



## **STANDARDS & EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY**

*(Adopted by vote of the GES faculty on 19 April 2019.)*

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies (GES) seeks to attract, reward, and retain faculty members who strive to expand knowledge and understanding through scholarship and community engagement; who are effective teachers and mentors; who contribute to departmental, college, and university governance; who are professionally engaged within their discipline; and who exhibit exemplary citizenship within the UNM community.

These general expectations provide guidelines for evaluating faculty performance. However, specific expectations and standards are necessary to implement effective and fair processes for evaluating faculty performance. In this section, expectations are defined for three aspects of work effort (scholarship, teaching, and service); standards are described for three faculty ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor); and the role of community engagement is specified with regard to faculty expectations and standards.

### **A. EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

#### *1. Scholarship*

“Scholarship” is the production of research-intensive, or creative, or interpretive works based upon active reflection and knowledge-building. In general, GES faculty are expected to pursue research-intensive scholarship.

Faculty members in GES normally have appointments that identify scholarship as 40% of expected work effort. Such appointments are herein called “research appointments”. The actual work effort expected of any faculty member depends on the specific terms of their employment contract, and may vary each semester depending upon factors such as approved leaves, teaching buyouts, administrative appointments, and other factors, in compliance with all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the UNM. It is expected that faculty members maintain their individually specified level of work effort throughout each reporting period. If a faculty member finds that it is not possible to maintain their expected level of effort, they must collaborate with the department Chair to develop strategies for increasing or decreasing the work effort allotted to scholarship.

It is expected that GES faculty will maintain an active scholarly agenda, and that scholarly 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.

a) Minimum expectations for publishing.

All faculty with research appointments are expected to publish results of their scholarship, whether in printed or electronic formats. Given the disciplinary breadth of geography and environmental studies 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, encyclopedia entries, editor-reviewed chapters, or 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. General 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. However, exceptions may be made for recognizing outstanding examples of these generally excluded publication types as evidence of scholarship. Further, excluded publication types may provide evidence of a faculty member's teaching and/or service work efforts.

The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure 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 publications depending upon fields of research within geography and environmental studies. Additionally, scholarly productivity may be cyclical due to the normal progression of research projects.

b) Minimum expectations for seeking funding for scholarly activities.

The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure 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. Further, if a faculty member's current academic research projects are adequately funded for continuation, it may be unnecessary to seek additional funding.

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

- each faculty member must seek sufficient funding to enable active pursuit of their 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 best efforts to gain research support.

c) Minimum expectations for presenting scholarship publicly.

All faculty with research appointments are expected to present their scholarship in public venues outside the UNM. In rare cases, a faculty member may be unable to present all or part of their research publicly, due to the topic and/or conditions imposed by their funding sources. In such cases, the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and,

ultimately, the department Chair must decide on an individual basis how to evaluate achievements in presenting research.

Examples of professional venues, listed in approximate descending order of significance, include:

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

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 does not directly report results from a faculty member's scholarship. Providing public education may contribute to a faculty member's service work effort.

The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure 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.

## 2. *Teaching*

Tenure-track faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify teaching as 40% of expected work effort. Full-time Lecturers in GES normally have appointments that specify teaching as 80% of work effort. The actual work effort expected of each faculty member depends on the specific terms of their employment contracts and may vary per semester depending upon factors such as approved leaves, teaching buyouts, administrative assignments, and other factors, in compliance with all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies. It is expected that faculty members maintain their individual level of work effort throughout each reporting period. If a faculty member determines that it is not possible to maintain their expected level of effort, they must collaborate with the department Chair to develop strategies for increasing or decreasing the work effort allotted to teaching.

### a) Minimum expectations for teaching.

All teaching faculty are expected to provide quality instruction that is fair and efficacious. This means that in every course, faculty members must provide to students, and adhere to, a syllabus that specifies course expectations and requirements, and includes any required

language provided by the department Chair, the CAS, or other administrative units at UNM.

