



# **Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

Original Policy Adopted by the Faculty on March 14, 1990  
Revisions adopted:  
February 3, 1998  
May 12, 2000  
December 2016

Current Policy revision adopted by the Faculty Senate on  
April 2, 2019

Revised Policy Approved by President and Board of Regents  
March 13, 2020

New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology  
Socorro, NM 87801

## **POLICY FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

- I. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
  - A. Teaching
  - B. Scholarly Activity: Research and Creative Work
  - C. Service
    - 1. Professional Service
    - 2. Institute and Public Service
- II. Policy for hiring faculty with Tenure
  - A. Associate Professor Rank
  - B. Full Professor Rank
- III. Professional Appointments
  - A. Professor
  - B. Associate Professor
  - C. Assistant Professor
  - D. Visiting Appointment
  - E. Adjunct Appointment

## **PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

- I. Initial Appointment
- II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
  - A. Tenure Committee Formation
  - B. Candidate's Review File
  - C. Annual Tenure Review
  - D. Non-reappointment
  - E. Final Tenure Review
    - 1. Teaching Evaluation
    - 2. Research and Creative Work Evaluation
    - 3. Internal Review
    - 4. External Review
    - 5. Committee Recommendation
- III. Promotion or Appointment to Full Professor Other Procedure Information
- IV. Other Procedure Information

## **APPENDIX**

- I. Important Dates and Processes in Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
- II. Guidelines for the assessment of candidates for promotion to full Professor

**New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology**  
**POLICY FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**I. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure**

The candidate will be evaluated with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional service and Institute service including professionally related service to students, community, state, nation, and world. In evaluating the candidate's achievements within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Considering both internal and external assessments of the candidate's ability and promise, the review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a sound and productive scholarly program. The scholarly work should be predominately in the field for which the candidate was hired.

The review committee must take care to apply the criteria with sufficient accuracy but flexibility. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenured positions. Insistence upon this standard is necessary for maintenance of the Institute's dedication to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides in evaluating the candidate, not to set boundaries to the kinds of performance that may be considered.

***A. Teaching***

Effective teaching is essential to the achievement of tenure and promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made or promotion granted unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in teaching. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider the following: the candidate's present command of the subject; continuous learning in the subject area; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to work creatively; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; and the extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the academic advising and general guidance of students. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence considered in its appraisal of teaching skill.

While no single set of criteria can apply equally to all circumstances, the types of evidence, which should be considered in assessing teaching effectiveness, include the following: a) opinions of other members of the candidate's department, especially when based upon such things as class visitations, attendance at public lectures or lectures presented to professional societies, or the candidate's performance in courses prerequisite to those of the evaluator; b) written opinions provided by students; c) written opinions provided by graduates who have achieved professional success since leaving the Institute; d) the number and caliber of students attracted to the program by the candidate's reputation as a teacher and an academic leader; e) the

number and caliber of the students guided in research and creative activity by the candidate; and f) development of new and effective programs and techniques of instruction.

It is important to emphasize that teaching activity extends beyond the classroom and involves academic and personal counseling activities (including referrals), and research advising. The committee should also pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instruction by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels.

***B. Scholarly Activity: Research and Creative Work***

Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or literary and artistic creation. Publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. The evaluation of scholarly activities should be based on scholarly achievement, as evidenced by quality and quantity of all creative and independent work in accordance to the candidate's area of expertise, discipline and academic department. Work in progress should be considered.

In ascertaining expectations within a field or discipline, account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field of scholarship or research. To ascertain those expectations, informed reviews by the candidate's peers should be considered important evidence. This should be represented implicitly by the peer-reviewed papers and proposals of the candidate, and explicitly by letters and external reviews solicited by the tenure committee.

Scholarly products might include, but are not limited to, manuscripts published in refereed journals, books, book chapters, reviews, and presentations at professional meetings. The quality of these products should be evaluated through consideration of factors such as the number of citations, the editorial standards of the journals in which articles appear, published reviews, and the assessments of other Institute faculty and solicited external reviewers.

The quality of scholarly accomplishments can be evidenced in part by the ability to raise funding from grants and contracts, especially those that support students. This evidence must be evaluated in the context of differing levels of external support in different disciplines and differing disciplinary expectations of scholarly activity. The candidate's recognized practical innovations such as inventions, designs, and patents should be considered as evidence. Other creative accomplishments that are not in the category of academic publications could include fiction, poetry, music composition, conducting, performances, exhibitions, and other forms of creative activity. Honors or awards from professional societies for research or creative activity are evidence of a high quality of accomplishment.

