



Academic Year 2023-24 P&T Guidelines

Issued 07/2023

**Dossier submittal and review for:
Retention, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Decisions**

Table of Contents

PURPOSE	3
STAGES OF REVIEW	3
STAGE I - DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW	3
External Reviewers.....	4
Internal Reviewers	5
STAGE II: COLLEGE/SCHOOL REVIEW	6
STAGE III: PROVOST REVIEW	6
STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND PROMOTION	7
Retention at the mid-probationary review.....	7
Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor	7
Promotion to full professor.....	8
STANDARDS FOR LECTURER PROMOTION	9
Senior Lecturer	9
Principal Lecturer	9
Branch Campus Faculty	9
EARLY PROBATIONARY REVIEWS	9
THE CANDIDATE’S DOSSIER	10
RPT – UNM’s Online Dossier and Review System	11
RPT Organizational Requirements	11
RPT Components: Candidate, Department, School/College	11
Candidate RPT components:.....	11
Department RPT components:.....	13
College or School RPT Components:.....	15
COVID-19 Impact Guidelines	15
AY 2023-24 DEADLINES	15
System Administrators.....	15
Confirmation of Candidates’ Eligibility.....	15
Submittal Deadlines	15
Frequently Asked Questions	17
APPENDIX A	20
APPENDIX B	22
APPENDIX C	23
APPENDIX C-1	24
APPENDIX D	26

PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to describe the procedures, preparation of materials, and management of dossiers for retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion for University of New Mexico faculty.

The goal of the review process is to provide a thorough and objective review of the substance and merits of each faculty member's milestone review (mid-probationary, tenure and promotion, promotion). The guidelines are designed to support high standards in awarding tenure and promotion, and to insure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidates' performance as represented in the dossier.

These guidelines affirm principles and policies, incorporating UNM Faculty Handbook policies. Nothing in these guidelines should be deemed to alter the text of the University policy statements on academic tenure, which may be found in the UNM Faculty Handbook; in case of conflict with these guidelines, the text of the Faculty Handbook will take precedence.

These guidelines apply to probationary faculty undergoing mid-probationary retention review, probationary faculty seeking tenure and promotion in rank, tenured faculty seeking promotion in rank to full professor, and lecturers seeking promotion to senior or principal lecturer.

STAGES OF REVIEW

STAGE I - DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

The faculty candidate's department Departmental Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee carries out the initial review of the candidate's dossier. A department P&T committee may carry out the review or the department may conduct the review in accordance with the department's governance practices and bylaws.

In those departments where a P&T committee carries out the review, the committee may be appointed by the Department Chair, or it may be elected, following traditional practice in the Department. Departments may establish ad hoc committees for each promotion and tenure case, or they may establish a single committee each year to review all cases. In either case, the committee must consist of only tenured members of the department of appropriate rank. The committee must have at least three such members.

If the department does not have three tenured members, the Department Chair must consult with the Dean about drawing on tenured faculty from other departments of the college or school. The committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, including but not limited to a dissertation advisor, co-author, or other close associate; such individuals are, however, eligible to participate in the full departmental discussion and vote on the committee report.

It is the responsibility of the department (or department P&T Committee) to verify the completeness of the relevant materials, to review them in detail, and to prepare a written report with a recommendation in favor or against the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate.

Depending on the P&T practices of the department, the formal written report and recommendation of the Department P&T Committee may be presented to the tenured department faculty of appropriate rank for a vote or may be passed on to the Department Chair.

The written report and evaluation of candidates submitted by faculty reviewers should provide a clear statement of the candidate's teaching performance, scholarly or creative works, and service and assign a rating

of excellent, effective, or needs improvement, for each area of performance. The recommendation should also provide a clear rationale for each rating.

The report of the Department faculty or Departmental P&T Committee and the vote by eligible faculty are advisory to the Department Chair. The Committee report and individual ballots submitted by eligible faculty are to be signed (and dated) by the Committee members and individual eligible faculty members. The Chair must forward the report and numerical vote to the Dean with the Chair's own recommendation.

The Department Chair's letter must include a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field and explain why it is important to the department that this field be represented on its faculty. It is also helpful for this statement to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate's discipline (e.g., quality of the venues within which the work appears).

The Department Chair's recommendation should make the case for or against retention, tenure and/or promotion, based on materials and evaluations submitted to date, explicitly compared to departmental standards for same.

The Department Chair's recommendation should provide a clear statement of the candidate's teaching performance, scholarly or creative works, and service and assign a rating of excellent, effective, or needs improvement, for each area of performance. The recommendation should also provide a clear rationale for each rating.

External Reviewers

A minimum of six (6) written evaluations from experts in the discipline/field at other institutions must form part of the dossier for the tenure and promotion review and the review for promotion to full professor. FHB B1.2.2(c)

Each department will have its own process for selecting external reviewers. However, FHB B4.5.2 states, "The candidate shall suggest potential reviewers to the chair. The chair, in consultation with tenured faculty, shall identify additional reviewers." The department chair then invites external reviewers, typically striving for half from each list.

Faculty candidates or department chairs **must not** solicit external reviews from individuals who have conflicts of interest with the candidate (i.e., dissertation advisors, co-authors, collaborators on sponsored research, former students, etc.). If there are questions about what constitutes a conflict of interest, please reach out to the Senior Vice Provost (svp@unm.edu) for guidance.