Student evaluations are one means of identifying teaching quality. Faculty should 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 evaluation system(s) may be in effect for a particular reporting period.

The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in interpreting student evaluations, because:

- evaluation scores may be lower for women and minorities, all other factors being equal;
- evaluation scores may be lower for large courses, all other factors being equal;
- evaluation scores may be lower for more technical courses, all other factors being equal;
- evaluation scores may be affected by factors beyond a faculty member's control (such as condition of teaching facilities, or availability of teaching assistants); and
- student evaluations do not provide a complete measure or estimate of teaching effectiveness.

For non-tenured faculty and for tenured Associate Professors, peer teaching evaluations shall serve alongside student evaluations as means of assessing teaching quality.

Beyond this minimum expectation for teaching quality, other minimum expectations are specified in relation to teaching load, accessibility to students, and teaching assessment and evaluation.

i) Teaching load.

All faculty members who have teaching responsibilities are expected to teach their assigned number of organized courses. Organized courses have regularly scheduled meetings with multiple students, 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 studies, honors research, or thesis research), or might not (such as writing letters of recommendation, advising students, or serving on graduate or undergraduate committees of study). 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 typical 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 typical teaching expectation is eight organized courses per academic year of three or four credit hours each, with a typical distribution of four courses during the fall semester and four courses during the spring semester. Courses taught during the summer semester or during intersession periods may satisfy normal teaching expectations if the department Chair pre-approves these courses as satisfying normal teaching expectations, *and* if these courses are not taught for remuneration above a faculty member's normal salary. More generally, the specific characteristics of individual, expected teaching loads may be modified with the written approval of the department Chair and the 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 research 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 research appointments are expected to participate in additional instructional activities, particularly those activities that support student research, to a greater degree than Lecturers (or other faculty with non-research appointments), because of the importance of professional mentorship in 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 expected teaching work effort corresponding to 10 percentage points per course within an academic year.

Common rationales for reducing a faculty member's teaching load are: A) formal leaves, including sabbaticals and family leaves, identified in the UNM Faculty Handbook; B) administrative assignments (such as department Chair, or director of an academic unit); C) course releases intended to increase scholarly productivity for new hires and pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty; D) course buy-outs (made possible through research grants, fellowships, or other sources of funding); and E) class size and credit hours (for classes with very high enrollment, or courses of more than four credit hours).

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 “effectiveness” standards (described below) 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. (Faculty members who consistently do not meet departmental “effectiveness” standards for teaching may be assigned remediation activities, such as training.)

In all cases, any actual change in expected teaching work effort must be determined through discussion among the effected faculty member, the Personnel Committee, the department Chair, and the CAS, and 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.

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 committees of study (including thesis, project, examination, 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;
- respond to student inquiries, requests, and complaints in timely manners;
- make substantial efforts to accommodate student learning needs, particularly in coordination and communication with the UNM Accessibility Resource Center; and
- teach a minimum of approximately 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 number of students taught per year should be approximately 120, reflecting the higher teaching load of Lecturers.

ii) Teaching Assessment and Evaluation

All teaching faculty must participate in and contribute to departmental assessments and evaluations of teaching effectiveness. This means: A) in every course, faculty members must provide students the opportunity to evaluate teaching, particularly through standardized, end-of-semester assessments provided by the department Chair, the CAS, or other administrative units at UNM; B) faculty members who teach courses that are part of the department's learning outcomes assessment plan must collect and report relevant data in coordination with the departmental Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator; and C) all teaching faculty members must participate in department efforts to provide peer evaluations of teaching.

Not all courses are included in the department's learning outcomes 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, processing, and tabulation of assessment data, as specified by the Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator;
- reporting of assessment data to the Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator;
- assistance in interpreting assessment data, in collaboration with the Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator; and
- responding to requests for information from the Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator.

