

NMSU-Alamogordo Evaluation and Promotion & Tenure Policy

Chapter I, Fundamentals

Part 1. Purpose

It is the policy of New Mexico State University (NMSU) to provide conditions under which high quality instruction, research and service may be expected to occur. The faculty and administration recognize that quality education is based on and will occur as the result of interaction and contact between professionally competent faculty and adequately prepared students.

Promotion and tenure decisions are the means by which NMSU rewards and retains its most valued scholars, sustains excellence in its instructional disciplines, and fulfills its mission to advance knowledge. The quality of faculty accomplishments largely determines the quality of the university as a whole. The processes involved in promotion and tenure must be fair, transparent, and participatory.

The integrity of the evaluation and promotion and tenure processes relies upon consultation by and between groups and individuals with successively broader views of the university, and participation by the involved faculty member. To ensure a fair process for recognition of excellent faculty, it is the policy of the university to allow faculty members to vote on the promotion or tenure of departmental colleagues, exercising collegial judgment based on criteria established for promotion and tenure by the Principal Units and consistent with the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure. To achieve fairness, transparency, and broad-based participation, all of the parties must base decisions on the documentation described in the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure.

Part 2. Rules for Evaluation and Promotion & Tenure

The NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure [Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP) 9.30 – 9.36], establish the rules relating to the faculty annual performance evaluation process, and relating to promotion and/or tenure criteria and procedures for review. These rules clarify the roles and responsibilities of the candidate applying for promotion and/or tenure, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the promotion and tenure committees and academic administrators involved in each review stage. These rules set forth the requirements for the department and college promotion and tenure committees, and the common elements which must be included in their respective promotion and tenure policies.

Each Principal Unit, such as NMSU Alamogordo (NMSU-A), shall post on its website its written promotion and tenure policy document, which must be in alignment with the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure with a link to the Office of the Provost's website. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will post the current and previous editions of the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure on its website. The Office of the Provost will also post other relevant information pertaining to the annual promotion and tenure review processes to explain and facilitate the process for candidates and academic administrators alike. NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP) supersede NMSU-A policies, if a conflict exists between the documents.

Upon hiring of a regular faculty member, the individual's assigned NMSU-A division head will provide the faculty member with electronic copies of applicable promotion and tenure policies. The division head will also provide, electronically, a similar packet of materials to faculty members who are eligible to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the spring semester prior the academic year in which the individual's application for promotion and/or tenure will be made.

Part 3. Community Colleges

The mission of the NMSU community colleges is to provide open access to quality education and support economic and cultural life in prescribed service areas. Community colleges provide traditional liberal arts education, vocational and technical training, contract training, community interest classes, and developmental education. Every effort is made to keep programs and curricula flexible to accommodate varied and expanding community educational needs. Since the community college's primary role is the dissemination of information, more emphasis is placed on teaching and advising in the evaluation process.

A. General Qualifications for Faculty Appointment (Community College System) (ARP 6.51)

The following qualifications are listed in the order of their relative importance: teaching is more important than professional service; professional service is more important than other service; other service is more important than research.

a. Teaching

This element is commonly considered to include the teacher's knowledge of the field; awareness of and the application of developments in the field; skill in arousing interest and evoking responses in students; skill in stimulating students to think critically, to understand the interrelationship of fields of knowledge and the application of knowledge to human problems; and skill in awakening students to a realization of the social, political, economic, and ethical implications of their study.

b. Professional Service

This element includes, above all, the faculty member's service with respect to the organization, development, and welfare of the community college and the university. This element also includes service to any individual or group needing the specific benefits of the faculty member's professional knowledge and skills.

c. Other Service

This element allows a faculty member to be recognized for service to the general welfare of the community, which is interrelated with the welfare of the community college.

d. Research

Research or other creative work is not required at the community colleges. However, those faculty members who produce research and/or creative work should be encouraged, and such work should be considered for appointment, promotion, and tenure considerations.

The academic credentials of all community college instructors will be reviewed by the community college division heads, and by the chief instructional officer to meet the guidelines established by the main campus departments. Instructors must also be approved by the campus executive officer and by the executive vice president and provost.

B. Specific Qualifications for Faculty Appointment (Community College System) (ARP 6.51)

In the following statements of required time in each rank, it should be emphasized that the periods stated are to be considered as minimum and not as maximum, under normal circumstances. It is recognized that the time served in a rank at another institution may be taken into consideration. It is also recognized that the evidence for various fields, to some extent, and standards of judgment cannot be rigidly uniform.

a. *Junior Ranks*

1. *Instructor*

This rank should be given to persons with the necessary education and/or experience to teach within the community college concept.

2. *Assistant Professor*

To be considered for this rank, a person must have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively in the person's field. It is strongly believed that a good teacher must constantly remold the course or project materials in light of new knowledge derived from the teacher's own creative scholarship, as well as that of others. To be considered for this rank, a person should expect to serve at least 3 years as an instructor under normal circumstances. An assistant professor may be expected to have a thorough command of the subject matter of some segment of the general field of the discipline, in addition to a comprehension of the whole.

b. *Senior Ranks*

Appointment or promotion to either senior rank should represent an implicit prediction on the part of the community college that the individual so appointed will make sound contributions to teaching and learning during the remainder of the individual's life. It should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's promise in teaching, professional service, other service, and, if applicable, research and/or creative service. By this statement, it is meant that serious attention must be given to the caliber of the candidate's professional stature, for this will probably be the key factor in determining the extent to which past performance in teaching and service may be expected to carry on through continuing and enlarged contributions.

1. *Associate Professor*

An associate professor occupies a position adjunct to that of the professor. This person's views contribute to community college policy. An associate professor should have competence and a mature outlook over a fairly large part of the professor's whole field. A candidate for an associate professorship is expected to have demonstrated capacities in the lower ranks and should offer evidence that the candidate's teaching has kept abreast of times in method and subject matter, that a greater degree of maturity has been attained, and that there has been a retention of interest in competent teaching and service. To be considered for this rank, a person should expect to serve for at least 4 years as an assistant professor under normal circumstances.

2. *Professor*

Appointment or promotion of individuals to professorships is obviously the most critical step in determining the future of the community college system and the university. There should, therefore, be a clear understanding of the functions and qualifications of individuals in this rank. A professor, through teaching and service, should have demonstrated substantial command of the professor's whole field, sound scholarship, and a mature view of the discipline. Promotion to

professor should not be considered to be forthcoming merely because of years of service to the community college and the university (it should not be expected based on any number of years as an associate professor) or because a continuous contract is achieved. Rather, a person being considered for a professorship is expected to have maintained all the qualities and conditions required for tenure and for the rank of associate professor. Additionally, a professor should exhibit special stature in the professor's discipline, in leadership, and in both teaching and service.

Part 4. The NMSU-A Promotion & Tenure (P & T) Committee

Due to their size, the organizational structure for tenure review at the Alamogordo campus consists of one promotion and tenure committee. Based on availability of faculty, the P & T committee will consist of eight faculty, six senior tenure-track faculty (if six senior tenure-track faculty are not available, then one junior faculty may serve in place of a senior faculty member), and two senior college-track faculty (if senior college-track is not available, then junior faculty can serve in place). Members are elected in the spring semester, with terms beginning the following fall semester. The election is the responsibility of the Chair of the P & T committee. Division heads are ineligible to serve on the P & T committee. The term of committee membership will be 3-years. Membership will be evaluated every two years by the outgoing chair.

- Faculty members elected to the P & T committee may serve no more than two consecutive terms.
- The Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary will be elected by the P & T members. The Chair must be a full tenured professor and the Vice Chair must be a senior tenured professor. The Chair only votes in case of a tie. Officer elections will be held every two years, unless an emergency arises, and an officer must step down from his or her elected position.
- In cases when there are not enough full professors on the P & T to vote on full professor promotion portfolios, all full professors on the campus will be asked to participate, review, and vote on the full professor portfolios. Note: College faculty vote only on promotion for non-tenured track faculty. Only tenured faculty may vote on tenure decisions.
- During meetings, Robert Rules of Order will be used and members of the P & T committee will be obligated to follow procedures of Executive Session.
- If a member has any conflict of interest with any candidate, the member will recuse himself or herself from all deliberation on that candidate.
- Members who permanently are unable to serve should resign. The chair may also call a vote to remove a member. Vacancies can be remedied by P & T committee appointment until an election can be held.
- During periods, when the committee experiences a heavier than normal workload, the Chair may negotiate reassigned time for P&T committee work from the appropriate supervisor.

A. The Duties of the P & T committee are:

- To advise the NMSU-A administration on issuance of temporary and/or continuous contracts to tenure track faculty and promotions of regular faculty;
- To advise the administration on the evaluation of annual performance of pre-tenured faculty;
- To assist faculty on preparing promotion and tenure documents; and
- To advise tenured faculty on how to improve performance after they have received two consecutive "needs improvement" ratings.

Part 5. Glossary of Terms Used in NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure (ARP 9.30 – 9.36)

Allocation of Effort: The percentage of effort, agreed upon by the faculty member and department head or supervisor, that the faculty member will devote to each of the major categories of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, extension, outreach and other assigned duties. (See ARP 6.61 Faculty Assignments – General)

Annual Performance Evaluation: (See ARP 9.31 – [Effective AY 18/19] Annual Performance Evaluation – Regular Faculty)

College Faculty: A faculty member on a regular (0.5 FTE or greater) appointment, who is not eligible for tenure, but is eligible for advancement in faculty rank (promotion). (See ARP 6.03 Employment Categories)

Core Document: A document submitted in the Portfolio for promotion or tenure that includes several specific elements: a routing form, cover sheet, table of contents, curriculum vitae, executive summary, department head and dean letters, prior and current Allocation of Effort statements, annual performance evaluations, summary of teaching evaluations, external reviews and, for community colleges, letters of support. (See ARP 9.31 – [Effective AY 18/19] Annual Performance Evaluation – Regular Faculty and ARP 9.35 Part 6, “Portfolio Preparation by Candidate”).

Department Head: Department head refers to the academic department head or equivalent supervisor, which may include program coordinator or superintendent, depending upon the unit and as determined by the cognizant dean or community college chief academic officer. This role at NMSU-A is performed by the division head

Documentation File: An organized collection of supplemental documents and other materials that supports, explains, or clarifies the quality and significance of the candidate’s work. Administrators and committee members must have access to this file, which is stored by the Principal Unit.