The chair shall select "reputable scholars, researchers, or creative artists and critics who can evaluate the candidate's contributions to scholarship, research, or creative work." FHB B4.5.2.

(Note: An external reviewer template invitation is available in Appendix A. Department chairs are encouraged to use the template.)

The majority of external reviewers **must** be affiliated with Carnegie Research Classification – Doctoral Universities: Very High Research Activity (R1) academic institutions.

External reviewers must receive written instructions from the candidate's department on UNM's standards for promotion and tenure, and promotion, as appropriate, in addition to a curriculum vitae and the works to be reviewed. All external reviewers shall be advised that UNM will keep the reviewer's identity confidential, to the extent permitted by law. FHB B4.5.2

A table titled, External Reviewers 2023-24 Academic Year, added to the dossier by the department, is necessary (Appendix B). The table includes the external reviewers' names, title/faculty rank, department/affiliation, institution, and Carnegie Research Classification – Doctoral Universities, reviewer recommended by faculty candidate, department chair, senior faculty members, brief rationale for recommendation, and response to the invitation.

Please note: Dossiers without the External Reviewers 2023-24 Academic Year table will be considered incomplete and returned to the department and/or school/college.

Internal Reviewers

Departments and colleges are required to adhere to these principles during the review process:

Department- and college-level review committees are to be comprised of faculty at or above the rank under consideration (e.g., tenure and promotion to associate professor committees include associate professors – preferably not recently tenure and promoted associate professors and/or professors; promotion to professor committees are to be made up of full professors). If necessary, internal reviewers may be recruited from cognate departments, following approval by the school/college dean.

Department Chairs and Deans must ensure review committee members do not participate in the review process for candidates with whom they have a conflict of interest. For example, a candidate's spouse, domestic partner, or supervisee may not participate in the review process. However, the occurrence of a dispute or disagreement between a senior and probationary faculty member does not necessarily present a conflict of interest; if there is any question about conflicts of interest, consult with the Senior Vice Provost in advance of finalizing the composition of the department or college review committee. Similarly, in cases where an associate professor is serving as department chair and seeks promotion to professor, a professor from the department or, if necessary, outside the department is to be appointed to chair and administer the review process. Note: This should be rare because the practice of appointing associate professors to serve as chairs is strongly discouraged.

Each tenure and promotion committee member is allowed only one advisory vote for a particular candidate. In other words, a committee member cannot submit an advisory vote for the same candidate as a department faculty member or chair, and again as a college-level or university-level committee member.

Ballots are to be signed (and dated) by each individual P&T committee member.

Faculty reviewers should also be guided by these UNM Faculty Handbook policies:

“The department chair, in consultation with at least the tenured members of the department, conducts a formal review of the faculty member's achievements in teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics.” FHB B4.3.1(a)

Tenure and promotion reviews “shall take account of the annual reviews of the faculty member.” FHB B4.3.1(a)

While voting is contemplated, “tenured members of the department are [also] expected to submit written evaluations of the candidate and indicate either a positive or negative mid-probationary, tenure, and/or promotion recommendation.” FHB B4.3.1(a)

If it is the department's practice or policy, “untentured faculty may participate in reviews. The chair's report shall distinguish between the evaluations and votes of the tenured faculty, on one hand, and those of the untentured faculty, on the other. Untentured faculty members may decline to participate in the review without

penalty.” FHB B4.4.2 Academic Affairs interprets this statement as applying to the potential for probationary faculty to submit recommendations, but not to serve on review committees, if used.

Faculty who are on sabbatical leave or absent from campus on other forms of leave shall be informed by the chair of upcoming reviews with sufficient time to participate if they choose. FHB B4.4.3.

“The chair shall discuss the review and recommendation with the faculty member....The faculty member shall be advised in writing whether the recommendation is positive or negative.” FHB B4.3.1(c).

“If the recommendation is negative, a copy of the chair’s report, the internal peer reviews and external letters (all redacted as necessary to preserve confidentiality), if requested by the candidate, shall be furnished to the candidate.” FHB B4.3.1(c).

It is of the utmost importance that department committee members respect the requirement to keep the entire review process, including all materials and deliberations, completely confidential. Any committee member who fails to do so can be subject to disciplinary action for violating Faculty Handbook policies.

STAGE II: COLLEGE/SCHOOL REVIEW

The dean of the college/school is responsible for evaluating the candidate’s dossier and making a recommendation to the provost level of review. The dean is expected to consult an advisory committee consisting of only tenured members in the college/school of appropriate rank. The advisory committee makes its recommendation to the dean of the college/school.

The college/school advisory committee members’ recommendation should provide a statement of the candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarly or creative works, and service and assign a rating of excellent, effective, or needs improvement, for each evaluation category. The recommendation should also provide a clear rationale for each rating.

A summary of the school/college committee recommendation, and committee reviewer recommendations or the committee’s report is submitted to the dean.

It is of the utmost importance that college committee members respect the requirement to keep the entire review process, including all materials and deliberations, completely confidential. Any committee member who fails to do so can be subject to disciplinary action for violating Faculty Handbook policies.

The dean’s letter should make the case for or against retention, tenure and promotion, or promotion, based on the materials submitted to date. The dean will ordinarily make their recommendation to the provost in a timely manner.