### 3. *Professional Service*

Full-time, tenure-track faculty in GES normally have appointments that identify professional service as 20% of expected work effort. Full-time Lecturers in GES normally have appointments that specify service as 20% of work effort. The actual work effort expected of each faculty member depends on the specific terms of their employment contracts, and may vary per semester depending upon factors such as approved leaves, teaching buyouts, administrative assignments, and other factors, in compliance with all applicable rules, guidelines, and policies. It is expected that faculty members maintain their individual level of work effort throughout each reporting period. If a faculty member determines that it is not possible to maintain their expected level of effort, they must collaborate with the department Chair to develop strategies for increasing or decreasing the work effort allotted to professional service.

It is expected that professional service contributions are shared as equally as possible amongst faculty members at each rank (Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors, and Lecturers). Professional service should be pursued within the department, within 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

administration and governance. Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member meet their service expectations primarily through service outside the department.

a) Minimum expectations for service.

The minimum service expectations for all faculty are:

- provide timely communication about service assignments, whether these are individual or committee-based assignments;
- complete service assignments in compliance with deadlines established for their completion;
- attend all faculty meetings, unless impossible due to professional travel or some other professional responsibility, or a major personal event;
- participate actively in departmental administration and governance; and
- contribute generally to educational and professional outreach within and beyond UNM.

There are no additional service expectations for pre-tenure, tenure-track, first-year faculty.

For pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty, service expectations should marginally increase for the second and subsequent years prior to tenure. The department Chair, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, may allow lower service expectations for individual, pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty members, in order to allow a faculty member to commit greater work effort to scholarship and/or teaching. Such allowances reflect the priority of scholarship and teaching within the expectations for GES faculty members, and the department's goal of guiding faculty members toward successful applications for Promotion and Tenure.

Tenured faculty members are expected to make greater service contributions than non-tenured faculty members. However, no faculty member should exceed their expected work effort for professional service, unless they have specifically gained approval to do so from the department Chair, the CAS, and/or another administrative unit at UNM.

Many activities may be interpreted as evidence of service work. Some examples include:

- participation as a member or chair of departmental committees, such as Personnel Committee, Budget Committee, Hiring Committee, or a major ad hoc committee;
- service as a titled Coordinator within the department, such as Computing and Facilities, Physical Geography Labs, Learning Assessment, Website, Speaker Series, or Outreach;
- participation as a member or chair of college- or university-level committees;
- service as a leading, elected officer in regional, national, or international professional organizations (normally president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, or councilor);
- other forms of 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in evaluating service contributions, because minimum expectations may be met through types of activities not listed above.

Faculty members may be excused from professional service work. Reasons for such excusal may include authorized leaves, or a temporary reduction in service expectations meant to increase a faculty member's research and/or teaching work efforts. If the terms of a faculty member's authorized leave include excusal from service work, they are not expected to make service contributions within UNM for the semester(s) for which leave has been granted. In such cases, faculty members may choose to continue non-UNM service contributions but are not expected to do so as a term of UNM employment.

## **B. STANDARDS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

The following standards for faculty performance provide the bases for reviews and evaluations of each faculty member's performance. The various reviews and evaluations are described elsewhere in this governance document (see sections relating to "Annual Review" and to "Tenure & Promotion"). These standards reflect the department's interpretation of the UNM Faculty Handbook's statements regarding faculty evaluation (see Faculty Handbook B1: Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation, *Approved by Regents December 8, 1998; Approved by Faculty December 7, 1998*). These standards must be interpreted prudently, reasonably, and fairly in all faculty reviews and evaluations, in order to support positive career development for all faculty members.

Standards for faculty performance are defined in the following sub-sections, for tenure-track Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors. In these sections, three standards are established: competence, effectiveness, and excellence. Additionally, placeholder sections are established for the later development of standards for permanent Lecturers, and for other categories of faculty or instructor.