In all cases the evidence should be assessed in light of the expectation that the candidate will show continued scholarly development and productivity during their probationary period at the Institute. The assessment of the quality and quantity of accomplishments should be based primarily on accomplishments at the Institute.

***C. Service.***

An appropriate amount (depending on the faculty member's terms of employment) of service to

both the profession at large and to the Institute (including professionally related community service) is expected of all faculty.

### *1. Professional Service*

Service and participation in professional organizations and their activities are important aspects of faculty development. In evaluating the level of the candidate's professional participation and leadership, the committee should consider the following: offices held in professional organizations; service to a journal as a member of the editorial staff, regular contributor, or reviewer; organization of professional meetings and symposia; participation in meetings, symposia and short courses; involvement in educational or professional accreditation; honors such as service medals, prizes, and honorary appointments; or such other factors as the committee may perceive to gauge the extent of professional reputation and service. Good professional standing is taken for granted, but indications of leadership outside the classroom are sought for promotion and tenure.

### *2. Institute and Public Service.*

The faculty play an important role in the administration of the Institute and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should, therefore, be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and Institute policies. Services by members of the faculty to the community, state, nation, and world, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should likewise be recognized as evidence for promotion. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence.

## **II. Policy for hiring faculty with tenure**

In cases where an Institute academic department wishes to pursue hiring with tenure (i.e., faculty who have already earned tenure elsewhere), the following procedures should be followed, as a function of hiring rank.

### ***A. Associate Professor Rank:***

The committee will request the candidate's curriculum vitae and tenure packet required for the candidate's tenured faculty appointment at another institution. The candidate can also supply documentation of additional accomplishments since the tenure promotion.

The hiring committee, upon receiving the documents, will review them, and may request additional material from the candidate (e.g., recommendation letters, recent student teaching and/or peer research evaluations, etc.). While evaluating the candidate's qualifications, the hiring committee should apply the current tenure-and-promotion appointment criteria of NMT. Based on the candidate's qualifications, the committee will provide a letter to the department for approval recommending hiring with immediate tenure, or a reduced provisional period before granting tenure.

Upon department approval, the hiring committee will compile all documentation, including the department's recommendation, which will be forwarded for review and approval (in sequence) to the Department Chair, the Dean of the Instructional Unit, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and the President of the Institute. If approved by each, the President will ask the Board of Regents to approve tenure, approve a shortened probationary period before consideration of tenure, or take other appropriate action.

### ***B. Full Professor Rank:***

The Hiring Committee will request the candidate's curriculum vitae and the professorship promotion packet required for the candidate's full Professor appointment at another institution. The candidate can also supply documentation of additional accomplishments since the awarding of the rank of full Professor.

The hiring committee, upon receiving the documents, will review them and may request additional material from the candidate. While evaluating the candidate's qualifications, the hiring committee should apply the current Institute criteria for promotion to full Professor. Based on the candidate's qualifications, the committee may provide a letter to the department for approval recommending hiring at the rank of full Professor with tenure.

Upon department approval, the hiring committee will compile all documentation, including the department's recommendation, which will be forwarded for review and approval (in sequence) to the Department Chair, the Dean of the Instructional Unit, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and the President of NMT. If approved by each, the President shall ask the Board of Regents to approve tenure, approve a shortened probationary period before consideration of tenure, or take other appropriate action.

### **III. Professional Appointments**

The professorial appointments at the Institute include the three customary professorial ranks: full Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. In addition, the Institute recognizes two other professorial appointments: Visiting (Instructor, Assistant, Associate or Professor) and Faculty Adjunct.

#### ***A. Professor***

The rank of Professor is the highest rank attainable in the academic profession. Appointment or promotion to this rank therefore requires evidence of exceptional distinction by a combination of leadership, accomplishment, and service in the scholarly, teaching, educational, and general intellectual life of the Institute or wider academic community. In itself, a long period of service does not justify promotion to the rank of Professor.

#### ***B. Associate Professor***

The rank of Associate Professor requires evidence of both significant past accomplishments and future promise. Such accomplishments must be distinctive, and not merely average or adequate.

#### ***C. Assistant Professor***

The rank of Assistant Professor requires evidence of exceptional future promise and preparation for an academic career.

#### ***D. Visiting Appointment***

A distinguished scholar who is a member of the faculty of another institution may be eligible for appointment as Visiting (Instructor, Assistant, Associate, or Professor) on a year-to-year basis or for part of the year. Such an appointment carries no implication of academic tenure.