STAGE III: PROVOST REVIEW

The provost evaluates each candidate’s dossier and recommendation submitted by the Dean. In doing so, the provost appoints the Provost’s Advisory Review Committee of tenured faculty, representing the various schools and colleges, to seek further counsel.

The Provost’s Advisory Review Committee (PARC), chaired by the Senior Vice Provost (SVP), reviews all retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion dossiers. In every case, a two-person PARC subcommittee reviews a candidate’s dossier, provides a statement of the candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarly or creative works, and service (excellent, effective, or needs improvement), and makes a recommendation.

Ballots are to be signed (and dated) by the individual P&T committee member.

In cases where PARC subcommittee members' recommendations are split, or both offer negative recommendations, or where other questions about the candidate's qualifications are deemed worthy of deeper review, the SVP either resolves the split or moves the file to review by the full committee. In the latter case, the candidate's dossier will be made available to the full PARC committee for review, discussion, and recommendation. The two-person subcommittee's written assessments are loaded into the RPT system.

It is of the utmost importance that Provost's Advisory Review Committee members respect the requirement to keep the entire review process, including all materials and deliberations, completely confidential. Any committee member who fails to do so can be subject to disciplinary action for violating Faculty Handbook policies.

The Provost's Advisory Review Committee recommendations are submitted to the Senior Vice Provost for review, evaluation, and recommendation to the Provost. The Provost completes the final review and evaluation, and officially notifies the candidates of the decision, no later than June 30, 2024.

STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND PROMOTION

Local departmental standards and policies, specific to the discipline, should be in place to guide candidates and reviewers in assessing what constitutes effective vs. excellent teaching and scholarly/creative work in their disciplines. A collection of current standards is available on the Office of the Provost website (provost.unm.edu). Any local policy updates should be sent to svp@unm.edu.

Retention at the mid-probationary review

In their recommendations, tenured faculty reviewers, chairs and deans should state how the candidate meets, or does not meet, the following standards:

To receive a second probationary period, "there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, the competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty [teaching, scholarly work, service and personal characteristics], as well as promise of excellence in either teaching or scholarly work." FHB B4.6.1(c)

"If the University concludes that insufficient progress towards tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and necessary." FHB B4.6.1(c)

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

To earn tenure and promotion to associate professor, "faculty are required to be effective in four areas: teaching, scholarly/creative work, service, and personal characteristics. Excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion." FHB B1.2(b).

The Faculty Handbook provides requirements as to what evidence reviewers of tenure and promotion candidates shall consider:

"Evidence to be evaluated for teaching ... must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member, and written reports of peer observations of teaching." FHB B1.2.1(c). Note the requirement that written reports of peer observations must be included.

The candidate's dossier will include a teaching summary table listing, for each course taught, the academic year, semester, course number, course title, undergraduate and graduate student enrollment, 21-day enrollment, return rate (for *EvaluationKit* course evaluations) and mean Q1, Q2, Q3 *EvaluationKit* data. The teaching summary table can be found in the Appendix C.

The teaching summary table will be prepared and added to the dossier by the candidate.

“Evidence of scholarship or creative work is determined by the candidate’s publications, exhibits, performances, or media productions and may be supplemented by evidence of integration of the candidate’s scholarly work and teaching.” Written evaluations from external reviewers may be considered for the mid-probationary review and must be considered for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks.” FHB B1.2.2(c).

The Faculty Handbook does not provide guidance as to how “excellent performance” in teaching or scholarly/creative work is determined. Departments and programs must adopt policies, specific to the academic discipline, to guide candidates and reviewers in making this assessment.

The Faculty Handbook does, however, provide guidance as to how “effective performance” in teaching or scholarly work may be assessed in FHB B1.2.1 and B1.2.2.

To be promoted to the rank of associate professor, faculty shall have acquired significant experience beyond the terminal degree and “shall have demonstrated competence as teachers and have shown a conscientious interest in improving their teaching. They shall have demonstrated a basic general understanding of a substantial part of their discipline and have an established reputation within and outside the University in their fields of scholarly work. This implies scholarly work after the terminal degree sufficient to indicate continuing interest and growth in the candidate’s professional field.” FHB B2.2.2(a)

“Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of associate professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions to teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service. The appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments and promise in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership.” FHB B2.2.2(b).

Faculty review committee members, department chairs, and deans should state in their recommendations how candidates meet, or do not meet, these standards.

Promotion to full professor

In their recommendations, faculty review committee members, chairs, and deans should state how the candidate meets, or does not meet, the following standards for promotion to full professor:

“Individuals who have attained high standards in teaching and who have made significant contributions to their disciplines may be considered for this faculty rank. They shall also have developed expertise and interest in the general problems of university education and their social implications and have shown the ability to make constructive judgments and decisions. It is expected that the professor will continue to develop and mature regarding teaching, scholarly work, and the other qualities that contributed to earlier appointments.” FHB B2.2.3(a)

“Appointment or promotion to professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college/school, and University that the individual has made significant, nationally recognized scholarly or creative contributions to their field and an expectation that the individual will continue to do so.” FHB B2.2.3

“Professors are the most enduring group of faculty, and it is they who give leadership and set the tone for the entire University. Thus, appointment or promotion should be made only after careful investigation.” FHB B2.2.3

“Qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor include attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly work, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in their field at the same rank in comparable universities. Service in a given

rank for any number of years is not, in itself, a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.” FHB B4.8.3(a)

It should be understood from the above references to ‘national recognition in the field,’ and qualities that contributed to earlier appointments, that candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence that their teaching or scholarly work continues to rise to the level of excellence originally required for tenure.

