

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE & PROMOTION

(Adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 09 December 2015. The evaluation criteria described below apply to all tenure-track faculty members that joined GES during or after the 2016-17 academic year. This document is included in the GES Governance Document as Section VII.)

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.

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.

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 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 Hand Book 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.