For pre-tenure faculty, these departmental standards serve as guidance regarding progress toward tenure. For faculty at the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor, these standards serve as guidance regarding progress toward promotion. For Full Professors, these standards serve as guidance regarding necessary performance to avoid negative evaluations, up to and including post-tenure review. Importantly, the competence standard represents the attainment of no more than minimum expectations; the competence standard does not necessarily indicate that a faculty member is on track for a successful application for promotion or tenure, or to earn positive results in annual reviews or in post-tenure reviews. Faculty members who consistently attain only the competence standard for research may be assigned an increased teaching load, as described in the Variable Workload Policy.

Exceptions to the standards described below are allowed. First, in the case of joint appointments with other units on campus, exceptions may be specified in the letters of appointment. Second, in all other cases, exceptions must be formally requested by the faculty member under review and approved by the department Chair in consultation with the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. The specific terms of any approved exception must be documented, including full and explicit justification for granting the exception; this documentation must be included within the faculty member's tenure and/or promotion dossiers. Any disapproved exceptions must be similarly documented and justified, but the documentation shall be provided to the relevant faculty member without its inclusion in tenure and/or promotion dossiers.

*1. Tenure-track Assistant Professors.*

The following standards assume that all tenure-track Assistant Professors are not tenured.

a) Competence

The competence standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets all the minimum expectations described above (in part A of section I); and
- the department Chair receives no comments, complaints, or other communications that indicate—whether through substance or quantity—egregious professional behavior on the part of the faculty member under consideration.

*Assistant Professors who meet the competence standard may not be on track to earn tenure or promotion to Associate Professor.*

b) Effectiveness

The effectiveness standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets the competence standard just described; and
- the faculty member under consideration has established and maintained a professional record that appears to be on track to earn promotion and tenure by the end of the six-year period that follows initial hiring as an Assistant Professor.

The second of these standards requires greater specification:

- i) With regard to scholarly publishing: Tenure-track Assistant Professors should publish annually about 1.5 to 2.0 peer-reviewed journal articles, measured on average over the period of time since initial hiring as an Assistant Professor. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) rates of publication may vary significantly between years; B) other types of publications, such as those identified in the faculty expectations portion of this document, may substitute for the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, at ratios suggested in the analytical table used in annual evaluations and reviews; and C) over a short period of years, effective publishing may be shown through the active development of works to be published, even if these have not yet been completed or submitted for publication.
- ii) With regard to seeking funding for scholarly activities: Tenure-track Assistant Professors should submit for competition at least one funding proposal per year, measured on average over the period of time since initial hiring as an Assistant Professor. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) rates of funding proposal submission may vary significantly between years; B) some types of scholarship require little to no funding beyond faculty salary and the basic administrative and other support supplied by the department and/or other units at UNM; and C) a faculty member who has successfully won funding for scholarly work may find it unnecessary to seek additional funding for some period of time. Further, it is necessary to note that unsuccessful funding applications may show effectiveness, depending upon a faculty member's field of research, years of experience as a faculty member, and the characteristics of relevant funding programs.

- iii) With regard to presenting scholarship publicly. Tenure-track Assistant Professors should publicly present their scholarship outside UNM at least once per year, measured on average over the period of time since initial hiring as an Assistant Professor. Presentations outside UNM are important for developing and establishing a faculty member's national, scholarly reputation. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) the ability to travel to presentation venues may be limited by the amount of funding available to a faculty member by the department and UNM more broadly; B) rates of presentation of research may vary significantly between years; and C) some presentation venues within UNM may represent prominent and/or prestigious public settings.
- iv) With regard to classroom teaching: Tenure-track Assistant Professors should seek improved student evaluations of teaching, as measured from one year to the next and on average over the period of time since initial hiring as an Assistant Professor. An Assistant Professor should attend pedagogical trainings if the professor, the Personnel Committee, or the department Chair determine that such trainings are necessary to improve classroom teaching. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) student evaluations do not provide a complete measure or estimate of teaching effectiveness, as described above; B) student evaluations are only one measure of teaching quality and may be influenced by the or factors beyond an instructor's control, as described above; and C) peer evaluations of teaching may show clear improvement in teaching practice even if student evaluations do not show significant change.
- v) With regard to other teaching activities: Tenure-track Assistant Professors should actively seek to mentor graduate and undergraduate students. Within six years of initial hiring, an Assistant Professor should: A) serve as chair of the committees of study for multiple Master's-level graduate students, and/or undergraduate honor's students; B) mentor to degree completion approximately two such students; and C) serve as a member of a greater number of committees of study than they chair. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) the recruitment of students whom a faculty member might appropriately mentor is limited by factors beyond the their control; B) a faculty member might mentor Ph.D.-level graduate students early in their career, which would likely reduce the opportunities to mentor Master's level or undergraduate students; C) a faculty member may reduce their number of mentees in anticipation of authorized leaves in subsequent years; and D) the department Chair may limit an Assistant Professor's mentorship activities to enable increased work effort on scholarship and/or classroom teaching.
- vi) With regard to professional service: Tenure-track Assistant Professors should seek marginally increased service responsibilities from one year to the next and on average over the period of time since initial hiring as an Assistant Professor. Variations to this standard are required, because: A) the department Chair may reduce an Assistant Professor's service load to enable increased work effort on scholarship and/or teaching; and B) there may be insufficient opportunities for all