STANDARDS FOR LECTURER PROMOTION

In their recommendations, faculty review committee members, chairs, and deans should state how the candidates meet, or do not meet, the following standards:

Senior Lecturer

To be promoted to the rank of senior lecturer, candidates should “have demonstrated professional excellence and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills.” FHB C190, Section A2(a)

Promotion to “the rank of Senior Lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the department, school/college, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions in their professional areas.” The review should include an evaluation “of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise.” FHB C190, Section A2(b)

Principal Lecturer

To be promoted to the rank of principal lecturer, candidates should “have sustained consistently high standards in their professional contributions, consistently demonstrated their wider service to the University community and its mission and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills. It is expected that principal lecturers will continue to develop and mature with regard to their professional activities and leadership within the University.” FHB C190, Section A3(a)

Promotion to “the rank of principal lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the department, school/college, and University that the individual has attained and will continue to sustain an overall profile of professional excellence and engagement in the wider profession.” The review should include an evaluation “of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise.” FHB C190, Section A3(b)

Branch Campus Faculty

The standards for promotion and tenure are modified for branch campus faculty members. For evaluation of faculty for retention and/or promotion, branch campus units will use the ‘categories’ described in Faculty Handbook Section B1.2. The branch campus will “utilize consistent implementation and evaluation policies and procedures.” FHB F90.B, and FHB F90.C.

“Branch faculty review, or departmental/divisional review when appropriate, shall mirror Faculty Handbook, B4.” FHB F90.E.

EARLY PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

The UNM Faculty Handbook, Section B 3.2.1.b, indicates that by written agreement between the faculty member (or appointee) and the chair of the department and with the approval of the dean and the Provost/Executive Vice President, the probationary period may be reduced below the maximum period of six full academic (or fiscal) years. Further, when the probationary period is reduced below the maximum period by agreement, the agreement will identify specific times for the mid-probationary and tenure reviews. A faculty member shall be reviewed for tenure only once.

Academic Affairs affirms the 2017 Guidelines for Implementing and Reviewing Shortened Faculty Probationary Period issued by former SVP Carol Parker. Segments of the guidelines are included below.

Faculty candidates should not determine how long their probationary period and incoming rank and status will be. Setting an appropriate probationary period and determining an appropriate rank and status at the time of hire are assessments made in consultation with the senior faculty of the department, at a minimum, and will ideally include a faculty vote on the question. These determinations are incorporated into the written appointment letter and become part of the initial employment contract.

The Provost's Office does not encourage shortened probationary periods. In rare circumstances, a probationary period may be shortened, but only if the chair, dean, and provost approve. Granting such a request has the effect of amending the terms of the employment contract (Appendix D)

The faculty member would explicitly acknowledge:

- that they understand a probationary faculty member shall be reviewed for tenure only once.
- that they requested the modification.
- in granting the request, neither the chair, dean, or provost indicate that an early review is certain to have a successful outcome;
- that the outcome will be determined by the standard review processes and criteria currently in place for the department, school/college, and Academic Affairs; and
- that if the result of the early review is negative, the candidate will receive a notice of contract discontinuation and be offered a one-year terminal contract.

THE CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER

Candidates for retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion bear the primary responsibility for assembling the review materials and are obligated to put forward a complete dossier of their work for review. The Faculty Handbook states: "The dossier is a collection of documents that summarize and evaluate a faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service and contain evidence of personal and professional effectiveness. FHB B.4.5.1

The candidate shall provide the following elements:

- statement by the faculty member of professional goals and progress toward achieving them;
- complete and current curriculum vitae (CV); and
- systematic collection of professional materials documenting the faculty member's achievements in the evaluation categories of teaching; scholarly/creative works; and service." FHB B4.5.1(a)

Candidates are encouraged to include materials that support and illustrate their scholarly/creative works, teaching, and service performance. Ideally, a candidate's dossier should not exceed 500 pages. Dossiers that exceed 500 pages are cumbersome, and they create challenges accessing and downloading the materials which delays efficient review processes.

Many academic units require various forms of supplemental materials. Refer to the RPT Organizational Requirements section below (p. 13) for a list of the materials to be submitted.

Candidates are required to submit, in a timely manner, dossier materials, and to communicate with faculty administrators to ensure peer teaching reviews, annual performance reviews, and external reviews of scholarly/creative work are included and made readily available to all UNM reviewers.

Probationary faculty can confirm the status of their tenure and promotion timeline via the Employee tab in Loboweb, in the Pay Information → 'Faculty Contract Summary' section (<http://my.unm.edu>).

RPT – UNM’s Online Dossier and Review System

Retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) reviews conducted AY2023-24 must use UNM’s online system – rpt.unm.edu -- to build dossiers and manage the review process; RPT can be found at <http://rpt.unm.edu>. The RPT application, developed by UNM’s Institute of Design and Innovation, was originally piloted by the School of Engineering (AY2015-16) and implemented for reviews in all units in the subsequent academic year.

