; or
- high quantitative scores on student evaluations; or
- highly positive written comments on student evaluations; or
- highly positive peer teaching evaluations from other faculty; or
- the development of new courses, or the adaptation of existing courses to new formats; or
- the adoption or development of new pedagogical techniques or technologies; or
- student achievements, such as the publication of a student's paper in the UNM 'best student essays' periodical/web site; or

- exceptional participation in instructional activities other than regular courses, such as a large number of graduate or honors student advisees, or extensive instructional activities in support of other academic units.

Discretion in evaluating evidence for excellence in teaching is necessary because: a) excellence may be evident in different ways depending on the manner and structure of course delivery (such as large lecture-based courses, smaller discussion-based courses, hybrid online/in-person courses, entirely online courses, and laboratory courses); b) factors beyond a faculty member's control may affect teaching effectiveness; and c) class size may affect student evaluations independently of teaching effectiveness.

3. *Service*

Faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify professional service as the minor component of total work effort. For purpose of promotion and tenure, the Faculty Handbook notes that: "Service [is] important but normally round[s] out and complements the faculty member's strengths in teaching and scholarly work" (Faculty HandBookB1.2(b): Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation).

a) Expectations in professional service

It is expected that professional service contributions are shared as equally as possible amongst faculty members at each rank. Professional service should be pursued within the department, within the UNM, and more broadly through local, state, national, and international efforts. However, service within the department is particularly important to ensure its effective and efficient operation and governance. In only rare cases may a faculty member meet his/her service expectations entirely or primarily through service outside the department. The expectations for all faculty are: 1) attend all faculty meetings, unless impossible due to professional travel or some other professional responsibility, or a major personal event; 2) participate actively in departmental governance; and 3) contribute generally to educational and professional outreach within and beyond UNM. There are no additional service expectations for non-tenured, first-year faculty.

b) Evidence of excellence in professional service.

Excellence in professional service may be difficult to evaluate, because many service responsibilities entail administrative tasks whose work products are difficult to evaluate qualitatively. Additionally, the quantity (or number) of service responsibilities or titles may not accurately correspond to the quantity of service-related tasks. Excellence in professional service may be evident in:

- awards for service from professional organizations; *or*
- appointment to service positions by UNM administrators outside the department, or by other public officials; *or*
- clear importance and/or impact of a service responsibility (such as chairing the CAS Tenure and Promotion committee); *or*
- visibility of service responsibility (such as serving as an expert consultant to a public agency, or an elected officer of a national or international organization); *or*
- resolving a longstanding or significant problem through completion of a service responsibility.

4. *Personal Characteristics*

The Faculty Handbook 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 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 (Faculty Handbook B 1.2.4)

It further states that, as with service "personal characteristics are important but normally round out and complement the faculty member's strengths in teaching and scholarly work" (Faculty Handbook B1.2(b): Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation). GES does not have specific assessment criteria for personal characteristics. However, any behavior that deviates from the expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook will be considered as a factor in any recommendation for tenure and promotion.

B. PROCEDURES

1. *Promotion and Tenure Committee*

The Faculty Handbook outlines the procedures for Departmental Review and Recommendations for promotion and tenure (Faculty Handbook B4.3.1: Faculty Reviews, *Approved by Regents December 8, 1998; Approved by Faculty December 7, 1998*). The GES chair is responsible for overseeing the implementation of these procedures.

GES is a relatively small department, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured faculty. Lecturers and pre-tenured faculty are welcome to attend meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee but will not be pressured to provide a substantive assessment and will not participate as a voting member. Similarly, only full professors will participate in decisions promoting faculty from associate to full professor.

The candidate's dossier will be divided into two sections:

- a) information provided and generated by the candidate (e.g. C.V., research and teaching statements, supplemental materials) and
- b) information provided and generated by the GES (including external letters, annual reviews, course evaluations, the Chair's letter, confidential personnel materials, etc.)

Section 1 will be made publicly available. Section 2 will be available only to members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the GES Chair (Faculty Handbook C70: Confidentiality of Faculty Records).

After a thorough review of a candidate's dossier, each member of the committee will provide a written assessment based on the criteria outlined above to the Chair. Upon receiving the written assessments, the Chair will then meet with the committee, facilitate a discussion based on the criteria set forth in section A, and oversee the voting process.

Although it is reasonable to expect continuity between the annual reviews and promotion and tenure decisions, the two processes are functionally independent. The Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee will carefully consider these annual reviews but are not bound by them.