#### ***E. Adjunct Appointment***

A practitioner, or a research scientist or engineer, who has developed a high level of expertise in fields of particular importance to the Institute, and who demonstrates a deep commitment to teaching and/or research, may be eligible for appointment as faculty adjunct. An adjunct appointment carries no implication of academic tenure.

**New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology**  
**PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

To maintain standards, promotion to successive professorial ranks involves an increasing measure of participation and review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, his/her appointment of review committees, and the President of the Institute; and the consideration of both internal and external assessments of the candidate's ability and promise. In order to ensure the highest academic standards, recommendations for tenure or promotion are made on the basis of a most thorough and considered review, based upon the documented evidence, at each level, including the tenure review committee, Department Chair, Graduate Dean, Vice President for Research, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and President. Final approval of all academic appointments, promotions, and tenure rests with the Board of Regents.

Appointment, tenure and promotion are granted only through the process described here and in the accompanying Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure statement. That is, by a positive and systematic evaluation process culminating in an explicit decision of the Board of Regents.

**I. Initial Appointment**

The initial appointment will be made after a competitive search. The search committee will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on recommendation of the Department Chair. The committee will consist of five to seven faculty or research staff members. If possible, a majority of the committee should be members of the department. In order to ensure uniformly high standards, at least two members must be faculty members from other departments. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint the chair. The committee will recommend the candidate to the Department Chair and, after obtaining approval, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The candidate recommended for appointment must have at least three outside letters of evaluation, and must have presented a seminar, open and advertised, to the entire Institute academic community. The recommended candidate must show promise of sustained distinction in the areas of teaching, research or creative activity, and service to the profession and Institute, including professionally related service to students, community, state, nation, and world. All appointments are subject to approval by the President and the Board of Regents.

The initial appointment at all levels is normally considered probationary. Tenure can only be awarded at the time of appointment through the procedures outlined in the Policy for hiring faculty with tenure.

**II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are normally considered together. Tenure and promotion must be granted to assistant professors within seven years of service only at the Institute, if they remain employed at the Institute. The promotion and tenure decision will not normally be made prior to the fifth year of service. If the original appointment is at a rank higher than that of Assistant Professor, then the tenure decision will be taken alone. Unless tenure is granted at the time of appointment, tenure will not normally be granted to Associate and full

Professors prior to the third and second years, respectively, of service at the Institute. Tenure appointments will not be made in the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Visiting appointments or Faculty Adjunct appointments.

#### ***A. Tenure Committee Formation***

A tenure (and promotion) committee will be formed for each Assistant Professor, non-tenured Associate and full Professor within three months of the candidate's initial appointment. The committee will consist of five tenured Associate or full Professors appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, on recommendation of the Department Chair. At least two of the committee members will come from outside of the department. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint one member as the chair. In order to ensure the independence of the administrative appraisal and recommendation, it is desirable that administrators signing recommendations on the tenure report not also be members of the tenure committee. It is desirable that Department Chairs not be members of tenure committees for faculty within their departments. However, in some circumstances it may be necessary for a Chair to serve (e.g., small departments, rotating chair assignments), in which case the Chair may serve but shall not be the Chair of the tenure committee. In small departments, insufficient to form a tenure committee, a reviewer or reviewers from outside the Institute may be appointed. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may replace committee members if necessary or appropriate.

#### ***B. Candidate's Review File***

Each year the candidate will prepare and submit an annual review file, addressing the issues discussed in the Institute's Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and following the format specified by the department. Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's review file is essential for the uninterrupted progress of a formal tenure and promotion review process. The candidate is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department's criteria for teaching, research and creative work, and service. This will be submitted to the tenure committee chair by January 15.

#### ***C. Annual Tenure Review***

Each year the tenure committee will review the candidate's review file and, if necessary, request additional information from the candidate. The committee will then meet, evaluate the candidate's progress, and report its findings in writing on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form. The committee will meet with the candidate in person each year to review the expectations for progress. This meeting will be held prior to the submission of the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form to the Department Chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the candidate, which must be submitted by February 15. The candidate will also receive a copy of the committee report each year at this stage of the review. The candidate may submit a memo in response to the committee's report to accompany the committee's report to the Department Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs, by February 22.

By March 1, the Department Chair will submit his/her comments on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form should be returned to the committee and candidate by May 1 in order to provide the

candidate with complete feedback in time to adjust plans for the remainder of the year.