RPT data are stored in a secure, cloud-based platform under license, ensuring the vendor will not disclose UNM’s data which are protected by FERPA (e.g., student teaching evaluations) and data protected by other policies (e.g., FHB C70). Each candidate is assigned a confidential section in which to assemble their dossier.

Access to the RPT application is controlled by UNM’s Central Authentication Service via NetID and password. Within the application, at each level of review, department, college, and provost, system administrators control access.

RPT is organized in tiers which system administrators use to control viewing and accessibility to load review materials. Generally, reviewers at each level can ‘look below’ to view earlier reviews but can never ‘look above’ to view the subsequent views.

It is of utmost importance that department, college, and university reviewers respect the mandate to keep the entire review process, including all materials and deliberations, completely confidential. Any reviewer who fails to do so may be subject to disciplinary action for violating Faculty Handbook policies.

RPT Organizational Requirements

The provost recognizes that no single template can meet all needs. However, consistent organizational structure and comprehensible and accessible materials will facilitate an efficient process for reviewers at every level, especially for reviewers outside of the department. Candidates should closely follow this template while presenting their record as effectively as possible, given academic discipline/field differences.

The RPT dossier-builder automatically indexes all PDFs. The only exception is audio and video files, for which links should be provided via an open URL (not password protected). If any materials present unique uploading challenges, please confer with SVP@unm.edu for guidance.

RPT Components: Candidate, Department, School/College

Candidate RPT components:

Item/Segment	Description	RPT File name
Curriculum Vitae (CV)	Current and comprehensive CV	CV
Teaching Statement (or Portfolio, follow college/school requirements)	Statement that addresses the candidate’s contributions in teaching. The candidate may choose to describe the impact of the pandemic on teaching (optional) .	Teaching Statement (or Teaching Portfolio)
Peer teaching evaluations	Peer teaching evaluations (one per academic year) should follow department guidelines for the peer review of teaching. The peer evaluation may be based on a review of the course	Peer teaching evaluation by (reviewer’s last name, first initial)

	syllabi, assigned readings, examinations, class materials, and other assessments, such as observation of lectures, as appropriate for the academic discipline and subject area.	
Student Evaluations	A summary of student evaluations of teaching is presented in the standard table (available in Appendix C) Student comments (combine into one PDF for each course)	Summary of student evaluations Student comments_course name_course #
Course Materials	Examples of original teaching materials from each unique course taught. (Materials from the same course taught over several semesters are not required. Please do not include every material used for every course.)	Name each document: YYYY_semester_COURSE number_(title of document) Example: 2021_spring_CHEM131_final exam
Research/Creative Works Statement	Statement that describes the candidate's scholarly/creative works, including grant-funded research. Articles, books, research grant proposals, etc., if they are to be provided, should be uploaded in the Supplemental Materials section. The candidate may choose to describe the impact of the pandemic on their scholarly/creative work (optional) .	research (or creative works) statement_last name_first initial
Service statement	Statement that describes the candidate's service contributions aligned with the expectations associated with the level of review (retention, tenure & promotion, promotion). For example, a candidate for promotion to professor is expected to contribute to the department, University, and academic discipline. The candidate may choose to describe the impact of the pandemic on service (optional) .	service statement_last name_first initial

<p>Supplemental materials</p>	<p>In most cases, the candidate will suggest what is to be included and will upload materials after consultation with their Chair.</p> <p>The Provost’s Advisory Review Committee requires that any unpublished material lists on the CV (e.g., works in progress, must be uploaded in this section). For works that are too preliminary to include as works in progress on the CV, the candidate will instead discuss them in the Research Statement rather than listing them on the CV.</p>	<p>Comprehensive List (signed by the Chair) of contents of supplemental materials section [required in A&S only]</p> <p>1_Books Starting with the most recent publication, list each as 1.01 (author, title, etc.), 1.02, 1.03.</p> <p>2_Articles Starting with the most recent publication, list each as 2.01 (author_abbreviated title), 2.02, 2.03.</p> <p>3_Research Grants Starting with the most recent grant, list each as 3.01 (PIs, title), 3.02, 3.03, etc.</p> <p>4_Reviews of grant proposals or manuscripts</p> <p>5_Unsolicited letters describing the candidate’s contributions to community, awarding of prizes, gratitude of students and professional colleagues, contracts for future publications, etc.</p> <p>6_Other. List each as 6.01 (details), 6.02, etc. Include links to webpages or external audio or video files here.</p>
-------------------------------	---	--

Department RPT components:

Item/Segment	Description	RPT File name
Annual Reviews	The candidate’s annual performance reviews describing performance and recommendations for growth and development are included.	AY####-####_annual_perform_review_last name_first initial
List of External Reviewers	Minimum of 6 external reviewers with the majority from Carnegie Classification Doctoral Universities:	external reviewer’s summary table