Assistant Professors to participate equally in departmental administration and governance during a given period.

c) Excellence

The excellence standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets the effectiveness standard just described; and
- the faculty member under consideration has exhibited accomplishments that clearly and significantly exceed the effectiveness standard.

The second of these standards requires further specification:

- i) With regard to scholarly publishing: Excellence in publishing is not certainly evident in the 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. Further, contextual information is necessary to identify excellence in publishing, such as: the relationship of a published work to other works published by the same faculty member; the number of authors listed on a published work; the role of the faculty member in the production of a multi-authored work; and publication practices characteristic of relevant subfields within geography and environmental studies.

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

- 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 citation measures are methodologically imperfect, but each provides some basis for comparing publications); or
- potential impact within a field of study, due to the novelty, originality, or scope of a particular publication; or
- the breadth, depth, and/or complexity of a given work; or
- number of publications, especially if the number substantially exceeds characteristic output of scholars within relevant fields of research.

Evaluation of the quality of a publication is inevitably subjective. The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair, may require input from other faculty members (not including a faculty member under review, nor their spouse, if relevant) if a committee and/or the department Chair do not have appropriate expertise to evaluate a publication or body of publications.

In all cases, the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must exercise discretion in identifying

excellence in publication because this may be evident through a combination of factors that is impossible to define in general terms.

- ii) With regard to seeking funding for scholarly activities: Successful funding proposals provide the clearest evidence of excellence. However, the strength of such evidence depends upon several aspects of any proposal, whether successful or unsuccessful: 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 associated with the application/award; G) the importance of funding support to the faculty member's research agenda; and H) the competitiveness of a funding program.
- iii) With regard to presenting scholarship publicly: The quality of individual research presentations may be often difficult to evaluate, because many presentations will not be viewed by any departmental faculty members. As a result, excellence in presenting scholarship may be rarely identifiable. Such excellence may be evident in the number of presentations, or the characteristics of the venues in which presentations are made. The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair must use discretion in inferring from contextual factors the quality of any research presentation.
- iv) With regard to teaching: Excellence in teaching may be evident through the combination of more than one of the following:
- awards for teaching quality; ***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; ***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; ***or***
  - highly positive teaching evaluations from peers and/or students.
- The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure 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, laboratory courses, hybrid online/in-person courses, and entirely online courses); B) factors beyond a faculty member's control may affect teaching quality, as well as student evaluations of teaching; and C) forms of evidence not included in the list above may indicate teaching excellence.

- v) With regard to professional service: Excellence in professional service is rarely evident. In exceptional cases, the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or the department Chair may find evidence of excellence in the level of responsibility associated with a faculty member's service roles, or in the quantity of service roles, or in the quality of service work products. However, many service work products will not be viewed by any other departmental faculty member. Additionally, the number of service responsibilities or titles may not accurately correspond to the quantity or quality of service-related tasks. Further, the quality of service work products may not be evident in the products themselves, but instead in the context in which they were produced. Finally, service work products may be confidential, and thus not reviewable by the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the department Chair.