Executive Summary: A summative report and personal statement by the faculty member that addresses the faculty member’s activities in and philosophies regarding teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, extension and outreach, and other assigned areas.

Extension and Outreach: Extension involves the process of defining and building relationships between communities and the university to extend university resources and intellectual expertise through coalition building, non-formal educational programs, and applied research designed to address locally identified needs. Outreach involves an organized and planned program of activities which are offered to representative groups of citizens of New Mexico and the nation or internationally; these activities bring the resources of the university to bear in a coherent and strategic fashion for the benefit of the receiving entity.

External Reviewer: A person from outside NMSU who writes a letter of evaluation of a candidate’s Portfolio. (See ARP 9.34, Part 3.AA; ARP 9.35, Part 5.B.9.)

NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure: Rules ARP 9.30 – 9.36 are collectively referred to as the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.

Four Areas of Faculty Effort: As used in this rule and the other rules governing promotion and tenure at NMSU, the Four Areas of Faculty Effort refers to: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service. (See ARP 9.31, Part 3)

Joint Appointment: A faculty line shared between two departments or colleges; the appointee enjoys all the privileges and incurs all the responsibilities normally given in each area.

Letters of Support: Letters submitted to support a candidate's application for promotion or tenure that are distinct from external reviews (See Definition I. above), but serve a similar purpose at the community colleges. (See ARP 9.34, Part 3.AA.6.; ARP 9.35, Part 10.C.)

Mid-Probationary Review: A formal, non-mandatory mid-term assessment requested by a Tenure-Track Faculty member of their professional development and progress toward tenure. The Mid-Probationary Review is in addition to the annual performance evaluation.

NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure: Rules 9.30 through 9.36 and 9.40 through 9.43 of the Administrative Rules and Procedures of NMSU posted at <https://manual.nmsu.edu/policies-and-procedures/>

Peer Evaluation: Assessment of teaching style, content, and effectiveness gained through observation by colleagues; the observations may come in such forms as classroom visits, participation in web-based courses, review of videotaped teaching, or reviews of course materials collected/created by the faculty member being reviewed.

Performance Evaluation: An annual report prepared by the faculty member documenting activities in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, service, and other assigned areas. The department head provides the faculty member with a written appraisal of the faculty member's performance.

Portfolio: Consists of the Core Document and Documentation File that supports the candidate's case for promotion or tenure. A Portfolio is also sometimes referred to as a dossier.

Post-tenure Review: An annual review designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, extension, outreach and other assigned areas. The Performance Evaluation generally serves the above aim; however, if deemed necessary due to deficiencies, a more extensive review may be initiated. (See ARP 9.36 – [Effective AY 18/19] Post-Tenure Review.)

Principal Unit: A tenure home unit responsible for conducting annual faculty performance evaluations and making promotion and tenure recommendations. This definition includes Departments, Colleges, Community Colleges, Cooperative Extension Service, and the University Library, but not centers, clusters, or institutes.

Probationary Period: The cumulative amount of time spent under term appointments while on the “tenure-track.” (See ARP 9.36 – [Effective AY 18/19] Post-Tenure Review).

Research: See Scholarship

Scholarship: Both creative activity and product, scholarship includes discovery through original research; integration through synthesizing and reintegration of knowledge; application through professional practice; and teaching through transformation of knowledge. (See Boyer, 1990 and ARP 9.31 Part 3.D. “Scholarship and Creative Activity”.)

Service: Contribution to the institution and development of the university, as well as provision of service to local, state, national, or international agency or other organization in need of the faculty member's professional expertise.

Supporting Documents: Material available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the Documentation File that serves to further support, explain, or clarify the Core Document.

Tenure: Continuous contract granted after a probationary period to a faculty member candidate that gives protection from dismissal without due process; the primary purpose of tenure is to protect academic freedom and offer economic security.

Tenure Home: The Principle Unit where tenure and rank resides or will reside.

Tenure-Track Faculty: A faculty member in their pre-tenure probationary period, eligible for tenure but who has not yet been granted tenure, sometimes also referred to as "candidate" (as are faculty members seeking promotion).

Tenured Faculty: A faculty member who has been awarded tenure by the executive vice president and provost or designee.

NMSU-Alamogordo Evaluation and Promotion & Tenure Policy

, Annual Evaluation and Allocation of Effort

Part 1. Purpose

Regular faculty at New Mexico State University-Alamogordo (NMSU-A) are annually evaluated based upon their performance in the four areas of faculty effort and in accordance with their respective assigned workload's Allocation of Effort (AOE).

A. Service to Mission

A successful process considers whether the faculty member is effectively serving the mission of the university, as defined by NMSU-A criteria and the individual's agreed upon goals and objectives. This means, for example, that the efforts of a faculty member made in response to administrators or committees are taken into account during promotion and tenure evaluation.

B. Consideration for Variance in Duties

The efforts of two faculty members may vary at the same points in their careers according to their particular strengths and division needs. Faculty assignments in different divisions may vary.

C. Equitable Treatment

To ensure equitable treatment, every faculty member will complete an Allocation of Effort statement as part of the Annual Performance Evaluation process. When determining the Allocation of Effort, decisions must be made without regard to race, national origin, gender, gender identity, age, disability, political views, religion, marital status, sexual orientation, special friendships, or animus towards candidates. Further, for the Allocation of Effort statement to be accurate and useful, administrators at all levels must understand and take an active role in avoiding institutional factors that could produce an undue burden on untenured faculty members.

Part 2. Policies

A. Perspective on the Evaluation Process

Performance Evaluations are conducted annually in accordance with the timeline for promotion and tenure as described in Chapter III, Promotion and Tenure.

The timeline described in Chapter III, Promotion and Tenure, will be followed by faculty and appropriate supervisors involved in Annual Performance Evaluations at NMSU-A. This timeline clearly defines the appropriate deadline for each step in the process.

Each college will develop separate policies, procedures, and criteria for the promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. These are subject to final approval by the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations. These promotions will be handled in the same time period and with documentation similar to that for tenure-track faculty promotions (ARP 9.18).

All regular faculty members are required to meet with their division head during the evaluation process to discuss the individual's progress toward promotion and/or tenure as appropriate, the recording of their objectives and goals, and the division's faculty evaluation requirement.

The division head will certify that the Annual Performance Evaluation meeting with the faculty member occurred. The faculty member's supervisor must meet with them before the performance evaluation is considered final. After the evaluation meeting, the supervisor approves the faculty member's evaluation within the Faculty Success (formerly Digital Measures) work flow. Workflow approval serves as an electronic signature for the evaluation process. If a faculty member disagrees with their evaluation, they may submit a written rebuttal to the VPAA within 10-days.

B. NMSU-A Allocation of Effort Common Expectations by Rank

Introduction

This section seeks to explain the common expectations for effort based on faculty rank. The following descriptions are based on the NMSU ARP, 9.33, "The Professorial Ranks." The purpose of this document is to recommend to faculty a set of common expectations, as described in NMSU policy, on which they can base their allocation of effort which is negotiated with the division head/supervisor for each academic year. The following is not a set of "requirements." This section outlines recommended expectations of each faculty rank in order to prepare faculty to make progress toward promotion and tenure. Because of the mission of NMSU Alamogordo, the number of faculty, and since service is an expectation of the job description of faculty members, the evaluation document at NMSU-A campus requires faculty members to include service on their Allocation of Effort document beginning with the level of Assistant Professor. Fulfillment of the recommended expectations contained in this section does not guarantee promotion and or tenure.

a. Instructor

"An instructor's job description primarily relates to teaching or its equivalent and usually does not include scholarship and creative activity." (ARP, 9.33)

The Instructor is to focus all of their effort on teaching. The Instructor is expected to demonstrate expertise within their discipline through practical, applied, and/or related experience. (ARP, 9.33) Thus, the Instructor is not expected to allocate effort to service or to scholarship and creative activity. However, after the first year, it is recommended that Instructors begin to allocate some effort to scholarship/professional development, as well as service if they plan to apply for promotion to Assistant Professor. In all cases, however, the bulk of effort of an Instructor should be devoted to teaching.

b. Assistant Professor

"An assistant professor is expected to have a thorough command of the subject matter of some segment of the discipline, in addition to a comprehension of the whole." (ARP, 9.33) The Assistant Professor, in addition to teaching, allocates effort to scholarship, in order to increase their command of their subject matter. Attending conferences to increase knowledge in one's discipline and in teaching is recommended. At this rank, the Assistant Professor is not expected to present at conferences. During the time a faculty member holds the rank of Assistant Professor, if they plan to apply for promotion to Associate Professor, it is

recommended that the faculty member allocate some effort to service, institutional and community, in order to establish a record of service.

c. Associate Professor

“An associate professor must demonstrate competence, continuous progress, and a command over a large part of the academic field.” (ARP, 9.33)

“It is expected that evidence showing high quality of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity and/or extension and outreach or service has been provided and is current.” (ARP, 9.33)

The Associate Professor demonstrates all of the expectations of the previous ranks. In addition, the Associate Professor has made contributions to the institution and the community through their service in both. During the time a faculty member holds the rank of Associate Professor, if they plan to apply for promotion to full professor, it is recommended that they allocate effort to leadership in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, in order to establish a record of leadership.

d. Professor

“A professor, sometimes referred to as a “full professor,” has established disciplinary, intellectual, and institutional leadership.” (ARP, 9.33)

“The professor demonstrates command of the disciplinary field as evidenced by teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service.” (ARP, 9.33)

The Professor demonstrates all of the expectations of the previous ranks. In addition, the Professor has demonstrated leadership in each area of evaluation: teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service (institutional and community). It is the demonstration of leadership that distinguishes the professor from the other ranks.

C. Evaluation Emphasizes Three Areas of Faculty Effort

Serious attention must be given to performance in the three Areas of Faculty Effort: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, and service. The relative importance of each of these areas varies according to the cumulative Allocation of Effort statements. Each area is vital to NMSU-A’s ability to achieve its mission, and the performance of a faculty member will be viewed as an indication of future contributions. Each faculty member must have at least one goal aligned with NMSU’s strategic plan.

a. Teaching and Advising Area of Faculty Performance

Description of Teaching and Advising Activities

Elements of Teaching as Essential Criterion – Teaching is central to NMSU’s mission. For those who teach, effectiveness in teaching and advising is an essential criterion for tenure and for advancement in rank. The teaching and advising category includes all forms of university-level instructional activity, as well as advising undergraduate and graduate students, both within and outside the university community. Such activities are commonly characterized by the

dissemination of knowledge within a faculty member's area of expertise; skill in stimulating students to think critically and to apply knowledge to human problems; the integration and application of relevant domestic and international, social, political, economic, and ethical implications into class content; the preparation of students for careers in specific fields of study; and the creation and supervision of appropriate field or clinical practice.