	Very High Research Activity (or R1) institutions.	(Note: Dossiers without the summary table will be returned and considered incomplete.)
External Reviewers' CVs	The curriculum vita for each external reviewer assists in documenting their expertise in specific domains of scholarship and creative works. External reviewers must have a demonstrated record of accomplishments on precisely those themes and topics that the candidate has described as the primary areas of work in which they aspire to have an impact.	For each external reviewer's CV: External reviewer's last name_CV
External Reviews	At least six external reviews are required for tenure and promotion and promotion to full professor. External reviews may be optional for mid-probationary candidates, as determined by local departmental standards. In such cases, upload a statement indicating external reviews are applicable in this instance.	For each reviewer's letter: External reviewer's last name__external review for faculty candidate's last name
Department Faculty Vote and Comments	Report of department review subcommittee, if used. Separate summary of faculty vote. Individual department reviewer recommendations	Dept_review_report_candidate's last name, first initial Summary_fac_vote_candidate's last name, first initial Dept_rev by (reviewer last name, first initial)
Department Chair recommendation	Chair's recommendation letter: Should make the case for or against retention, tenure and/or promotion, based on materials and evaluations submitted, explicitly compared to department standards for same. The chair's letter should provide the necessary context so that subsequent reviewers understand the field and how the candidate's work adds value to the institution and impact to their scholarly discipline.	Department chair_rec_ (chair's last name, initial)

College or School RPT Components:

Item/Segment	Description	RPT File name
College vote and comments	Summary of college committee vote Individual college committee reviewer recommendation form or committee report, as appropriate	(Candidate's last name, first initial) College (or School) Committee review by (reviewer last name, first initial)
Dean's recommendation	The recommendation from the dean should make the case for or against retention, tenure and promotion, or promotion, based on the candidate's materials and evaluations submitted to date.	Letter from dean (dean's last name) _candidate's last name e.g., Letter from Dean Green_Peach

COVID-19 Impact Guidelines

Candidates for retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion are encouraged (not required) to address the impact of COVID-19 on their scholarly/creative work, teaching, and service in the statements (listed above) they prepare. The purpose is to provide candidates with the opportunity, if they so choose, to document and summarize the effects of the pandemic on their scholarly/creative work, teaching, and service.

Departments are strongly encouraged to use the template (Appendix A) to invite external reviewers. The invitation includes language to remind external reviewers the candidate was an active scholar/researcher in 2020 and 2021, during which the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the disease, COVID-19, that it causes, disrupted all aspects of faculty work.

AY 2023-24 DEADLINES

System Administrators

Each school and college must submit to SVP@unm.edu system administrators' names for the RPT system as soon as possible, but **no later than August 21, 2023**. Please inform SVP@unm.edu of the administrators who need RPT training.

Confirmation of Candidates' Eligibility

Each school/college must submit to SVP@unm.edu, the names of all candidates who will be considered for retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion during AY 2023-24 by **September 5, 2023**. This information will be verified against the Office for Academic Personnel (OAP) records. If discrepancies exist, the Senior Vice Provost will work with each school/college to reconcile them.

Submittal Deadlines

The deadlines and guidelines for organization and submittal of dossier materials are provided below. Colleges and Departments should set deadlines that allow sufficient time for review and decision-making to meet the

firm deadlines identified below. Deans are responsible for setting internal deadlines for college-level review. Late and incomplete submissions will not be accepted.

Candidates for Promotion to Professor: Promotion files (candidate dossier, mandatory external reviews, departmental and/or college reviews and recommendations) are to be completed and fully uploaded in the RPT application for Provost-level access by **5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 1, 2024.**

Candidates for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: Tenure and promotion files (candidate dossier, mandatory external reviews, department and/or college reviews and recommendations) are to be completed and fully uploaded in the RPT application for Provost-level access by **5:00 pm on Friday, March 1, 2024.**

Candidates for Retention/Mid-Probationary Review: Mid-probationary files (candidate dossier, external reviews if used, department and/or college reviews and recommendations) are to be completed and fully uploaded in the RPT application for Provost-level access by **5:00 pm on Friday, March 15, 2024.**

Candidates for Senior and Principal Lecturer Promotion: Lecturer promotion files (candidate dossier, department and/or college reviews, and recommendations) are to be completed and fully uploaded in the RPT application for Provost-level access by **5:00 pm on Friday, April 5, 2024.**

Notice to Candidates: The Faculty Handbook states that the deadline for the Provost's final decision in retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion reviews is **June 30.**

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the difference between reviewers, recommenders, and decision-makers?

As described in the Faculty Handbook, three individuals have the responsibility of making a recommendation: Chair, Dean and Senior Vice Provost. FHB B4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3. Only one individual – the Provost – has the responsibility for making the decision. FHB B4.3.4.

At each stage of review, recommenders are strongly encouraged to seek input and advice of relevant faculty members. This typically occurs through use of committees and/or faculty votes of at least the senior faculty members in the department. FHB B4.4.5

For branch campus faculty, branch campus chancellors also make recommendations. FHB F90

Should faculty review committee members have access to the candidate's annual performance reviews?

Department faculty review committee members need to know what department chairs told candidates at earlier annual or mid probationary reviews, in order to know whether the candidate had a clear picture of expectations for and progress toward tenure.

FHB C70, Section 3.2 clearly states that access to a candidate's personnel record is anticipated for anyone who has an official role in the evaluation for tenure status and rank. A candidate's personnel record should contain the annual reviews, so reviewer access is implied. However, Section B4 of the Faculty Handbook provides for some leeway in this regard. One section states that the chair should summarize for voting faculty what was contained in previous annual reviews, while another section states that annual reviews must be taken into account in a department's review of a candidate.

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) issued a clarifying opinion, September 20, 2022, affirming AF&T's position that full annual performance reviews should be included in the materials for promotion and tenure process, and not a summary from the department chair. You may find the AF&T 2022 memo [here](#).