Prior to the first year review, the tenure committee chair and available committee members will meet with the candidate to describe their expectations for the candidate regarding teaching, research and creative work, and service, with respect to the particular discipline and approved department guidelines. The committee will also identify expectations for the tenure review file, which includes providing the applicable template and specifying any additional information to be included. This meeting should be held well before January 15 to allow the candidate time to assemble the annual tenure review file.

The candidate may petition the Vice President for Academic Affairs for an additional probationary year, provided the candidate is clearly making good progress toward tenure. The additional year should not be used to prolong probation for a candidate making insufficient progress.

#### ***D. Non-reappointment***

Tenure committees may conclude the candidate is making insufficient progress during any probationary year. If the tenure committee finds that the candidate is making insufficient progress, it will send to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a recommendation of non-reappointment. This notice will be sent in accordance with the schedule outlined in Section II D 1 of the Institute's Regulations Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure. This schedule requires that a preliminary, if not a final, recommendation of non-reappointment should be included on the February 15 submittal of the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form.

#### ***E. Final Tenure Review***

The final tenure review will be initiated in May of the academic year before the academic year of the tenure decision. By August 15 of the same year that the final review is initiated, the candidate will submit the final review file to the tenure committee chair.

The Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure provides specific guidance on the criteria, the types of evidence which should be considered, and the methods for evaluation of performance in teaching, research and creative work, and Institute and public service. Clearly all three areas are important, but excellence in teaching, and research or creativity, is essential for tenure. The Policy states that "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions."

##### ***1. Teaching Evaluation***

For teaching, the Policy states that "the committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence considered in its appraisal of teaching skill." According to the Policy, the types of evidence include a range of assessments from other members of the candidate's department, students, graduates, and the number and caliber of students attracted to the candidate's teaching and research programs. In order to ensure quality teaching at the Institute, it is recommended that the tenure committee conduct interviews with advisees and students who have taken courses from the candidate. The Registrar can provide a list of randomly selected students to interview.

## *2. Research and Creative Work Evaluation*

For research and creative work, there should be evidence that the candidate is continuously engaged in research or creative activity of high quality and significance. Although every candidate for tenure is different, there should be a basis of comparison within the Institute of previously tenured faculty. Opinions should be sought on the standards at comparable institutions. Tenure decisions should be made that will ensure that the Institute not only maintains but also increases its standards of excellence.

## *3. Internal Review*

Letters will be invited from all tenured department members, tenured Institute faculty, and research staff. These letters are for internal review of the candidate, but are not to be sent as part of the external review. Letters of evaluation collected by the candidate are not appropriate to be included in the final tenure packet.

## *4. External Review*

The tenure committee will obtain written letters from no less than five distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as or a closely related field to the candidate. The external reviewers should include an appropriate balance of tenured faculty members, research staff, and other professionals (e.g., a traditional tenure-track faculty member may have external reviews entirely by tenured faculty members at other universities; a tenure-track faculty member with a higher than usual research expectation may have reviewers including tenured faculty members, research staff at National Laboratories, or industry researchers). The candidate will be asked to suggest possible outside reviewers. In addition to the reviewers suggested by the candidate, the committee chair must solicit letters from other distinguished individuals who should be familiar with the candidate's work. The collected letters will include at least four outside reviewers with no conflict of interest with, or bias toward, the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, coauthors, collaborators on sponsored research, supervisor, etc.). Any such external reviewer must be clearly identified in the final tenure recommendation.

The tenure committee chair is responsible for informing outside reviewers of the criteria and procedures for evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion at the Institute, including the expectations for teaching, research or creativity, and service. External reviewers should agree to perform the review before the candidate's tenure package is delivered. Tenure committee chairs should send the candidate's review file, a copy of the Institute's current Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and a copy of any current published departmental tenure expectations to each outside reviewer.

## *5. Committee Recommendation*

The tenure committee will meet with the candidate before submitting its final recommendation and share its final recommendation with the candidate. The committee may share and discuss external review comments with the candidate only through a process that prevents revealing the identity of the reviewers. The candidate should be reminded that the committee recommendation is only its recommendation and that the administration and Board of Regents make all final tenure decisions, which may be different from the committee recommendation.