Responsibilities of Teaching– Teaching responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, preparation for and teaching of a variety of courses, seminars, and other academic learning experiences; non-credit workshops and informal instructional activities; course and program development; team or collaborative teaching; web-based instruction, both on and off campus supervision of student research, performances, or productions; service on graduate student program and research committees; field supervision and administration of field or clinical experiences; production of course materials, textbooks, web pages and other electronic aids to learning; and others.

Common Responsibilities for Teaching

Assumptions:

- Teach 27-30 credits (1.0 FTE) or equivalent with reassigned time
 - Course expectations are clearly stated.- . Instructor is expected to fulfill reassigned duties with diligence. (Reassigned time will be acknowledged and evaluated in a separate section.)
- Demonstrate command of subject matter
- Demonstrated by content updates to the course during QM reviews; by adoption of new textbooks and materials like open source materials; by presenting at content-specific conferences; by attendance at content-specific conferences; by ongoing membership in content-related professional organizations; by taking content-related workshops or courses—“content-related” means subjects in or closely related to the discipline; by book reviews, including adoption reviews, of content-related texts; by recommending library acquisitions.
- Performance appropriate for rank (minimum standards) for Teaching & Related
 - Instructor - successfully delivers courses and may design his / her own versions.
 - Assistant Professor - actively and routinely participates in trainings and curriculum dev. Is responsible for the design and assessment of courses in his / her area.
 - Associate Professor - satisfies role of Assistant Professor and might mentor newer faculty. Takes a leadership role in initiatives within his/her area.
 - Full Professor - satisfies role of Associate Professor and routinely takes a leadership role on teaching and curricular initiatives within division, on campus, and system. Provides mentorship.
- Convey course content effectively to students - Evaluation criteria (25% of Teaching):
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently; Designing new innovative teaching approach/project...
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of innovative and active learning methods. Strong evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. Strong evidence of the use of scaffolded learning. Student evaluations and class observations reveal that course content is effectively conveyed and encourages active learning.

- Level 2 - Limited evidence of innovative and active learning methods. Limited evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. Limited evidence of the use of scaffolded learning. Student evals. and class observations reveal limited success in conveying course content.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of active learning methods. No evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. No evidence of scaffolded learning. Student evaluations and class observations may reveal a very passive atmosphere and ineffectively conveyed course content.
 - Possible methods to use in justification:
 - Activities in classes that are meaningfully sequenced to support learning.
 - Variety of learning strategies and individual supports used within teaching.
 - Classroom observations and peer observations
 - Assessment data showing student success
 - Discussion of student evaluation data
- Assess student learning and utilizes that student learning to make course adjustments - Evaluation criteria (25% of Teaching)
 - Rankings:
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently; course adjustments demonstrably enhance student success....
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. Strong correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/ environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self-assessment is ongoing.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. Limited correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/ environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self-assessment is sporadic.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. No correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/ environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self-assessment is missing.
 - Possible methods to use in justification:
 - Describe assessment activities on the course level and, if appropriate, the program level.
 - Describe changes made to courses based on the assessment.
 - Describe changes to program based on the assessment.
 - Discuss student evaluation data
 - Discuss assessment reports generated
- Demonstrate revision and updates of curricula - Evaluation criteria (25% of Teaching)
 - Rankings:
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently;
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. Strong

- evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. Strong evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. Limited evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. Limited evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. No evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. No evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.
 - Possible methods to use in justification
 - Discuss updated/revised pedagogy
 - Discuss updated/revised activities and assessment
 - Discuss incorporation of new technology
 - Discuss student evaluation data
 - Discuss changes in syllabi
 - Discuss changes in instructional materials (textbook, hand-outs, videos, etc.)
- Demonstration of leadership in teaching - Evaluation criteria (25% of Teaching)
 - Rankings:
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 and exceeds leadership for rank.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of leadership in teaching appropriate to rank as evidenced by facilitating training in methodology, teaching practice, assessment; mentoring others; routinely sharing materials; etc.
 - Level 2 - Participates in supporting roles, but needs assistance in developing leadership appropriate to his/her rank.
 - Level 1 - Has not taken or sought leadership roles appropriate to his/her rank.

Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

Evidence to Assess Teaching Effectiveness – Teaching is a complex and multifaceted activity. Therefore, several forms of evidence should be used to assess comprehensively teaching effectiveness. Each form of evidence will be weighted according to its importance in evaluating teaching. Such documentation must demonstrate command of subject matter, the ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students, and assessment of student learning. It may also demonstrate revision and updates of curricula, and the integration of scholarship (for faculty who produce scholarship) and service with teaching. Materials appropriate for evaluating teaching should include:

- Evidence from the instructor,
- Evidence from other professionals,
- Evidence from students, and
- Evidence of student learning.

It is not necessary for all four types of evidence to be used, but, in accordance with state law, at a minimum, student evaluations and one other form of evidence must be used.

b. Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development:

Description of Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development Activities

Rationale – This understanding is grounded in Boyer’s (1990)^a concept of the four scholarships:

- The scholarship of discovery involves processes, outcomes, and the passionate commitment of the professoriate and others in the university to disciplined inquiry and exploration in the development of knowledge and skills;
- The scholarship of teaching involves dynamic, reciprocal, and critically reflective processes among teachers and learners at the university and in the community in which their activity and interaction enriches and transforms knowledge and skills, taught and learned;
- The scholarship of engagement refers to the many and varied ways to responsibly offer and employ knowledge and skills to matters of consequence to the university and the community;
- The scholarship of integration is the process by which knowledge and skills are assessed, interpreted, and applied in new and creative ways to produce new, richer, and more comprehensive, insights, understanding, and outcomes.

a. Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

NMSU Definition of Scholarship and Creative Activity: Products developed through these processes are typically public, open to peer review, and available for use by others, but may also include classified projects, protected intellectual property or other confidential materials. Scholarship and creative activity can take many forms, including but not limited to refereed publications and patented intellectual property. At NMSU’s community colleges, scholarship and creative activity includes scholarship that is also evidenced by professional development activities that disseminate knowledge to the college’s learning communities.

Acknowledgement of Land Grant Mission: This definition reflects the university’s mission as the state’s land-grant university, serving the needs of New Mexico’s diverse population through comprehensive programs of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service. It addresses the breadth and diversity of scholarly and creative activity among faculty, staff, and students through which this mission is fulfilled.

Common Responsibilities for Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development

- Performance appropriate for rank (minimum standards) for Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development
 - Instructor - should be encouraged to attend professional development opportunities, but only required for online trainings & similar requirements.
 - Assistant Professor - may express leadership, but is active and routinely participates in scholarship, creative activity or professional development opportunities.
 - Associate Professor - takes facilitator role. Might collaborate in organizing or delivering scholarship, creative activity or professional development opportunities.
 - Full Professor - routinely takes a leadership role and/or facilitator role. Should achieve Level 4 in “leadership” in Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development.

- Development of knowledge and skills - Evaluation criteria (25% of Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development including attendance at confs., prof. dev. events, earning additional degree, seminars, staying current in literature, brown bags, etc. This includes both within the discipline and pedagogy.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development.
 - Possible methods to use in justification
 - Document local and/or national conference participation within field of study
 - Attend Professional Development opportunities include narrative (date, time, session title) and certificates earned (as appropriate)
 - Describe creative research (artwork created, articles written and creative teaching materials developed)
 - Describe books and/or articles utilized in development of expertise in field of knowledge
 - Describe participation in a regional, national, or international organization related to your subject area
- Application of knowledge and skills - Evaluation Criteria (25% of Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills to curriculum development., course (re)design, assessment processes, etc.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills.
 - Possible methods to use in justification
 - Describe how knowledge is applied in the classroom environment acquired through Professional Development activities
 - Describe new or updated assignments, such as updated class handouts, lectures, syllabus, and/or media
 - Describe incorporation of new technology
- Sharing of knowledge and skills - Evaluation Criteria (25% of Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills in the classroom, campus, community, professional organizations, advisory boards via publishing, presenting, holding exhibitions, etc.

- Sharing must be communicated through a variety of venues and modalities.
- Level 2 - Limited evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills.
 - Level 1 - No evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills.
 - Possible methods to use in justification:
 - Describe sessions presented at NMSU-A (certificates)
 - Describe sessions presented at regional and national conferences (conference schedules, emails)
 - Describe lectures presented in field of expertise to the Institution, other institutions, regional, national, or international organizations
 - Describe presentation of creative work, such as artwork exhibited, articles published, public performances
 - Demonstration of leadership in professional development - Evaluation Criteria (25% of Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence in organizing or providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence in providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.
 - Level 1 - No evidence in providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.
 - Possible methods to use in justification:
 - Describe a Lecture/Workshop presented at a National Conference (program, abstract)
 - Describe a Lecture/Workshop presented to the Institution, fellow Universities, National and/or Regional organizations (program, abstract)
 - Describe creative project presented at the Institution, fellow Universities, National or Regional Organizations (program)
 - Describe creative projects presented in local, regional, national publications. (flyer, photographs, article, reviews, program)
 - Describe published articles. (abstract or excerpt)
 - Describe innovative skills and techniques developed and shared
 - Officer in a professional, discipline-related organization

Note: Parenthesis includes recommended documentation

Evaluation Criteria for Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development

All scholarly activity and outcomes, regardless of funding source, must consider the following criteria adapted from Diamond (2002)^b:

- The activity's purposes, goals, and objectives are clear. Its objectives are realistic and achievable. It addresses important questions in the field.
- The activity reveals a high level of discipline-related expertise. The scholar brings to the activity a high level of relevant knowledge, skills, artistry, and reflective understanding.