Can new material be added to a dossier after a deadline?

Departments and programs should review candidates' dossiers at each rank according to consistent timetables. FHB B4.5.4. However, candidates may add material to their dossiers throughout the review process, and at each level of review. New material will be available only to reviewers assessing the files at the time it was added and thereafter. In other words, new material is not cause for previous reviewers to revisit their earlier votes or recommendations.

The Faculty Handbook also states, "if any substantive material is introduced at a higher administrative review, the candidate, chair and dean (if appropriate) shall be furnished copies. If necessary to preserve confidentiality, material provided to the candidate shall be redacted and the candidate shall have five (5) working days to submit written comments if desired." FHB B4.5.4

Are letters of support accepted?

Colleagues from other departments, from other universities, and sometimes members of the public often wish to write letters of support or otherwise lobby for particular outcomes. Letters of support, not obtained as part of a department or college's regular review process, will not be added to a dossier after the dossier is submitted

by the candidate as they are outside of the scope of the procedure and policy allowing for additional material to be added.

What if there are procedural concerns?

Occasionally, concerns arise about whether a candidate received due process during the management of the probationary period or during the review process itself.

Faculty review committee members should focus on ascertaining whether a candidate's body of work meets the standards required for retention, tenure and promotion, and promotion. They should not consider potential procedural concerns as they assess a candidate's teaching and scholarly work. Faculty review committee members may note potential procedural concerns, but addressing procedural problems are in the domain of department chairs, deans, and the provost.

What about rebuttals and appeals of negative recommendations or decisions?

Candidate, faculty and administrator rights and responsibilities when negative recommendations occur are described below.

Notice. Department chairs must provide the negative recommendation to the candidate, and discuss the recommendation with the candidate, and discuss the recommendation with the candidate.

Rebuttal. Candidates have the right to rebut a negative recommendation. In order to prepare a rebuttal, a candidate may request a copy of all supporting materials in the dossier. All material in the file must be redacted, prior to delivery, to assure confidentiality. Any new materials or written statements added by the candidate in response to a negative recommendation become available to reviewers at the next level; rebuttal material is not cause for previous reviewers to revisit earlier votes or recommendations. Note: The FHB does not explicitly state that rebuttals are available at every level of review, but it is inferred from B4.3.6 that candidates are able "to present their views to the next level of review before the next recommendation."

Reconsideration. A candidate may request reconsideration, of a negative decision, to the Provost. FHB B4.3.6

Appeals. A dean is normally expected to follow a chair's recommendation, so a chair may appeal a dean's recommendation, if it is contrary. The appeal is made to the Senior Vice Provost. FHB B4.3.2. A candidate may also appeal a Provost's negative final decision to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee at the conclusion of the process following FHB B4.3.7 or the UA-UNM Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 1, Grievance and Arbitration Article 17.

Can candidates request copies of a file following positive recommendations?

From time-to-time, candidates request copies of their file even though the recommendations were positive. Such requests may impose an undue burden of redaction on staff and faculty administrators. Between 100 – 150 retention, promotion and tenure files are typically reviewed each year, and a file may contain 500 pages or more of documents. Further, despite redaction, reading internal reviews could lead candidates to infer – rightly or wrongly – how their colleagues may have voted. Such behaviors are counterproductive to supporting collegial working environments.

Redaction. In order to provide rigorous and fair review, reviewers expect that their opinions shall also be kept confidential from the candidate. Redaction must be sufficient to protect the identity of all internal and external reviewers. This means that any information, not just names, that may reveal the identity of the author must be redacted. If it does not appear feasible to protect the identity of the author through redaction, the document

may be accurately summarized in writing for the faculty member instead. If the author of an evaluation submits a written waiver of confidentiality, the evaluation may be reviewed or copied by the faculty member without redaction. FHB C70, Section 2.2(a).

However, faculty members have a right to view their official personnel file maintained by the University. Should a faculty member request their retention, tenure and promotion, or tenure file, please refer them to Academic Affairs, where the official dossier is maintained. Academic Affairs personnel will schedule a time to review the file on the premises within a reasonable period (normally two weeks). UA-UNM Collective Bargaining Agreement, Unit 1, Article 18, Personnel Files.

APPENDIX A

Template – Request review by external reviewer

Name

Street

City, State Zip Code

Dear Professor _____:

On behalf of the Department of _____ in the College of _____ at the University of New Mexico, I am writing to request your service as an external reviewer for _____ who has requested consideration for _____ (promotion to the rank of associate/full professor). The evaluations of outside reviewers are a necessary and valued component of the University of New Mexico's tenure and promotion review process. Therefore, we would very much appreciate your assistance in evaluating the merits of the candidate's record of research/scholarship/creative works, contributions to the discipline, and impact on the candidate's intellectual community.

Our review procedures require that experts in the candidate's field evaluate the candidate's scholarly or creative effectiveness, professional contributions and impact. Please note that quality and excellence are more important than quantity in evaluating the candidate's work. Attached is the candidate's curriculum vita, research/creative works statement, select publications/creative works, and the academic unit's tenure and promotion criteria.