Despite these limitations, the following examples suggest how excellence might be apparent in a professor's service record:

- awards for service from professional organizations; ***or***
- appointment to prominent 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 Promotion and Tenure 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.

## 2. *Tenure-track Associate Professors.*

The following standards assume that all tenure-track Associate Professors are tenured.

### a) Competence

The competence standard for tenure-track Associate Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets all the minimum expectations described above (in part A of section I), and
- the department Chair receives no comments, complaints, or other communications that indicate—whether through substance or quantity—egregious professional behavior on the part of the faculty member under consideration.

*Associate Professors who meet the competence standard may not be on track to earn promotion to Full Professor, or to earn positive results in annual reviews or in post-tenure reviews.*

### b) Effectiveness

The effectiveness standard for tenure-track Associate Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets the competence standard just described; and

- the faculty member under consideration has established and maintained a professional record that appears to be on track to earn promotion to Full Professor within less than ten years from the date of promotion to Associate Professor. At the UNM, the principle criterion for promotion to Full Professor is the establishment of positive, national recognition for scholarship; the department also seeks evidence of international engagement.

The second of these standards requires greater specification:

- i) With regard to scholarly publishing: The analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors applies also to tenure-track Associate Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Associate Professors must maintain the trajectory of scholarly productivity and accomplishment that they established as an Assistant Professor, and must develop and accomplish a research agenda that tends to establish national (and international) recognition within relevant fields of geography and environmental studies. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors, and also because: A) strategies for establishing national (and international) recognition may include a shift in publishing practices (such as from research articles to monographs); and B) the publishing efforts of Associate Professors may be increasingly dominated by activities that do not directly lead to examples of sole or principle authorship. Such activities may include editorships, mentorship of student publications, or contributions to many-authored publications.
- ii) With regard to seeking funding for scholarly activities: The analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors applies also to tenure-track Associate Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Associate Professor rank. An Associate Professor should at least maintain the pattern of proposal submission and success that they established as an Assistant Professor. In any case, an Associate Professor must seek and obtain sufficient funding to pursue nationally (and internationally) recognizable scholarship. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors, and also because: A) an Associate Professor may require minimal scholarly funding in order to maintain an established scholarly agenda; and B) the fundraising efforts of Associate Professors may be increasingly dominated by activities that do not directly lead to funding proposals as Principal Investigator (P.I.), such as mentorship of student funding proposals, or participation in large funding proposals in non-P.I. capacities.
- iii) With regard to presenting scholarship publicly. The analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors applies also to tenure-track Associate Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Associate Professor rank. An Associate Professor should at least maintain the pattern of public presentations that they established as an Assistant Professor. Additionally, an Associate Professor must seek and present in venues that tend to advance their national (and international)

scholarly recognition. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors.