- Appropriate methods are used for the activity, including principles of honesty, integrity, and objectivity. The methods have been chosen wisely and applied effectively. They also allow for replication or elaboration.
- The activity achieves its goals, and its outcomes have significant impact. It adds consequentially to the field. It breaks new ground or is innovative. It leads to further exploration or new avenues for exploration for the scholar and for others.
- The activity and outcomes have been presented appropriately and effectively to their various audiences.
- The activity and outcomes are judged meritorious and significant by one's peers.
- The scholar has critically evaluated the activity and outcomes and has assessed the impact and implications on the greater community, the community of scholars, and on one's own work. The scholar uses this assessment to improve, extend, revise, and integrate subsequent work.

b. Diamond, Robert M. (2002). *Serving on promotion, tenure, and faculty review committees: A faculty guide, 2nd ed.* Bolton, MA: Ankar Publishing.

c. Service

Description of Service Activities

Service is an essential component of the university's mission and requires the faculty member to contribute to the organization and development of the university, as well as to provide service to local, state, national, or international agencies, organizations or institutions which may benefit from the faculty member's professional knowledge and skills.

Common Responsibilities for Service

- Performance appropriate for rank (minimum standards) for Service
 - Instructor - should be encouraged to participate in committees.
 - Assistant Professor - will participate and contribute to university's service needs.
 - Associate Professor - takes an active role in collaborating, leading, and contributing to university's service needs.
 - Full Professor - routinely takes an active role in collaborating, leading, and contributing to university's service needs. Could also include mentoring junior faculty.
 - Service to the institution (Helping the institution to run) – Evaluation criteria (50% of Service) Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of significant service and/or accomplishment in committees (including at least one major*), subcommittees, taskforces, statewide articulation, student organization advisor, and events that support the NMSU-A Strategic Plan.
 - Level 2 - Limited evidence of significant service and/or accomplishment in committees, subcommittees, taskforces, statewide articulation, student organization advisor, and events that support the NMSU-A Strategic Plan.
 - Level 1 - No evidence and/or minimal evidence of committee participation. Limited to no participation in events related to NMSU-A Strategic Plan.

- Possible methods to use in justification
 - Standing committee work (minutes, subcommittee work, products)
 - Ad-hoc committees (Car Show, 60th anniversary)
 - Search committee
 - College-sponsored events
 - Service to the NMSU system
 - Student organization advisor
 - Student academic advising
- Service to the community – Evaluation criteria (25% of Service)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Participation in multiple volunteer activities or an activity that involves ongoing service during the year that supports the community.
 - Level 2 - Participation in at least one volunteer activity during the year that supports the community.
 - Level 1 - No participation in events related to community involvement.
 - Possible methods to use in justification
 - Volunteer work outside of the institution within field of expertise
 - Volunteer work outside of the institution outside field of expertise
 - Products from volunteer work (website, exit surveys)
 - Letter of support
- Demonstration of leadership in institutional or community service – Evaluation criteria (25 % of service)
 - Rankings
 - Level 4 - Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.
 - Level 3 - Strong evidence of leadership in service appropriate to rank for example chairing committees, leading taskforces, chairing subcommittees, organizing community service events, etc.
 - Level 2 - Evidence shows participation in supporting roles, but may need assistance in developing leadership appropriate to his/her rank.
 - Level 1 - No evidence in leadership in service.
 - Possible methods to use in justification:
 - Describe service as University Committee or Subcommittee Chair, Co-Chair or Secretary and how leadership benefitted the committee and the university
 - Describe important contributions to tasks and duties performed by the University committee
 - Office or position held within volunteer work outside of the Institution

Evaluation Criteria for Service

The type and amount of service that a faculty member performs should be determined in consultation with the appropriate administrator(s). All relevant activities in which a faculty member participates should receive appropriate consideration for promotion and tenure decisions. Service contributions should be evaluated based on how they are applied and how they draw upon the professional expertise of the faculty member.

Part 3. Performance Evaluation Forms and Process

The performance of each regular faculty member, including regular college track faculty, must be reviewed at least once a year. The Annual Performance Evaluation provides documentation of expectations and a record of faculty performance relative to the stated expectations in the agreed upon Allocation of Effort documents. Each community college determines and uses its own performance evaluation form.

Performance evaluation forms include the following elements:

A. Allocation of Effort Statement (AOE):

AOEs shall also be a part of the candidate/faculty member's tenure and/or promotion portfolio, and all aspects of the agreed upon efforts shall be factored into the recommendation made at each step of the Promotion and Tenure process.

Allocation percentages will be negotiated by the faculty member and the division head in alignment with ARP Rule 6.61, and approved annually by the faculty member's division head and the VPAA. The teaching load for community college faculty members will usually be the equivalent of 15 credits per semester or from 27 to 30 credits per academic year. The teaching load shall be prorated for short courses or courses taught over part of a semester (ARP 6.61). If agreement cannot be reached between a faculty member and the division head, the VPAA may determine the contents of the AOE. Approval of the AOE by the VPAA is final.

The AOE and assigned percentages may be altered during the year with the mutual agreement of the faculty member, division head, and VPAA to reflect changing circumstances, such as service commitments, time for scholarship and creative activity, changes to teaching load, advising assignments, reassigned duties, etc.

The AOE of pre-tenured faculty members will be routed to the P & T Committee for review to ensure that the goals appear to be appropriate for the rank.

At the minimum, the AOE will contain the following elements:

- a. Percentage of effort to be devoted to the three areas of faculty effort. The total percentage must be 100%. The minimum for any category is 0%. At least one goal must be aligned with NMSU's strategic plan.
- b. A statement of what NMSU-A considers a full teaching and advising load.

B. Current Position Description.

C. Submission from Faculty Member:

A written section submitted by the faculty member detailing and citing accomplishments in relation to the four areas of faculty effort as agreed upon in the AOE from the previous academic year.

D. Written Review by Division Head:

A written review will be provided from the division head including specific commendations, concerns, and recommendations in each of the areas of performance, as well as separate comments about progress toward promotion and tenure.

Part 4. PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. NMSU Generic Process Instructions:

Early in each spring semester (refer to timeline), the faculty member is expected to prepare their written narrative (Final AOE) of accomplishments from the previous calendar year. At this time, the division head confers with new faculty members concerning the recording of objectives and goals and the general use of the AOE form within Watermark Faculty Success (formerly Digital Measures). Division heads are also expected to meet with all new faculty members regarding progress toward promotion and tenure and to certify in writing to the VPAA that evaluation meetings have occurred.

Each regular faculty member completes the form within Faculty Success detailing and citing accomplishments in the three areas of faculty effort, of teaching, research and/or creative scholarship, and service during the performance evaluation period, including at least one goal aligned with NMSU's strategic plan. The type, method of collection, and disposition of evidence regarding effectiveness of teaching is of particular importance, and faculty should consult with the division head concerning the collection of this evidence. The performance evaluation form, along with any supplemental material, is submitted by each faculty member to the faculty member's division head through Faculty Success by the due date stipulated on the timeline for promotion and tenure as described in Chapter III of this document (Promotion and Tenure Processes).

The division head reviews the faculty performance forms, prepares a written evaluation based upon accomplishments reported as compared with previously set goals and objectives (a copy of this report will be shared with the faculty member), and confers with the VPAA, as necessary, on the written recommendation and the prepared summary to be discussed with the faculty member.

The division head meets with the faculty member to discuss all aspects of the performance evaluation, addressing separately the person's progress toward promotion, progress toward tenure, strengths, and weaknesses. This conference also serves to set goals and objectives for the ensuing year. The faculty member and division head will establish goals for all areas having an allocation of effort greater than zero. Goals should be realistic and obtainable. It is understood that some objectives may not receive funding, may not work, or may take longer than the faculty member anticipated. These goals and objectives will be recorded in writing, with a copy to the faculty member.

Division heads, along with the NMSU-A promotion and tenure committee, and VPAA formulate independent recommendations when and where appropriate regarding evaluation of the faculty member's performance on the basis of the policies stated in this manual and the NMSU ARP. These are communicated to the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations or designee.

First semester pre-tenured faculty members' evaluation document will be reviewed by the P&T Committee, but will only receive comments rather than ratings. This will serve as a guide to help faculty members determine if they are on track with the tenure process.

Annual evaluations for tenured faculty members will be provided. The Post-Tenure Review rule ensures that all tenured faculty members will receive an annual review and that those with either exceptionally fine performance or serious deficiencies in one or more areas will be identified. Special achievement (merit) shall be rewarded in a manner determined by each community college campus. For a tenured faculty member who receives two successive unsatisfactory annual reviews

with identified and uncorrected serious deficiencies, this rule provides a mechanism to establish a remedial program for correcting such deficiencies.

The annual review document will be labeled as the Post Tenure Review for each tenured faculty member. This Post Tenure Review will weigh the three areas of teaching, scholarly work, and service in proportion to the percentage each category receives in the faculty member's allocation of effort for a given year. Administrators who hold tenured faculty rank are reviewed on the performance of their faculty duties (teaching, research, and service). Administrators who have no assigned faculty duties will not be reviewed under ARP rule 9-36.

If, in the judgment of a supervisor, the annual review for a tenured faculty member shows a serious deficiency in the performance of that faculty member, the supervisor shall inform the faculty member in writing of the deficiency, as well as recommend actions the faculty member might take to address the issue. If the deficiency or deficiencies continues for two or more years and if the faculty member has not taken the corrective actions, one of two possible courses of action may ensue:

1. The faculty member may request a further review with the concurrence of a majority of the tenured faculty on the P&T committee by requesting that the supervisor submit the record of poor performance and suggested actions to the committee, or
2. If the faculty member does not request the review, the supervisor may initiate such a review with the concurrence of a majority of the tenured faculty on the P&T committee.

If serious deficiency is found, a specific remedial program shall be developed in consultation with the faculty member that includes procedures, criteria for evaluating progress, and a reasonable timetable. If the faculty member's teaching needs improvement, such a program might include participation in programs offered by the Teaching Academy, mentoring by a recipient of teaching awards, intensive study of videotaped classroom sessions, etc. However, in accordance with NMSA 1978, Section 21-1-7.1, part E (1), any remedial effort can be no shorter than two years in length.

Whether or not a tenured faculty member accepts the recommendation to participate in a work enhancement program, and whether or not the member performs well in the program, the faculty member's performance will be judged on subsequent work. The more complete review shall not be initiated for any tenured faculty member more frequently than once every five years.

If a tenured faculty member's teaching deficiencies are considered by the executive vice president and provost or designee to be very serious and to have been uncorrected at the conclusion of the agreed time period, and further, if there is evidence that the faculty member's teaching performance has deteriorated since the award of tenure such that the faculty member's teaching performance is now typically unsatisfactory, the executive vice president and provost or designee shall recommend loss of tenure for the faculty member in question. The current designee is the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations.