We also note that this candidate was an active researcher in 2020 and 2021, during which the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the disease, COVID-19, that it causes, disrupted all aspects of faculty work. This candidate was in the cohort of scholars who had to pivot their courses online, work remotely, and in many cases manage their own children's education. Beginning Spring 2020 semester, as a result of the health crisis, and in response to state of New Mexico public health orders, access to research and creative facilities were significantly reduced, library services were restricted, and all student evaluations of teaching were suspended. Research disruptions, significant shifts in teaching modalities, limited childcare, and remote work persisted into the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. We ask that you take this unprecedented event into consideration when evaluating the faculty candidate's work.

The University of New Mexico automatically extended all probationary periods for faculty impacted by this public health crisis. During your evaluation of this candidate's record, we ask you **not** to consider time since degree or time in rank; please assume that the candidate is coming up for review and promotion at the right time for our institution and refrain from any comment about time.

We ask external reviewers' letters to include a brief statement regarding your acquaintance with the candidate, and if you have any joint work with the candidate.

We ask that you provide an evaluation of the significance, independence, impact, and promise of the candidate's scholarship/creative works, as well as the candidate's national/international scholarly/creative reputation. If you could also provide your assessment of the appropriate independence or team nature of the candidate's work, that would be most helpful. We would like to receive your assessment of the originality and

impact of the candidate's work. Has the candidate's work contributed to new lines of research or deepened our understanding of existing debates within the discipline? Has the candidate demonstrated a meaningful and appropriately independent or team focused scholarly program? For candidates in the creative, visual, and performing arts, has the candidate had an impact within the field, reflecting recognition and respect among other professionals and scholars nationally or internationally. The more detailed your analysis and evaluation of the candidate's work, the more useful your review will be to our deliberations.

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation within the limits established by law. Neither the names of the referees nor the identifiable contents of their letters will be shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the faculty tenure and promotion review committee in the Department of _____ and will become part of the candidate's file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels.

Your selection as a reviewer is based on the knowledge and appreciation that my colleagues and I have for your work in this field. However, institutional consideration of the candidate's case inevitably will entail review by faculty unfamiliar with this line of inquiry and with your own work and achievements. To assist those individuals in assessing the information you provide, please include a copy of your curriculum vita.

Please return your letter and copy of your current CV no later than _____ (date). If you have any questions or if you need further information, please feel free to contact me by phone at (XXX) XXX-XXXX or by e-mail: _____@unm.edu.

Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation.

Sincerely,

Chair/Director

SAMPLE

APPENDIX B

2023-2024 Academic Year - List of External Reviewers

Candidate: _____ Academic Unit: _____ Review: Tenure & Promotion / Promotion (circle one)

Reviewer Name	Title/Faculty Rank	Department/Affiliation	*Institution + Carnegie Research Classification Doctoral Universities (R1, R2)	Reviewer recommended by faculty candidate, department chair, senior faculty member	Brief rationale for recommendation	Response to invitation
StevenPinker	Johnstone Professor	Department of Psychology	Harvard University/R1	Faculty Candidate	Distinguished researcher in psycholinguistics	Yes

*The majority of external reviewers must be affiliated with R1 institutions. Minimum of six external reviewers required.

APPENDIX C

2023-2024 Academic Year - Teaching Summary Table

Candidate: _____ Academic Unit: _____

Review: Mid-probationary Tenure & Promotion / Promotion (circle one)

Academic Year	Semester	Course Number	Course title	Enrollment		21-day enrollment	Return rate	Mean Q.1	Mean Q.2	Mean Q.6
				UG	Grad					

Evaluation Kit Data

*EvaluationKit Q1 = Rate the Instructor’s Overall effectiveness (5 highly effective – 1 highly ineffective)

EvaluationKit Q2 = How comfortable do you feel approaching the instructor with questions? (5 very comfortable – 1 very uncomfortable)

EvaluationKit Q6 = When compared to other courses how much did you learn in this course? (5 much more – 1 much less)

APPENDIX D

LETTERHEAD

DATE

Dear XXX:

This specifies proposed terms of amendment to your employment contract as a member of the UNM faculty.

You currently hold a 9-month, 1.0 FTE faculty appointment as an Assistant Professor in the Department of XXXXX in a probationary status. This appointment is annually renewable subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook (FHB), which can be found on the UNM website <http://www.unm.edu/~handbook/>. Your appointment is subject to a mid-probationary retention review in year <<three>>, and a final tenure and promotion in year <<<six>>>. You are in year XXX of your probationary period.

You recently requested that your <<<mid-probationary retention and/or your final promotion and tenure>>> review be accelerated and that it take place instead in AY20XX/XX.

FHB Section B3.2.1(b) provides that by written agreement with the Chair, and the approval of the Dean and the Provost, a probationary period may be reduced and different times for the mid-probationary and/or final tenure and promotion reviews may be specified. The FHB also provides that a faculty member shall be reviewed for tenure only once.

I have agreed to grant your request to shorten your probationary period so that your <<<mid-probationary retention and/or your final promotion and tenure>>> review will now occur in AY20XX/XX. In all other respects, the terms of your current faculty appointment will remain the same.

If you agree, please sign this letter and return it to me, keeping a copy of your records.

This agreement is subject to approval by both the Dean of XXX and the UNM Provost. When your signed acceptance is received and countersigned by both the Dean and the Provost, a copy will be provided to you and this letter will become part of your employment contract and will be legally binding upon UNM and you.

Sincerely,

Chair

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I agree to the shortened probationary period and the new date for my <<<mid-probationary retention and/or final promotion and tenure>>> review stated above.