- iv) With regard to classroom teaching: The analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors applies also to tenure-track Associate Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Associate Professor rank. In addition, Associate Professors should pursue opportunities for teaching leadership, such as through curriculum development, pedagogical funding proposals, or facilitation of workshops. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors.
- v) With regard to other teaching activities: Tenure-track Associate Professors should actively mentor graduate and undergraduate students. An Associate Professor should: A) serve each year as chair of the committee of study for at least one Master's-level graduate student, and/or undergraduate honors student; B) mentor to degree completion approximately one such student annually, measured on average over the years since promotion to the Associate Professor rank; C) serve as a member of a greater number of committees of study than she/he chairs; D) serve as dissertation committee chair for at least one student during the years since promotion to the Associate Professor rank<sup>1</sup>; and E) seek to publish or present research as a co-author with, or editor for, student mentees. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for tenure-track Assistant Professors.
- vi) With regard to professional service: Tenure-track Associate Professors should have increased service responsibilities compared to Assistant Professors. Associate Professors should seek, accept, and satisfactorily execute major service responsibilities, in order to gain administrative and/or leadership experience, and to contribute to the administration and governance of the UNM. A major portion of an Associate Professor's service work should be within the department and elsewhere at UNM. Associate Professors should accomplish service responsibilities beyond UNM, too, but these responsibilities should not prevent a professor from accepting service work at UNM. Within six years after promotion to Associate Professor, a professor should: A) serve at least two academic years as departmental Graduate Program Director, Undergraduate Program Director, or Associate Chair, or as a titled Coordinator within the department (such as Learning Outcomes Assessment, Speaker Series, or Facilities); B) serve at least three academic years on a major departmental committee (such as Personnel, Budget, or Curriculum); C) serve at least two academic years as member or chair of a college-level or university-level committee; and D) establish a record of service participation in professional societies. If an Associate Professor continues in this rank for more than six years, the same level of service should be continued for subsequent years. Variations to this standard are required because: A) it may not be possible for all Associate Professors to hold titled service roles, or participate in all committees, within the

---

<sup>1</sup> This standard pertains only in the event that GES has an active Ph.D. program.

department during a given period; B) faculty members who accept major service responsibilities elsewhere on campus (such as directing an academic program) will have less time to commit to service work within the department; and C) faculty members who accept exceptional service responsibilities off campus (such as elected president of a national organization) will have less time to commit to service work on campus.

c) Excellence

The excellence standard for tenure-track Associate Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets the effectiveness standard just described; and
- the faculty member under consideration has exhibited accomplishments that clearly and significantly exceed the effectiveness standard.

Guidelines for identifying excellence are provided above, in the standards for tenure-track Assistant Professors. These standards apply also to tenure-track Associate Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Additionally, for excellence to be evident in the performance of a tenure-track Associate Professor, at least one of the following qualitative standards must be met:

- The faculty member's scholarly work shows clear evidence of national and/or international impact.
- The faculty member's scholarly work shows clear evidence of exceptional success, such as through professional recognition, large or numerous funding awards, or large, impactful, or numerous published works.
- The faculty member's teaching work shows clear evidence of exceptional levels of success, such as through professional recognition, or large or numerous funding awards.

3. *Tenure-track Full Professors.*

The following standards assume that all tenure-track Full Professors are tenured.

a) Competence

The competence standard for tenure-track Full Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets all the minimum expectations described above (in part A of section I); and
- the department Chair receives no comments, complaints, or other communications that indicate—whether through substance or quantity—egregious professional behavior on the part of the faculty member under consideration.

1. *Full Professors who meet the competence standard may not be on track to earn positive results in annual reviews or in post-tenure reviews.*

b) Effectiveness

The effectiveness standard for tenure-track Full Professors entails:

- the faculty member under consideration meets the competence standard just described;

- the faculty member under consideration has maintained a professional record of continuous, active engagement in scholarship, teaching, and service; and
- the faculty member under consideration contributes directly to the administration and governance of UNM.

The final two of these standards requires greater specification:

- i) With regard to scholarly publishing: The analogous standards for tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors apply also to Full Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Full Professor rank. Full Professors should maintain the trajectory of scholarly productivity and accomplishment that they established as Associate Professors, and increase their participation in scholarly leadership activities. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standards for Assistant and Associate Professors, and also because increased participation in research leadership activities may cause changes to a faculty member's prior pattern of publication. Research leadership activities might include serving as a program officer for a major funding agency; serving in a prominent and important role in a research advocacy group; or editing (as chief editor) a major academic journal.
- ii) With regard to seeking funding for scholarly activities: The analogous standards for tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors apply also to Full Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Full Professor rank. A Full Professor should at least maintain the pattern of proposal submission and success that they established as an Associate Professor. In any case, a Full Professor must seek and obtain sufficient funding to maintain active scholarship. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standards, and also because increased participation in research leadership activities may cause changes to a faculty member's efforts to seek funding for their scholarship.
- iii) With regard to presenting scholarship publicly: The analogous standards for tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors apply also to Full Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Full Professor rank. A Full Professor should at least maintain the pattern of public presentations that they established as an Associate Professor. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standards, and also because: A) Full Professors may select presentation venues for professional reasons other than building scholarly recognition, such as pursuing outreach on behalf of the department, UNM, and/or professional organizations; and B) increased participation in research leadership activities may cause changes to a faculty member's prior pattern of presenting research publicly.
- iv) With regard to classroom teaching: The analogous standards for tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors apply also to Full Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Full Professor rank.