If tenure is to be revoked, the university shall follow the processes specified in Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP) Chapter 9, subject to the safeguards of ARP 10.01 Due Process.

Every year, the VPAA shall report to the NMSU executive vice president and provost or designee (the current designee is the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations):

- The number of tenured faculty receiving annual evaluations.
- The number receiving unsatisfactory evaluations.
- The number of tenured faculty who have been the subject of a more detailed peer review.

- The number of faculty who have participated in a remedial program as a result.
- The results of those programs.
- The number of faculty whose tenure have been revoked.

B. NMSU-A Specific Annual Performance Processes:

a. *Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio:*

This document is to showcase the faculty member's performance and achievements. Prior to receipt of tenure for tenure track regular faculty and promotion to Associate Professor for college track regular faculty, this document includes:

- A summary of the faculty members job duties and courses taught.
- the draft Allocation of Effort Statement for the academic year beginning;
- an unsigned allocation of effort for the previous academic year with the narrative of accomplishments. If agreed upon performance expectations were not met, documentation and an explanation are required concerning those items. Renegotiating performance expectations that cannot be achieved with the division head during the academic year is recommended to avoid unmet expectations;
- student evaluations for the previous academic year addressed by the narrative of accomplishments;
- documentation of the described accomplishments. The quantity of documentation for each of the three areas of faculty effort should mirror the percentage of effort for each area in the finalized allocation of effort from the previous academic year

Following receipt of tenure for a tenure track faculty member or promotion to Associate Professor for college track regular faculty, the expectation exists that regular faculty have received adequate guidance concerning what documentation they should retain to support future applications for promotion. Consequently, the requirement for documentation of described accomplishments will not be required in the faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio. However, documentation needs to be available upon request. Faculty may be asked to provide documentation, but must be given adequate notice for any documentation request and adequate time to respond as stipulated for post-tenure reviews.

b. *Timeline*

1. Early in February, all faculty will submit a complete Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio to the division head
2. By mid-February an Annual Performance Evaluation will be completed by the division head. The division head will meet with the faculty member and initiate the Annual Performance Evaluation (for tenured faculty the evaluation is called the Post-Tenure Review) based on the Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio and observations of the previous year's performance.

The division head will 1) review the faculty member's performance in each of the applicable areas; 2) write separate statements addressing progress towards promotion and/or tenure and addressing problem areas which may impede progress toward promotion and/or tenure; and 3) assign an overall evaluation rating and provide the faculty member a copy of the evaluation. (See Appendix A-2 for Annual Performance Evaluation)

3. If a faculty member disagrees with the division head's evaluation, the faculty member has 10 working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the VPAA that is included in the portfolio. Once the faculty member has received feedback from the division head, the Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio will be forwarded to the VPAA. If the faculty member is pre-tenured, once the division head has met with the faculty member, the P & T Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio will be completed by the faculty member and submitted to the P & T committee for independent evaluation without the division head's evaluation.

4. For pre-tenured faculty, the P & T Committee's tenured or tenure-track members will 1) review the faculty member's performance in each of the applicable areas; 2) write separate statements addressing progress towards promotion and/or tenure and addressing problem areas which may impede progress toward promotion and/or tenure; and 3) assign an overall evaluation rating and provide the faculty member a copy of the evaluation. The Chair of the P & T committee will report the results of the vote. The Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio will be returned to the division head with the P&T committee's original evaluation form.

5. If a faculty member disagrees with the P & T Committee's evaluation, the faculty member has 10 working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that is included in the evaluation document. The Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio will be forwarded to the VPAA through the Faculty Success workflow.

6. In April, the VPAA will review each faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluations Portfolio and overall evaluation. The VPAA may agree/disagree with the assigned rating based on the Annual Evaluation Portfolio, observed activities, rebuttals, and recommendations of the P & T committee for pre-tenured faculty. The VPAA will notify all faculty, in one written document (e-mail), of the opportunity for a meeting with the VPAA. The VPAA will respond to a meeting request within 10-working days.

7. If a faculty member disagrees with the VPAA's evaluation, the faculty member has 10-working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations that is included in the portfolio. After the 10-day rebuttal period has expired, the Annual Performance Evaluation considered final.

8. By mid-May, the reports will be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs for filing.

c. Post-Tenure Review:

Tenured faculty members' annual performance evaluation is labeled the Post-Tenure Review. This Post-Tenure Review shall weight the three areas of; teaching and related activities, creative and scholarly work and professional development, and service all in proportion to the percentage each category is given in the faculty member's allocation of effort for a given year. Annual Performance Evaluation Portfolio as Post-Tenure Review: This document will showcase the faculty member's performance and achievements. This report includes:

- the complete allocation of effort statement for the academic year commencing;
- the narrative of accomplishments;
- student evaluations for the prior year

Documentation is not required for tenured faculty or for college track faculty in the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, as previously stated. However, documentation needs to be available upon request. Faculty must be given adequate notice for any documentation request and adequate time to respond.

Administrators who hold tenured faculty rank are reviewed on the performance of their faculty duties. Administrators, who have no assigned faculty duties, will not be reviewed under this policy.

If, in the judgment of a supervisor, the annual review for a tenured faculty member shows a serious deficiency in the performance of that faculty member, the supervisor shall inform the faculty member in writing of the deficiency, as well as recommend actions the faculty member may take to address the issue. If the deficiency or deficiencies continue for two or more years and, if the faculty member has not taken the corrective actions, one of two possible courses of action may ensue:

1. The faculty member may request a further review with the concurrence of a majority of the tenured faculty on the P&T committee by requesting that the supervisor submit the record of poor performance and suggested actions to the committee, or
2. If the faculty member does not request the review, the supervisor may initiate such a review with the concurrence of a majority of the tenured faculty on the P&T committee.

The more complete review shall have the aim of identifying strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member in the four areas of:

- teaching and related activities
- creative and scholarly work including professional development
- service.

All areas must be listed in proportion to the percentage each category is given in the faculty member's allocation of effort for a given year. The review will be undertaken by the P & T committee. Student evaluations must be considered when evaluating the faculty member's teaching, along with other factors.

If the reviewers conclude that the faculty member's performance is not seriously deficient, the faculty member shall be so informed and a statement of the finding placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

If a serious deficiency is found, a specific remedial program shall be developed in consultation with the faculty member that includes procedures, criteria for evaluating progress, and a reasonable timetable. If the faculty member's teaching needs improvement, such a program might include participation in programs offered by the Teaching Academy, mentoring by a recipient of teaching awards, intensive study of videotaped classroom sessions, etc. However, in accordance with NMSA 1978, Section 21-1-7.1, part E(1), any remedial effort can be no shorter than two years in length.

Whether or not a tenured faculty member accepts the recommendation to participate in a teaching or scholarly work enhancement program, and whether or not the member performs well in the program, the faculty member's performance will be judged on subsequent teaching and scholarly work according to NMSU ARP Chapter 9. The more complete review shall not be initiated for any tenured faculty member more frequently than once every five years.

If a tenured faculty member's teaching deficiencies are considered by the executive vice president and provost or designee to be very serious and to have been uncorrected at the conclusion of the agreed time period, and further, if there is evidence that the faculty member's teaching performance has deteriorated since the award of tenure such that the faculty member's teaching performance is now typically unsatisfactory, the executive vice president and provost or designee shall recommend loss of tenure for the faculty member in question. If tenure is to be revoked, the University shall follow the processes specified in ARP Chapter 9, subject to the safeguards of ARP 10.1, Due Process.

NMSU-Alamogordo Evaluation and Promotion & Tenure Policy

Chapter III: Promotion and Tenure Processes

Part 1. Purpose

Promotion and tenure decisions are the means by which NMSU rewards and retains its most valued scholars, sustains excellence in its instructional disciplines, and fulfills its mission to advance knowledge. The quality of faculty accomplishments in teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service largely determines the quality of the university as a whole. The processes involved in promotion and tenure must be fair, transparent, and participatory.

Part 2. Statement on Value of Diversity; Commitment Against Discrimination

NMSU values the richness that inquiry based upon intellectual and cultural differences brings to the university community. NMSU administrators recognize that all employment decisions must be made without regard to race, national origin, gender, gender identity, age, disability, political beliefs, religion, marital status, sexual orientation, special friendships, or animus towards candidates, taking care to avoid conflicts of interest, structural, institutional, or habitual thoughts and patterns that could lead to disparate treatment, including prohibited discrimination and undue preferential treatment. (See Also Rule 3.19 – Conflicts of Interest – Ethical Conduct; ARP 3.13 Conflicts of Interest Arising from Consensual Relationships and ARP 3.25 Prohibition of All Forms of Unlawful Discrimination.)

Part 3: Nature of Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The mission of the NMSU community colleges is to provide open access to quality education and support economic and cultural life in prescribed service areas. Community colleges provide traditional liberal arts education, vocational and technical training, contract training, community interest classes, and developmental education. Every effort is made to keep programs and curricula flexible, in order to accommodate varied and expanding community educational needs. Since the community college's primary role is the dissemination of information, more emphasis is placed on teaching and advising, in the evaluation process. Due to its size, the organizational structure for tenure review at the Alamogordo campus consists of one promotion and tenure (P&T) committee.

The integrity of the promotion and tenure processes relies upon consultation by and between groups and individuals with successively broader views of the mission of the university and participation by the involved faculty member, who has an opportunity to seek redress for perceived violations of policy, rules or procedure which might unfairly affect the outcome. In order to ensure a fair process for recognition of excellent faculty, it shall be the policy of the university to allow faculty members to vote on the promotion or tenure of departmental colleagues, exercising collegial judgment based on criteria established for promotion and tenure by the Principal Unit and consistent with the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure. University faculty and academic administrators involved in the review and recommendation or decision making processes relating to an application for promotion or tenure shall not have any conflict of interest that would render them unable to perform their duties in a

fair, impartial and equitable manner. In order to achieve fairness, transparency, and broad-based participation, all of the parties must base their decisions on the documentation described in the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure.

The NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure [Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP) 9.30 – 9.36], establish the rules relating to the faculty annual performance evaluation process, and relating to promotion and/or tenure criteria and procedures for review. These rules clarify the roles and responsibilities of the candidate applying for promotion and/or tenure, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the promotion and tenure committees and academic administrators involved in each review stage. These rules set forth the requirements for the department and college promotion and tenure committees, and the common elements which must be include in their respective promotion and tenure policies.