The tenure committee will send its recommendation with supporting documentation, along with

any minority opinions, to the Department Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15 of the tenure decision academic year. The recommendation will include formal internal and external assessments of the candidate's ability and promise, following the criteria set forth in the Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure. Internal and external letters should be assembled in a separate section of the report that will be kept confidential from the candidate. Unattributed excerpts from such letters may be included in the report. It is essential that the recommendation of the tenure committee, for every review but especially in the decision year, make an informed and complete argument supporting the committee's recommendation. Evidence should be cited, including specifics from the letters of the outside reviewers, details about the candidate's teaching and publishing achievements, and discussion of the candidate's professional service. In the final analysis, the committee's recommendation must provide convincing supporting evidence for its recommendation. The final tenure recommendation will be shared with the candidate, but all information pertaining to the identity of the external reviewers will remain in a separate document, which will not be shared with the candidate.

The Department Chair shall review the tenure package and committee recommendation and forward his/her own recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by January 15.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review the recommendations and forward the package with his/her own considered recommendation to the President by March 15. The President shall forward his/her recommendation to the Board of Regents. If the Board of Regents has an April meeting, it is advisable that the Regents consider tenure recommendations at that meeting.

### **III. Promotion or Appointment to full Professor**

(See Appendix: Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor, Adopted by the Faculty Council, 4/96 and revisions 5/12/00)

Initiation of appointment or promotion to full Professor will be at the request of the subject faculty member, the department chair, other tenured full Professors, or the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A request must be made in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by the end of September of the year in which it is to be considered. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will submit the request to the Promotion Committee for review.

The Promotion Committee consists of five tenured full Professors appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Committee membership includes one to three new members each year, and the term of appointment is three years. The Committee will request that the candidate compose a review package similar in content to that used for tenure decisions. In addition, the Committee will invite letters from all of the Institute's tenured full Professors, from tenured faculty within the candidate's department, from the Dean of Graduate Studies, and if appropriate from one or more directors of Institute divisions. The Committee will also obtain letters from no less than three distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as the candidate, following the same procedure used to select outside reviewers for tenure cases.

The Promotion Committee may interview the candidate and shall deliberate. A recommendation will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by March 15, who will forward it, with his/her own recommendation to the President by April 15, for possible referral to the Board of Regents.

## APPENDIX

### **I. Important Dates and Processes in Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure -- New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology**

#### ***A. Length of probationary period***

Initial appointment at all levels is normally considered probationary.

Tenure and promotion must be granted within seven years of service at Tech. Pending sufficient justification, tenure decisions can be deferred past the fifth year, but the maximum probationary appointment is seven years, if the candidate is to remain employed at the Institute. Normally the tenure decision will not be made prior to the fifth year. Tenure can only be awarded for faculty hired with tenure at the time of appointment in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Policy for hiring faculty with tenure.

#### ***B. Procedures for selection of tenure committee***

Formed within three months of initial appointment.

Consists of five tenured Associate or full Professors, appointed by Vice President for Academic Affairs, recommended by Department Chair.

At least two tenure committee members will be from outside the department.

#### ***C. Procedures for annual tenure review***

January 15 or before, candidate's annual review file, following the format specified by the department, will be submitted to the tenure committee chair.

February 15 or before, tenure committee will review the candidate's review file, meet with the candidate to discuss his or her progress, and report its finding on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form. Normally by May 1 the Appraisal Form will be returned to Department Chair, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the candidate.

#### ***D. Procedures for non-reappointment***

February 15 or before, preliminary or final recommendation of non-reappointment must be sent to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### ***E. Final tenure review***

Initiated by Vice President for Academic Affairs in May, before academic year of decision.

By August 15, the candidate's final review file will be submitted to the tenure committee chair.

Final tenure review will include formal internal and external assessments of candidate's ability and promise.

Letters from all tenured faculty or research staff on campus will be invited.

Committee must obtain written letters from no less than five distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as the candidate.

Candidate can suggest outside reviewers, but committee chair shall seek the names of other distinguished individuals who should be familiar with the candidate's work.

The collected letters will include at least four outside reviewers with no conflict of interest with or bias toward the candidate (i.e., dissertation advisor, coauthors, collaborators on sponsored research, supervisor, etc.).

**F. Final tenure review deadlines**

December 15 or before of decision (academic) year committee will send recommendation, along with any minority opinions, to Department Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

January 15 or before Department Chair will submit recommendation to Vice President for Academic Affairs

March 15 or before Vice President for Academic Affairs will make recommendation to the President, who, if feasible, will then make his or her recommendation to the Board of Regents in April.