- v) With regard to other teaching activities: The analogous standards for tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors apply also to Full Professors over the period of time since promotion to the Full Professor rank. Full Professors should maintain a continuous pattern of mentorship similar to what they established as Associate Professors, although variations to this standard are required because increased participation in research leadership activities may cause changes to a faculty member's prior pattern of student mentorship.
- vi) With regard to professional service: Full Professors are expected to show leadership in advancing the missions of the department, the CAS, and UNM. Thus, Full Professors should seek, accept, and satisfactorily execute major service responsibilities that contribute directly to the administration and governance of UNM. A major portion of a Full Professor's service work should be on campus at UNM; a faculty member's service responsibilities beyond UNM should not, in most cases, prevent a professor from accomplishing service work at UNM. Full Professors, in preference to Associate and Assistant Professors, are those who should pursue administrative assignments that include teaching and/or research releases as a reflection of the work required to complete these assignments. Full Professors should regularly: A) serve as departmental Chair, Graduate Program Director, Undergraduate Program Director, or Associate Chair; B) serve on major departmental committees (such as Personnel, Budget, or Curriculum); C) serve as titled Coordinators within the department (such as Learning Outcomes Assessment, Speaker Series, or Facilities); D) serve as members or chairs of college-level and university-level committees; and E) establish records of service participation in professional societies. Variations to this standard are required because of the reasons stated in the analogous standard for Associate Professors.

4. *Permanent Lecturers.*

This section has been established as a placeholder. Appropriate text shall be entered here.

5. *Other Categories of Faculty or Instructor.*

This section has been established as a placeholder. Appropriate text shall be entered here.

### **C. ROLE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN FACULTY EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS**

The UNM seeks to be a community-engaged institution of higher learning, as recognized by the Carnegie Foundation. According to the Carnegie Foundation:

Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and

civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

(See: <https://www.brown.edu/swearer/carnegie/about>)

GES faculty are encouraged, but not required, to pursue community engagement in their scholarship, teaching, and service.

Active pursuit of community engagement may cause faculty members to pursue non-traditional forms of research, publication, pedagogy, and/or service. If a faculty member decides that their community engagement has led to non-traditional work products, they must declare this to the Personnel Committee and/or the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in order to aid these committees in evaluating fairly the faculty member's work. In such cases, the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair, must accept non-traditional work products in their evaluations of faculty performance, but are still required to evaluate the quality and quantity of reported work products.

The Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and, ultimately, the department Chair, must exercise discretion in evaluating faculty performance in cases where a faculty member claims that their work has been directed toward community engagement. First, in such cases, the faculty member in question must document specifically how their work is community engaged. Documented attestations from community groups may be necessary to identify and evaluate community engagement. Second, the Personnel Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the department Chair may require input from other faculty members or other individuals (such as UNM administrators, representatives of non-UNM organizations, or members of community groups) to evaluate the substance and/or quality of the community engagement evident in the relevant faculty member's work.

Positive evidence of community engagement may be considered to support findings of effectiveness and excellence in scholarship, teaching, or service. However, community engagement alone shall not be sufficient to achieve findings of effectiveness or excellence. Further, a lack of community engagement shall not be construed or interpreted as evidence that any faculty member has failed to exhibit effectiveness or excellence in scholarship, teaching, or service. In sum, evidence of community engagement shall be considered a positive enhancement to an independently evident record of scholarship, teaching, or service work.