Each Principal Unit, such as NMSU-A, shall post on its website its written promotion and tenure policy document, which must be in alignment with the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure with a link to the Office of the Provost’s website. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will post the current and previous editions of the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure on its website. It will also post other relevant information pertaining to the annual promotion and tenure review processes to explain and facilitate the process for candidates and academic administrators alike. The NMSU ARP supersedes NMSU-A policies, if a conflict exists between the documents.

Faculty members are entitled to know what is expected of them, how they will be evaluated, and the rules of each applicable process. Upon hiring of a regular faculty member, the individual’s assigned division head will provide the faculty member with electronic copies of applicable promotion and tenure policies. The division head will also provide, electronically, a similar packet of materials to faculty members who are eligible to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the individual’s application for promotion and/or tenure will be made. Applicants for tenure or promotion must be reviewed on their performance of the duties assigned to them, following agreed-upon allocations of effort.

Part 4: Faculty Participation

A. Tenure Track Faculty

Before being considered for tenure at NMSU, eligible faculty members normally serve five years of the pre-tenure probationary period prior to applying for tenure during the sixth year of the probationary period. At the request of the faculty member and at the discretion of the administration, the pre-tenure period may be shortened. The six-year probationary period may be reduced or extended, in accordance with the guidelines in ARP 9.35, Part 2, and with the proper approvals. The probationary period begins with the first contract for a full academic year. If the NMSU Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (ARP 9.30 – 9.36) should change during a faculty member’s pre-tenure or pre-promotion period, the faculty member may elect whether to be evaluated by the former Rule or the revised Rule, and this election shall be documented in writing to clearly specify which standards and criteria will be applied in accordance with the faculty member’s election.

Tenure-Track faculty members may request, or individual units may require, a formal Mid-Probationary Review. The Mid-Probationary Review is an opportunity for feedback on the Tenure-Track faculty member/future candidate’s performance and is used to identify specific activities to enhance the candidate’s progress toward promotion and tenure. The review is formative, intended to

assist Tenure-Track faculty in achieving promotion and tenure and should take into account the allocation of work effort during the three years reviewed and be based upon the Principle Unit's criteria. The outcome must not be used as a determinant for setting merit pay or for contract continuation decisions.

B. College-Track Faculty

College-Track faculty will be eligible to be considered for advancement in rank, but are not eligible for consideration for tenure. These faculty members serve the institution under a regular academic appointment with no predetermined termination date (ARP 6.03). College-Track faculty may hold ranks as described in ARP 9.33 and are eligible to be considered for promotion. The distinct roles of the College-Track faculty should be recognized in the promotion process, and the standards and criteria for promotion should be appropriately adjusted. Promotion and Tenure Committees considering the promotion of College-Track faculty must include College-Track faculty representation of at least one College-Track faculty member.

Part 5. Professorial Ranks

Generalized descriptions of the professorial ranks as they relate to the promotion and tenure time frame are described below. (See ARP 9.31, Part 3 and ARP 9.32, Part 2 for standards and evaluation criteria)

A. Instructor

- a. Demonstrates expertise within their discipline through practical, applied, and/or related experience.
- b. Individuals new to this rank may not have demonstrated ability to conduct independent scholarship and creative activity, but there must be substantive evidence of likely success at university teaching or its equivalent.
- c. Instructors may be working toward a terminal degree.
- d. An instructor's job description primarily relates to teaching or its equivalent and usually does not include scholarship and creative activity.
- e. An instructor is not eligible for tenure.

B. Assistant Professor

- a. Tenure-Track Assistant professors must hold appropriate educational credentials in the form of accredited post-baccalaureate degree(s) (M.S., M.A., MFA, MBA, Ph.D., Sc.D., etc.) and certifications for their professional field.
- b. Outstanding experience and recognition in a professional field may be considered the equivalent of the terminal degree.
- c. An assistant professor is expected to have a thorough command of the subject matter of some segment of the discipline, in addition to a comprehension of the whole.
- d. Assistant professors are Tenure-Track Faculty members hired on a yearly, renewable contract for a maximum of seven years.
- e. During the sixth year, assistant professors typically are evaluated for promotion and tenure simultaneously, having submitted their Portfolio at the beginning of that year.
- f. However, an assistant professor may elect to apply for tenure or promotion at any time with the written approval of department head and dean or their equivalents.
- g. A faculty member may only apply for tenure once.

C. Associate Professor

- a. An associate professor is often a mid-career faculty member who has been awarded tenure.
- b. If a faculty member is initially employed at the rank of associate professor without tenure, the probationary period may vary depending upon agreements stipulated in writing at the time of initial hire.
- c. Once tenured, associate professors may hold this rank indefinitely or apply for promotion.
- d. Promotion to professor should not be considered to be forthcoming merely because of years of service to the university, or because tenure has previously been awarded.
- e. In accordance with the principal unit's timelines, a faculty member may present a promotion portfolio in any given year.
- f. An associate professor must demonstrate competence, continuous progress, and a command over a large part of the academic field.
- g. It is expected that evidence showing high quality of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity and/or extension and outreach or service has been provided and is current.

D. Professor

- a. A professor, sometimes referred to as a "full professor," has established disciplinary, intellectual, and institutional leadership.
- b. The professor demonstrates command of the disciplinary field as evidenced by teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, extension and outreach, and service.
- c. Faculty members initially hired at the rank of professor are often awarded service credit or awarded tenure on appointment.

Part 6: Roles and Responsibilities in Promotion or Tenure Reviews

All evaluators will recommend or not recommend promotion based on the requisite requirements of the applied for rank and all relevant allocation of effort statements. All evaluators will recommend or not recommend tenure based on the "demonstrated competence in a collegiate community" and all relevant allocation of effort statements.

A. Candidate

- a. Inform his/her division head, in writing, of his/her candidacy no later than mid-May as determined by the VPAA and P&T Committee. (The promotion portfolio is submitted during the following academic year, and promotion, if granted, would be for the next academic year after that).
- b. Maintains a curriculum vitae and a cumulative personal record of the activities and accomplishments affecting the application for promotion and/or tenure.
- c. Reviews the personal portfolio in relation to the criteria for promotion and/or tenure and seeks guidance from senior faculty and the division head.
- d. Requests and provides materials required in the mid-probationary periodic review.
- e. Applies for tenure by submitting to the division head in the spring of the candidate's fifth year, or other time as previously negotiated. Their portfolio includes both the core document and the documentation file. If a faculty member/candidate does not apply for tenure in the fifth year, or extended year as appropriate, and does not submit a resignation letter as contemplated the faculty member's employment will terminate with the expiration of the current annual "temporary contract".
- f. Requests extensions of the probationary period in accordance with ARP 9.35.
- g. Submits their portfolio to the division head for review by the designated date.
- h. Approves the evaluation within Faculty Success acknowledging that the candidate has received a copy of the letter and has been informed that he/she has ten working days to write a rebuttal letter addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that will be

- included in the evaluation document.
- i. After submitting the portfolio, adds additional material to the promotion and/or tenure portfolio as formally requested by evaluators or adds material through formal request.
- j. If applicable, can request a 30-day extension on promotion and/or tenure application deadline.
- k. Has the right to withdraw from the process prior to review by the VPAA. However, if the candidate withdraws from consideration for tenure, the candidate will also submit a letter of resignation if the faculty member is in the fifth year of service.
- l. If not satisfied with the rebuttal process, may use the normal university appeal processes.

B. Division Head

- a. Establishes and monitors a process for a tenured faculty to mentor the candidate in developing the best case for promotion and/or tenure.
- b. Responsible for mentoring each faculty member to ensure the best possible and most complete portfolios are forwarded to the Promotion & Tenure (P & T) committee. It should be understood that both the faculty member and the division head are responsible for incomplete documents.
- c. Provides initial information, timelines, and copies of all written guidelines regarding promotion and tenure expectations and policies to all new and continuing faculty members on a regular basis. Also informs tenure-track faculty of the rights to due process, appeal and informal processes for conflict resolution in promotion and tenure.
- d. Responsible for knowing the hire dates for regular faculty, any changes in status (part-time to full-time, regular to tenure-track, etc.), number of credits taught by part time faculty, as well as discuss highly recommended promotion cycles with each faculty member. Furthermore, the division head should be fully apprised of any negotiations made at hiring which might affect the promotion status and/or probationary period of the faculty member
- e. In the annual performance reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty, includes written details relating to assigned duties (i.e. the teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, and apportionment). The reviews also include separate statements addressing progress toward tenure and toward promotion including steps that should be taken to strengthen the faculty member's case.
- f. Assists tenure-track faculty who have completed five academic semesters or its part-time equivalent in preparing for an optional mid-probationary review.
- g. In mitigating circumstances, explores with the candidate the need for a time extension. At the request of the candidate, seeks permission from the VPAA to extend the probationary period.
- h. Provides assistance and guidance to faculty who are applying for promotion and/or tenure. Reviews the portfolio of applicants to ensure its completeness and compliance with requirements, and, where needed, makes recommendations for improvement.
- i. Writes an independent evaluation/recommendation concerning each candidate's case for promotion and/or tenure in relation to the criteria for promotion and tenure. This recommendation may be in support of or against supporting either promotion or tenure, or both. It should address the strengths and weaknesses, and level and nature of accomplishments of the candidate. Inform the faculty member that he/she has 10 working days to write a rebuttal, should they choose to do so.
- j. Places the division head's recommendation in the candidate's portfolio.
- k. Secures candidate documentation files and creates a place for promotion and/or tenure documents viewing.
- l. Forwards the portfolio when required to the promotion & tenure committee and VPAA.
- m. Requests additional material in writing from the candidate.