**G. Typical (5-year) Tenure Track at New Mexico Tech**

<b>Action</b>	<b>(Deadline)</b>	<b>Year</b>
<b>Initial Appointment</b>	Jan or Aug	x
Tenure committee recommended by Department Chair to VPAA	Nov 15	x
Committee chair meets with candidate to discuss expectations	Dec 31	x
<b>1st Review</b>		x+1
Candidate supplies Department Chair and Committee Chair with review package	Jan 15	
Committee meets with candidate to discuss progress and recommendation	Feb 15	
Committee reports to Department Chair, VPAA and candidate	Feb 15	
Department Chair submits recommendation to VPAA	March 1	
Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form ideally returned to the committee and candidate	May 1	
<b>2nd Review</b> (same as above)		x+2
<b>3rd Review</b> (same as above)		x+3
<b>4th Review</b> (same as above)		x+4
<b>5th and Final Review</b>		
VPAA initiates final review process	May 15	x+4
Candidate supplies VPAA and Committee Chair with final review package, along with a list of suggested outside reviewers	Aug 15	x+4
Committee submits final report to VPAA and Department Chair	Dec 15	x+4
Department Chair submits recommendation to VPAA	Jan 15	x+5
VPAA submits recommendation to President	Mar 15	x+5
President submits recommendation to Board of Regents	Apr 1	x+5
Board of Regents final (approval) decision	April	x+5
<b>New tenured appointment begins</b>		x+5

## **II. Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates For Promotion to Full Professor**

(Adopted by the Faculty Council, 5/96 revisions 5/12/00)

### ***A. Introduction***

The Policy for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure: New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, version of 14 March 1990, sets forth the criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor: "Appointment or promotion to this rank therefore requires evidence of exceptional distinction by a combination of leadership, accomplishment, and service in the scholarly, educational, and general intellectual life of the Institute or wider academic community. In itself a long period of service does not justify promotion to the rank of full Professor." In the associated Procedures document (same date), the Committee on Promotion and Tenure is assigned responsibility for evaluating candidates for promotion to Professor and making recommendations regarding those candidates to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The purpose of this document is to provide detailed guidelines for the evaluation process by the Promotion Committee. Guidelines are needed to help make the evaluation process objective and quantifiable, to provide consistency in the procedures used for evaluation from year to year, to help ensure fairness and equity in the outcome of the evaluations, and to ensure that the basis for recommendations is adequately justified and documented. The purpose of the Guidelines is not to impose a rigid formula for evaluation of candidates; it is explicitly recognized that each case is unique and that individual circumstances must be given full consideration.

### ***B. Nomination and Preliminary Evaluation***

According to the Procedures, candidates for promotion can be nominated by "the subject faculty member, the department chair, other tenured full Professors, or the Vice President for Academic Affairs". Nominations should be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by September 30th of the academic year in which it is to be considered. Nominations should be accompanied by a vita for the person nominated and a memorandum to support the nomination. In general, self-nominations are not encouraged. Department chairs and senior professors should normally take an active role in advising and, when the time is appropriate, acting as advocates for the promotion of Associate Professors in their departments. After receiving the nominations, the Committee will request that each candidate compose a review package similar in content to that used for tenure decisions. The Committee will perform a preliminary evaluation of the nominations. Those nominees passing the preliminary evaluation will be asked to supply an updated set of supporting documentation to be evaluated by the Committee, full Professors in the Institute, and outside reviewers. Those nominations not passing the preliminary review will be returned, with a justification of the decision, for the Vice President's review. The Vice President may elect to discontinue consideration of the nomination or to return it to the Committee for full consideration.

### ***C. Criteria***

The Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure sets forth the following four areas of activity in which evidence of "exceptional distinction" by candidates for promotion should be sought: (1) teaching, (2) research and creative work, (3) professional competence and activity, and (4) Institute and public service. Definitions and examples of these areas are described in the Policy. This document provides specific guidance on methods for comparative

evaluation of performance in these areas. Separate guidelines are provided for faculty in scientific and engineering fields and for those in the humanities and other fields.

In general, it would appear to be unreasonable to expect "exceptional distinction" in all four of the areas described above. However, distinction in at least two of these areas should be evident in order to meet the criteria. Teaching and research are the two essential activities of the Institute's faculty; and, as such, active participation and success in both of these areas and exceptional distinction in at least one should be demonstrated. The basis for comparison should usually be the faculty previously promoted in the Institute. In cases where appropriate comparisons within the Institute are not available, opinions should be sought on the prevailing standards at comparable institutions. In cases where there is doubt, decisions should be made that will ensure that the standards of excellence at the Institute will increase with time, rather than decrease. In order to demonstrate a sustained record of distinction, it is expected in most cases that five or more years will have elapsed since the promotion to Associate Professor.