2. Spouses

The evaluation of spouses/domestic partners within the GES will be undertaken with special attention to the need for objectivity. If one spouse/partner is Chair, the Associate Chair will assume the duties of Chair when necessary. In all cases, each spouse/partner will recuse himself or herself from any evaluative decision about the other. The GES expects all members of the faculty to respect the confidentiality of evaluation processes and of all other normally confidential procedures or discussions.

VIII. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION OF LECTURES

(This section adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 09 December 2015.)

A. CONTINUING, NON-TENURE TRACK LECTURER APPOINTMENTS.

Continuing non-tenure track faculty (e.g., Lecturer) appointments in the Department are guided by the same governance documents used for tenure-track 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). 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.

B. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS OF LECTURERS.

1. The UNM Faculty Handbook provides:

All Lecturers will have annual performance reviews, which should be conducted according to Section B: Academic Freedom and Tenure, 4.0 of the *UNM Faculty Handbook* and as specified in this document, as appropriately modified by each School, College, Department or equivalent to conform with each unit's standard faculty review processes and to reflect each unit's specific requirements for continuation and promotion of Lecturers. The annual review in the first year must be conducted in the spring, in time for the Chair to provide written notice to the Lecturer no later than March 31 whether the Lecturer's contract will be renewed. In the second and subsequent years, the review must be conducted in the fall, in time for the Chair to provide written notice to the Lecturer no later than December 15. The Department Chair's written notice to the Lecturer will be copied to the Dean for inclusion in the Lecturer's personnel file (Faculty Handbook, C190: Lecturer Annual and Promotion Reviews).

2. Criteria for Assessment

In GES, Lectures will be assessed annually using standards used to faculty performance in teaching and service. Lectures are expected to achieve, on average for all courses during a reporting period, quantitative scores from student evaluations that are minimally equivalent to a score of three out of five, with five being the highest (best) rating. It is recognized that teaching evaluation systems and criteria change, so that achievement of this expectation must be within the context of whatever evaluations system may be in effect for a particular reporting period.

Discretion in interpreting student evaluations is often necessary because: a) evaluation scores may be lower for large courses, all other factors being equal; b) evaluation scores may be lower for more technical courses, all other factors being equal; c) evaluation scores may be affected positively or negatively by factors beyond a Lecture's control (such as condition of teaching facilities, or availability of teaching assistants); and d) student evaluations do not provide a complete measure or estimate of teaching effectiveness. Peer teaching evaluations will serve alongside student evaluations as means of assessing teaching performance. Excellence in teaching will be recognized using the same criteria used for faculty annual reviews.

Discretion in evaluating evidence for excellence in teaching is necessary because:

- a) excellence may be evident in different ways depending on the manner and structure of course delivery (such as large lecture-based courses, smaller discussion-based courses, hybrid online/in-person courses, entirely online courses, and laboratory courses);
- b) factors beyond a Lecture's control may affect teaching effectiveness; and
- c) class size may affect student evaluations independently of teaching effectiveness.

It is expected that annual reviews for Lecturers will be conducted by the Department Chair, with input from tenured faculty. All evaluations will take into account individual

appointments (e.g., teaching load) and other assignments (e.g., specific service appointments or duties).

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, “if any performance review of a Lecturer on a one-year appointment produces a negative evaluation, the Chair may exercise the University’s discretion not to renew the Lecturer’s contract. Alternatively, the Chair may provide the Lecturer a written description of the areas in which the Lecturer must improve if she or he is to continue as a member of the faculty. The Chair and the Lecturer must both sign this document. The Lecturer may then be issued a one year contract, with the understanding that if concerns are not adequately addressed, this contract will not be renewed.”

C. OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Opportunities for promotion will be provided in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. The promotion process may be initiated at the request of the individual in writing to the Department Chair in the preceding Fall semester prior to the annual year 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 GES process for annual reviews and promotion decisions for continuing non tenure-track Lecturers are subject to any guidelines or rules set out by the College of A&S or the Provost’s Office at UNM.

IX. FACULTY MENTORING

A. PURPOSE, MISSION

Assistance from a well-respected mentor is an invaluable supplement to the guidance and assistance that a department chair provides during the early years at UNM. The purpose of the GES Faculty Mentoring Program is to assist incoming junior faculty to adjust to their new environment, succeed in their career goals, and develop a sense of belonging and membership within the Department and University.