C. Promotion and Tenure Committee

- a. Examines and reads the portfolio of each candidate, including the division head's letter.
- b. Evaluates the candidate according to the campus' promotion and tenure standards (see Chapter II, Part 4).
- c. Considers the candidate's department assignment and role apportionment as specified in the candidate's position description and Allocation of Effort forms.
- d. Makes recommendations to the VPAA pertaining to faculty members who are seeking promotion and/or tenure.
- e. Records in each candidate's portfolio the committee's vote totals.
- f. Places the committee's recommendation in the candidate's portfolio.
- g. Participates in the optional mid-probationary review process, providing formative feedback to candidates.
- h. Publish a calendar of submission dates for the following year's promotion cycle based upon document review deadlines. The Chair of the P & T committee will build into the calendar a "voting/evaluation" meeting. At this meeting the committee will fill out either the annual performance or Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation form and vote on each annual performance or Promotion and/or Tenure Portfolio.
- i. Works with the VPAA in mentoring faculty in the process and in scheduling workshops where sample portfolios are presented.
- j. Each member of the P & T committee is responsible to be at the voting meeting. Voting must take place either in person or virtually, however, the committee member must be present during the deliberations and the voting. No proxy voting can occur.
- k. Follow Roberts Rules of Order and members of the P & T committee will be obligated to follow procedures of Executive Session during discussions involving candidate documents (all members should acknowledge the confidentiality of all such discussions, reports, and recommendations).
- l. The Chair of the P & T committee provides each candidate a copy of the completed Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation form. The chair will inform the faculty member that the faculty member has 10 working days to write a rebuttal.
- m. The Chair of the P & T committee secures all portfolios while in the possession of the P & T committee and requests additional material in writing from the candidate, if needed.

D. Vice President for Academic Affairs

- a. The VPAA informs the P & T committee about the rank and status of new hires.
- b. On or before April 15, the VPAA will inform the eligible faculty, corresponding division head, and Chair of the P & T committee, in writing, of eligibility for tenure in the coming academic year.
- c. The VPAA will review the promotion and/or tenure portfolio and recommendations of the division head and the P & T committee. The VPAA will either recommend or not recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure.
- d. The VPAA will meet with the faculty member in order to review the VPAA evaluation and to support best practices for meeting the conditions of promotion and tenure. The VPAA will inform the faculty member that the faculty member has 10 working days to write a rebuttal.
- e. The VPAA will forward the promotion and/or tenure portfolio and recommendation to the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations.
- f. The VPAA requests additional material in writing from the candidate if required.
- g. The VPAA oversees the mentoring process of candidates, provides a process for training all faculty and P & T committee members in annual performance evaluation, promotion

- and tenure processes; and ensures that the campus policy and process comply with University policy.
- h. The VPAA provides initial information, timelines, and copies of all written guidelines regarding promotion and tenure expectations and policies to all new and continuing faculty members on a regular basis. The VPAA also informs tenure-track faculty of the rights to due process, appeal, and informal processes for conflict resolution in annual performance evaluation, promotion and tenure.
 - i. Ensures that a college-specific promotion and tenure policy is written and periodically revised and that the policy complies with university policy, rules, and procedures; and has been approved by the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations.
 - j. Assures that each division uses current promotion and tenure guidelines that comply with college and university policies and include date of version.
 - k. Assures a mentoring process for tenure-track faculty.
 - l. Assures a system of annual faculty performance evaluations.
 - m. Recommends extensions of the probationary period.
 - n. Provides oversight for the optional mid-probationary review program.

E. Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations

- a. Makes independent recommendations pertaining to promotion and tenure. To do this, considers:
 - a. Candidate's core document and the documentation file
 - b. Recommendations of the division heads
 - c. Recommendations of the NMSU-A promotion and tenure committee.
 - d. Ensures candidates are notified, in writing and electronically, of the recommendations of the NMSU-A Promotion and Tenure Committee and of the VPAA. These notifications must occur prior to passing the promotion and tenure applications and associated recommendations on to the executive vice-president and provost or designee.
- b. If requested, meets with the executive vice-president and provost or designee regarding promotion and tenure cases.
- c. Notifies candidates in writing of the final promotion and/or tenure decision.

Part 7. Portfolio Preparation by Candidate

The candidate is responsible for submitting a promotion and tenure Portfolio. The documents will be submitted through Faculty Success electronic system. Two different documents will be submitted.

A. Core Document

The Core Document elements will be submitted as one PDF file in Watermark Faculty Success and will include the following items in this order. The combination of items a-f shall not exceed 50 pages:

- a. A cover sheet indicating the candidate's name, current rank, department and college.
- b. Any written documentation generated throughout the promotion and tenure process, including the numerical vote counts of the promotion and tenure committee(s).
- c. A table of contents.
- d. Candidate's executive summary.
- e. A curriculum vitae.

- f. Annual performance evaluations for the period under review, including the Allocation of Effort statements, the goals and objectives forms, written statements submitted by the faculty member as a part of the annual performance evaluations, the supervisor's written comments, and any response made by the candidate to the supervisor's written comments. Numerical rankings, ratings, or vote counts should be removed.

B. Documentation File

Supplementary materials provided by the candidate related to the areas of faculty activity. This material is not routed beyond the P & T Committee, but is available for review.

If this is an application for tenure, the candidate is to include evidence of contributions since starting at NMSU, plus evidence from other institutions if credit for prior service was given at the time the candidate was hired. If this is an application for promotion, then the candidate is to include evidence of contributions since the last promotion or tenure review.

The documentation file should include the following sections in this order:

- Teaching and Related Activities - Evidence of high quality-teaching and related activities
- Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development - Evidence of scholarship, creative activity, and professional development activities
- Service - Evidence of service to institution and community
- Student Evaluations
- Classroom Observations – Classroom observations should be included for the period involving the last promotion or tenure review. If a classroom observation is not available because no students or the minimum students did not participate, a document needs to be included in place of the observation indicating the reason the observation is missing.
- Letters of Support – These letters come from colleagues, peers, and/or former students or can be other letters as appropriate
- Representative examples of syllabi
- Other Evidence - Any other evidence that they believe supports their application

Part 8: Withdrawal of Portfolio by Candidate from Further Consideration

A. Voluntary Withdrawal from Consideration

A candidate may withdraw from consideration at any time prior to the final signature of the executive vice-president and provost. A candidate shall prepare a letter requesting withdrawal from further consideration. The letter shall be transmitted to the VPAA. All documents shall be returned to the candidate and nothing relating to the application for promotion and/or tenure shall be placed in the candidate's personnel file.

B. Withdrawal in Fifth Year of Service

If the candidate is in the fifth year of service, withdrawal from consideration for tenure must be accompanied by a letter of resignation submitted to the VPAA no later than the end of the fifth-year contract period. The resignation shall be effective no later than the end of the sixth-year contract period. If a faculty member does not apply for tenure in the fifth year, or extended year as appropriate, and does not submit a resignation letter as contemplated by this rule, the faculty member's employment will terminate with the expiration of the current annual ("Temporary") contract.

Part 9: Outcomes

A. Full-time tenure-track candidates:

If the decision is to award tenure, the executive vice-president and provost will send a Contract of Employment (Continuous Appointment) Form through the VPAA and the division head to the candidate.

If the decision is to not award tenure, the division head will give a signed Contract Status Form to the candidate for signature acknowledging notification of non-renewal.

B. Part-time tenure-track candidates

In addition to the provisions for full-time tenure-track candidates:

If the decision is to award tenure, it is for the FTE as stated in the initial contract or as negotiated.

If the decision is to not award tenure, a faculty member has only one year of continued part-time employment beyond the denial.

C. All candidates

If the decision is in favor of promotion, the effective date is at the beginning of the ensuing contract year.

If the decision is in favor of promotion, it shall be the policy of the university that all promotions shall include a salary increase, irrespective of other salary increases.

If the decision is not in favor of promotion, the executive vice president and provost or designee will inform the candidate in writing.

The executive vice president and provost or designee is responsible for informing the Chancellor of the recommendations of the division head, VPAA and the decision of the executive vice president and provost or designee.

The executive vice president and provost or designee will prepare an official list of promotion and tenure decisions for distribution to relevant administrators, the vice president for administration and finance, and the assistant director of human resource services.

Tenure-track faculty members whose probationary contract is not renewed and who have another year before the termination of that contract do not submit a promotion and tenure Portfolio during their final year. If the non-renewal is being appealed on the basis of failure to follow procedure or discrimination, then the appellant may complete a packet and have it held in suspension until the grievance is resolved. If the individual is successful in the appeal, the Portfolio will be considered by the parties involved in the promotion and tenure process.

Part 10. Right to Seek Redress for Violation of Evaluation, Promotion, or Tenure Rules

A faculty member who believes that the university, or college's promotion and tenure policy or procedures have been violated, adversely affecting the faculty member's evaluation, promotion, or tenure may file a grievance pursuant to ARP 10.60 Faculty Grievance Review and Resolution.

ARP 10.60 provides an opportunity for mediation, and in the event mediation is not successful, review by a panel of faculty peers which hears evidence presented and issues factual findings and recommendations on the issue of whether or not the rules governing evaluation, promotion or tenure were violated.

A finding that there was not substantial compliance with the applicable Rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (ARP 9.30 – 9.36), or a finding that any violation materially and adversely affected the outcome for a faculty member will be grounds for relief.

If the grievance involves actions taken by the executive vice president and provost due to the provost's role in the promotion and tenure process, the grievance decision will be issued by the NMSU system chancellor; otherwise, the executive vice president and provost issues the final decision in faculty grievance matters.

Part 11: Timeline of Procedural Steps for Promotion and Tenure Review Processes

On or before April 15, the VPAA will inform the eligible faculty, division head, and Chair of the P & T committee, in writing, of those eligible for tenure in the coming academic year. Candidates applying for tenure will inform the VPAA (with copies to division head and Chair of the P & T committee) of their candidacy, in writing, no later than the last weekday in May of the academic year before they are eligible for consideration. Faculty may request, in writing to the Division head, for a 30-day extension to apply for promotion or tenure. If a candidate chooses not to seek a continuous contract, the VPAA will be notified in writing at this time and the candidate will attach a letter of resignation effective at the end of the following academic year.

Individual faculty members make the decision whether to apply for promotion each April. However, division heads will inform faculty of their promotion eligibility in relationship to the “highly recommended timeline” in the policy; that is, that candidates apply at the beginning of the 3rd year in that rank if the faculty member believes they have satisfied the prerequisites for the higher rank.

Candidates applying for promotion will inform their division head of their candidacy, in writing, no later than the last weekday in May (the promotion portfolio would be submitted during the following academic year and promotion, if granted, would be for the next academic year after that).

The division head will initiate the tracking/routing record for promotion and/or tenure, after receiving official word from the faculty member that they will pursue promotion and/or tenure. (See Appendix E for Tracking/Routing forms.)