#### ***D. Record-Keeping***

In order to promote consistency and objectivity in the evaluation process, it is necessary to provide a basis for comparison with promotions, usually in the previous five years. This can be accomplished only if records are kept of the achievements of those previously promoted. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Promotion Committee to compile the quantitative information on the candidates, to provide the committee with a comparison with the average achievements of those previously promoted, to update the records after promotions are approved, and to return complete files to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### ***E. Teaching***

The Policy and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure states: "In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, committees should consider the following: the candidate's present command of the subject; continues learning in the subject area; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to work creatively; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; and the extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the academic advising and general guidance of students."

One basis for judging teaching performance is student evaluations. Departments will provide to the committee summaries of student evaluations (compilations of numerical scores and written comments) for all classes taught since the candidate was promoted to Associate Professor, or for the last 5 years, whichever is shorter. The numerical scores should be averaged by grade level (i.e., 100-200, 300-400, 500 level) inasmuch as there are often systematic differences between evaluations at different grade levels. Average numerical scores above 4 in upper division courses, or 3 in lower divisions courses, can be taken to indicate distinction, if supported by other evidence. An additional form of evidence is numbers of undergraduate advisees, M.S. students, and Ph.D. students. Other evidence could include impressions gained from written comments by students on the evaluation form, opinions offered by other faculty members, written opinions submitted by former students, impressions gained from classroom visitations, and evidence of developing new and effective programs and techniques of instruction. Information on graduate advisees who have gone on to distinguished careers is another

particularly important basis for judgment. Receiving official recognition for teaching achievement (such as the Institute Distinguished Teaching Award) is another. In cases where either teaching performance is a critical part of a case for distinguished achievement, or where teaching quality appears to be so low as to be an impediment to promotion, it is recommended that the committee verify the situation by conducting interviews with advisees and students who have taken courses from the instructor under consideration. The Registrar can provide a list of randomly selected students to interview.

## ***F. Research and Scholarship***

### *1. For Scientific and Engineering Faculty*

Distinction in research and engineering development among candidates in the scientific and engineering fields should be demonstrated by evidence that the candidate's work has materially advanced the particular field. Primary, quantifiable evidence includes numbers and amounts of grants, numbers of publications in peer-reviewed journals, and books published. Numbers of patents may be important in some engineering or medical fields. However, such qualification should not degenerate into mere "bean counting;" it is the significance of the ultimate research product that is of primary importance, not the quantity.

One measure of the significance of the research can be found in numbers of citations listed in the Science Citation Index. Listings in the SCI must be used with caution. The SCI lists only citations from peer-reviewed journals and the relative importance of these journals as a means of disseminating results varies widely by field. Because not all journals are surveyed by the SCI, this may unduly bias the listings for some fields. Average numbers of publications and numbers of citations per publication vary widely by field, which can markedly affect numbers of SCU listings. Nevertheless, the SCI provides one of the very few readily available and quantifiable measures of the impact of an individual's research or engineering work, and is thus of importance. Candidates who feel that the SCI does not adequately characterize the importance of their work may provide documentation for the cause of the situation and should provide some alternative basis for comparison.

Another important and quantifiable measure of the significance of a candidate's work is the number of times that the candidate is requested to make presentations on that work. Invited presentations should be broken into three categories: (1) keynote presentations at scientific or engineering meetings (most significant), (2) invited papers (not keynote) at meetings, and (3) invited seminars at academic departments and other institutions.

Secondary, but still quantifiable, types of evidence include numbers of publications that are not in peer-reviewed journals and numbers of reports (not necessarily published). In some cases candidates may be able to assert that such methods of disseminating results are of equal or greater importance than peer-reviewed publications in their particular field, but demonstration of such assertions should be required. If performance in the primary types of evidence is high, lower values in these categories should not be a detriment.

### *2. Scholarly and Creative Work in Humanities, Fine Arts, and other Nontechnical Fields*

Like distinction in research and engineering development for candidates in scientific and engineering fields, distinction in scholarship and creative work for candidates in Humanities,

Fine Arts, and other nontechnical fields should be demonstrated by evidence that the candidate's work has made a significant contribution to the particular field. Faculty awarded the title of full Professor in these areas should have achieved national or international recognition for their scholarship or creative activity, should have provided leadership in professional organizations at the national level, should have provided strong leadership in the areas of teaching, professional development and service, and should demonstrate evidence of increasing leadership in these areas.