This purpose is carried out through provision of a knowledgeable established faculty mentor, typically someone who is in the same type of position as the incoming faculty, who has achieved a long-term relationship (e.g., tenured, experienced lecturer) with the department and university.

For new incoming faculty appointed as Associate Professor or Professor, assignment of a mentor is less critical, but highly encouraged, to serve as a means of acclimating the new faculty member to GES and UNM.

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies envisions the Department as a community where the value of diversity is recognized and where equal opportunity is afforded for all.

B. PROCEDURE

1. Chair Responsibilities

- a) The chair should inform new faculty about and ensure their attendance at UNM's new faculty orientation, which occurs each fall semester.
- b) The chair should advise new faculty on matters pertaining to academic reviews and advancement, although mentors are also encouraged to provide information to mentees based on their experience.
- c) The chair should ensure that mentors and mentees have current information on academic personnel process, department policies, graduate student advising, and so forth (e.g. Faculty Handbook, GES Policies and Procedures).
- d) During each semester that new faculty join the department, the chair should survey current faculty and ask for volunteers interested in mentoring new incoming faculty.
- e) Upon appointment of new faculty, Department Chair should appoint a volunteer mentor for the new faculty member.

2. Mentor Responsibilities

A good relationship with a supportive, active mentor contributes significantly to a new faculty member's career development and satisfaction. Although the role of mentor is an informal one, it requires dedication and time.

- a) After assignment to a new incoming faculty member, the mentor should contact the new faculty member in advance of arrival at UNM.
- b) The mentor should meet with the new faculty member on a regular basis over at least the first two years, ideally, at least one or two face-to-face meetings per semester.
- c) Mentors should encourage open communication via email, telephone, office hours, and so forth.
- d) The mentor should provide informal advice to the new faculty member on aspects of teaching, research, service, junior faculty research funding, staff responsibilities, and so forth, or be able to direct the new faculty member to appropriate others (see E.3. Mentoring Content).
- e) The mentor should treat all dealings and discussions with mentee as confidential.
- f) There is no evaluation or assessment of the new faculty member on the part of mentor, only supportive guidance and constructive criticism.

3. Mentee Responsibilities

- a) Mentees should encourage and attend scheduled meetings with mentors.
- b) Mentees should keep mentors informed of any problems or concerns as these arise.
- c) When input is desired for research or writing issues, mentees should leave sufficient time in the grant proposal or paper submission process to allow mentors time to review and critique drafts.
- d) Mentees should prepare key questions before each meeting, so that structured time with mentors is tailored to mentee's needs.

- e) Mentees should contact mentors between meetings should issues arise about which the new faculty member is unclear.
- f) Mentees should also access other established faculty members as informal mentors, as those faculty members' experience and expertise apply to issues that arise.
- g) E.3 New Faculty Mentoring Content (See Appendix A)

C. CONTENT

Key areas of mentoring content should include, but are not limited to the following: responsibilities of involved parties; university and department structure, decision-making, resources, and staff roles; teaching requirements, expectations, and student supervision; service requirements, committee structure, and department expectations; annual review process; issues related to research, publication, conferences, and funding.

X. EMERITUS POLICY

Retiring faculty members may be given emeritus status, in accordance with University policy. A majority vote of the voting faculty members is required.

XI. AMENDMENTS TO THIS DOCUMENT

This Statement of Department Governance may be amended at any regular meeting of the department provided the specific amendment shall have been distributed in writing with the agenda of the meeting at least three days prior to the meeting. A 2/3 majority vote of the total voting faculty is required to amend this document. Written proxies, sealed and delivered to the Chair prior to a meeting will be allowed only when amending this document or when electing faculty.

XII. LIST OF DIGITAL APPENDICES

(available in the GES "Faculty Share" drive)

A. DOCUMENTS INCLUDED WITHIN THIS GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

- Standards and Expectations for GES Faculty (included as Section V)
- Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance (included as Section VI)
- Criteria and Procedures for Tenure & Promotion (included as Section VII)
- Criteria and Procedures for Review & Promotion of Lecturers (included as Section VIII)
- Departmental Program and Policies for Faculty Mentoring (included as Section IX)

B. DOCUMENTS EXTERNAL TO THIS GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

- Chair's policy on grant submission deadlines, 08.14.2015
- Policy Regarding the Election of Plan I or Plan II for M.S. Students, 09.14.2015
- Chair's clarification of faculty obligations during leave, 09.30.2015
- Variable Workload Policy, 04.28.2016
- Analytical table for annual reporting of work performance, 01.2016