Candidates should demonstrate significant achievement in scholarship and creative activity by the publication of books, monographs, translated books, a significant number of articles in refereed journals or book chapters, or a substantial number of performances or exhibitions of creative work that have achieved national or international recognition. Other evidence of significant achievement in these areas includes the successful application for grants from major funding sources, editing of scholarly journals with national or international circulation, and major achievement awards.

Scholarship and creative activity may consist of the following kinds of activity: Publication of books, monographs, book-length translations, or edited books; original research and scholarship published in refereed journals; book chapters, articles in non-refereed journals, and translated articles; significant professional presentation of creative work by performance, exhibits, demonstrations, and publications; invited presentations at local, regional, national or international meetings; invited lectures or artist-in-residence appointments at other universities; successful proposals for professional grants; professional awards for scholarship or creativity; editing of scholarly journals.

### *3. Research and Scholarly Work in all Fields*

There are two types of every significant but non-quantifiable evidence for the importance of a candidate's work. The first is honors and awards outside of the candidate's department. These can include being awarded the status of "Fellow" (or equivalent title) in the candidate's professional society, distinguished lectureships, and other medals and achievement (not service) awards. Such external recognition constitutes prima facie evidence of distinction. The second is evaluations by distinguished, independent reviewers in the candidate's field. At least three such evaluations should be obtained. The reviewers should be made aware of the criteria for promotion at the Institute and should be able to affirm that the candidate has met those criteria. Reviewers should be particularly asked to focus on the significance of the candidate's work.

Qualitative evidence of a secondary nature includes letters of support from fellow department members, coworkers, colleagues, and former advisors and mentors. Such letters should normally be expected to be quite positive, but can constitute corroborative evidence.

### ***G. Professional Activity***

Evidence should be sought for both service and leadership in the candidate's professional field. Such evidence is not readily subject to quantification, but is relatively easily recognized. Important evidence includes service as associate editor or on editorial boards of professional journals. Service as chief editor is particularly noteworthy, as is being honored with a service award by a professional organization. Election to significant offices in professional organizations

is also noteworthy, as is playing a major role in the organization of professional conferences. Minor offices in professional organizations, organizing sessions or symposia at professional meetings, and regularly serving as a reviewer for professional journals are all indications of worthwhile professional activity.

#### ***H. Institute and Public Service***

Again, the evidence for distinction in Institute and public service is not easily quantified, but should be readily apparent to the members of the Promotion Committee. In order to serve as an important qualification for promotion, such evidence should not merely show routine participation in Institute activities and public organizations, but rather should demonstrate leadership in these arenas. Examples would include holding important offices in the Institute Senate or Faculty Council, serving as Department Chair, or chairing active Institute committees, or playing similar roles in public service organizations or other such bodies.

#### ***I. Basis for Evaluation***

The evidence for a record of distinction can be divided into two categories. The first is objective data that are at least partially subject to quantification, as discussed above. In general, candidates for promotion should be expected to have attained similarly high levels of quantifiable achievements as those of candidates promoted in recent years. In some cases a candidate with performance significantly below these levels in some areas may have compensating areas of excellence that permit a favorable recommendation, but such decisions should be explicitly justified.

The second type of evidence is subjective opinions and other indications of professional stature such as leadership positions or honors, which are not readily quantified. For such evidence, comparison with faculty previously promoted is less appropriate, and emphasis should be laid on, first, whether this evidence corroborates the quantitative evidence, and, second, whether the sum of this evidence provides a case for professional distinction.

In order to provide a consistent basis for evaluation, each nominee should include the following in the review package submitted to the Promotion Committee:

- curriculum vitae
- complete lists (with authorship clearly delineated) of refereed publications
- books
- technical reports
- other publications
- presentations
- invited lectures
- research grants, with dollar amounts and periods of performance
- awards received
- all teaching evaluations since the last promotion
- list of all M.S. and Ph.D. advisees, their thesis/dissertation titles, and completion dates
- contact information, including e-mail addresses, for four external referees

***J. Documentation***

The only product of the committee's efforts and deliberations is the recommendation communication to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This recommendation should describe the various lines of evidence in detail, should provide both quantitative comparisons with average performance of faculty promoted in the previous five years and an evaluation of the qualitative evidence, and should provide a well-reasoned case for the decisions. Complete documentation of the types of evidence considered should be appended. The recommendation should be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