By the first of October, Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will have submitted a complete and comprehensive promotion and /or tenure portfolio covering the relevant years (for promotion---all years since last promotion portfolio; for tenure---all years since hire) to the division head.

The division head will review the portfolio with each faculty member in his/her division. After reviewing the portfolio, the division head will meet with the faculty member and either recommend or not recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure. The division head will include the letter of recommendation in the promotion and/or tenure portfolio and a copy of the letter will be given to the faculty member. Finally, the division head will inform the faculty member that the faculty member has 10 working days to write a rebuttal.

If a faculty member disagrees with the division head's evaluation, the faculty member has ten working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the Associate Campus Director and Vice President for Academic Affairs that is included in the portfolio.

Once a faculty member's portfolio has been reviewed by the division head, it is to be made available for viewing by all faculty. The division head's letter is not included in the portfolio during viewing; however, faculty members are encouraged to make comments at this time and to forward those comments to the Chair of P & T committee. Documents should be available for viewing for at least two weeks, in accordance with the calendar determined by the P & T Committee.

The faculty member will be allowed 10 working days, to rebut the division head's letter. During the rebuttal process the faculty and the P&T committee will simultaneously review the portfolio.

The Chair of the P & T committee will build into the calendar an "examination/voting" meeting. At this meeting the committee will fill out the Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation form and the committee will vote to either recommend or not recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure. Only members of the P & T committee who hold tenure will review and vote on tenure portfolios. In addition, the Chair of the P & T committee will report the results of the vote on the evaluation form.

The Candidate will be supplied with a copy of the evaluation and is informed of the right to rebut.

If a faculty member disagrees with the P& T committee's evaluation, the faculty member has ten working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the Associate Campus Director and Vice President for Academic Affairs that is included in the portfolio.

After the faculty member has been allowed 10 working days to submit a rebuttal to the Promotion and Tenure committee's recommendation, the P & T committee will forward the portfolio to the VPAA.

The VPAA will review the portfolio and the recommendations of the division head and the P & T Committee. The VPAA will either recommend or not recommend the Faculty member for promotion and/or tenure. A copy of the evaluation will be supplied to the candidate and the candidate is informed of the right to rebut.

If a faculty member disagrees with the VPAA's evaluation, the faculty member has ten working days to write a rebuttal addressed to the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations that is included in the portfolio.

After the faculty member has been allowed 10 working days to rebut the VPAA's recommendation, the VPAA will forward the portfolio to the Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations.

The Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations will review the portfolios and the recommendation of the VPAA, P & T committee, and the division head. The Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations will either recommend or not recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure.

The Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations will complete the final review and endorsement, and issue the promotion and tenure outcome letter to the candidate on or about May 1 of the current academic year.

Each college shall determine a timeline for conducting promotion and tenure reviews compatible with due dates issued by the executive vice president and provost. The dates indicated here are suggested guidelines; the provost may alter these by further directives; and/or 12- month appointments may require a different time schedule.

Normal Timelines

For Annual Performance Evaluation / Promotion
and Tenure (P&T) Activities

Due Date*	All Regular Faculty
Last Friday in January	APEs (complete AOE, Narrative of accomplishments, student evals) due to Division Heads Initial AOE's due to Division Head except pre-tenured faculty
Third Friday in February	APE evaluation meetings completed with DHs. 10 working days for rebuttal.
Third Friday in February	All -pre-tenure faculty APEs submitted by faculty to P&T Committee
Fourth Friday in February	All others from DH to VPAA.
Second Friday in March	Pre-tenure APEs back to DHs and to VPAA. P&T reviews of pre-tenure APEs to faculty members. 10 working days for corrections and rebuttal.
Third Friday in March	AOE of pre-tenured faculty due to DHs
Fourth Friday in March	Pre-tenure APEs to VPAA
Fourth Friday in March	VPAA review of all APEs. VPAA notifies faculty through Watermark Faculty Success the result of the VPAA review. Faculty may set up meeting with VPAA to discuss APE. Faculty have 10 working days for rebuttal after receiving completed APE from supervisor. VPAA will respond to meeting requests within 10 working days.
Last weekday in March	Tenure application notification letters from VPAA to candidates due (copy to division heads (DHs), P&T Chair, and Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations)
By April 1	VPAA forwards regular faculty APE rebuttals to Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations.
By last weekday in May	Letter of intent to apply for promotion or tenure to DH and Chair of P&T

* Dates may have to be adjusted based on the calendar for that year.

Normal Timelines

For Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Activities

Candidates for Promotion or Tenure

Due Date*	Candidates for Promotion or Tenure
By last working day in March of previous year	Tenure application letters from VPAA to candidates due (copy to division heads (DHs) & P&T Chair).
Mid-May of previous year	Letter of intent to apply for promotion or tenure to DH and Chair of P&T.
Last Friday in September	Promotion and Tenure Portfolios submitted in Watermark to DHs.
No later than the second Monday in October	P/T candidate portfolio meetings with DHs. 10 working days for rebuttal.
No later than the second Friday in October	Promotion and Tenure Portfolios submitted in Watermark to P&T Committee
Following Monday for nine days through Thursday	P/T portfolios available to ALL faculty for viewing and comments, DH letter and evaluations not included. Comments on portfolios sent to P&T Chair.
	P/T portfolios available to P&T Committee does include the DH letters and all evaluations.
Last Friday in October and first Friday in November	P&T review promotion and tenure portfolios.
Second Friday in November	Candidates receive P&T review results. 10 working days for rebuttal.
Beginning of Spring Semester	VPAA meets/informs candidates of promotion/tenure recommendation. 10 working days after meeting/informing for
Early Spring Semester	P/T portfolios sent from VPAA to Associate Vice Chancellor for External Relations for review.

*Dates may have to be adjusted based on the calendar for that year.

Appendix A-1: Allocation of Effort Form Instructions:

The Allocation of Effort form (AOE) is through Watermark. The AOE may be used for initial planning at the beginning of the evaluation period, for revisions that may occur during the evaluation period (due to unanticipated assignment changes), and as a final document at the end of the evaluation period. Each use is discussed below:

Initial – At the beginning of the evaluation period, the faculty member and supervisor will meet and decide upon the faculty member’s allocation of effort for each evaluated category on the allocation of effort form. Normally, a community college faculty member’s primary focus will be on teaching. A teaching load of 15 credit hours will normally require 75 – 80% allocation of effort. The faculty member and supervisor will also determine allocation of effort toward scholarship and creative (including professional development activities), and Service.

The faculty member and supervisor will establish goals for all categories having an allocation of effort greater than zero. Goals should be realistic and obtainable.

Revision – Faculty members must remain flexible to meet the needs of students and the institution. This will often cause a change in the faculty member’s allocation of effort during the evaluation period. Should this occur, the faculty member should prepare a revised AOE form. The only difference will be the purpose will have “revision” checked. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will need to be notified to begin a new workflow.

In the event that the faculty member cannot come to agreement on the initial or revision Allocation of Effort form, the faculty member will meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs for mediation. This VPAA will interview the faculty member and their supervisor, and attach a written review of the investigation. This written review will state amendments (if any) to the AOE form. If the form is an initial or revised AOE statement, both the faculty member and supervisor will adhere to the stipulations of the attached statement. If the disagreement occurs as the result of a final submission, the attached statement by the next higher supervisor will become a part of the faculty member’s final evaluation. If this is a final evaluation, and the faculty member is still not satisfied with the outcome, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the evaluation which will become a part of the annual review. The faculty member may appeal the evaluation also, utilizing the university appeal’s process.

Appendix A-2: Annual Performance Evaluation Document

Annual Performance Evaluation

Overall assumption: This evaluation is based on the narrative and supported by accompanying evidence.

TEACHING					
Criterion	The following are assumptions pertaining to the Teaching criterion:				Comments
Teach 27 - 30 credits (1.0 FTE) (or equivalent with reassigned time*)	Discuss reassigned time in “comments” cell. Instructor is expected to fulfill reassigned duties with diligence. Course expectations are clearly stated.				*Reassigned time will be acknowledged and evaluated in a separate section
Demonstrate command of subject matter	Demonstrated by content updates to the course during QM reviews; by adoption of new textbooks & materials like open source materials; by presenting at content-specific conferences; by attendance at content-specific conferences; by ongoing membership in content-related professional organizations; by taking content-related workshops or courses—“content-related” means subjects in or closely related to the discipline; by book reviews, including adoption reviews, of content-related texts; by recommending library acquisitions.				
Performance appropriate for rank (minimum standards)	Instructor successfully delivers courses and may design his / her own versions.	Asst. Prof. actively and routinely participates in trainings and curriculum dev. Is responsible for the design and assessment of courses in his / her area.	Assoc. Prof. satisfies role of Asst. Prof. and might mentor newer faculty. Takes a leadership role in initiatives within his / her area.	Full Prof. satisfies role of Assoc. Prof. and routinely takes a leadership role on teaching and curricular initiatives within division, on campus, and system. Provides mentorship.	

Score	4	3	2	1	Comments
T1 - 25% - Conveys course content effectively to students	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently; Designing new innovative teaching approach/project...	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of innovative and active learning methods. Strong evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. Strong evidence of the use of scaffolded learning. Student evals. and class observations reveal that course content is effectively conveyed and encourages active learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of innovative and active learning methods. Limited evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. Limited evidence of the use of scaffolded learning. Student evals. and class observations reveal limited success in conveying course content.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of active learning methods. No evidence of varied, relevant instructional materials, which may incl. video, web-based sources, lecture, supplementary sources, some of which may be of the instructor's design. No evidence of scaffolded learning. Student evals. and class observations may reveal a very passive atmosphere and ineffectively conveyed course content.	
T2 - 25% - Assess student learning and utilizes that student learning to make course adjustments	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently; course adjustments demonstrably enhance student success....	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. Strong correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self-assessment is ongoing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. Limited correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self- assessment is sporadic.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of the use of multiple & varied assessments. No correlation between assessment and improved learning opportunities/environment. Assessment of student learning and instructor's self- assessment is missing.	

T3 - 25% - Demonstrate revision and updates of curricula	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 consistently;	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. Strong evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. Strong evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. Limited evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. Limited evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of using data from advisory boards, community, research, conferences, and on campus resources to update curricula. No evidence of taking a leading role in curricula updates. No evidence of program and/or course revisions and/or additions.	
T4 - 25% - Demonstrate leadership in teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3 and exceeds leadership for rank.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of leadership in teaching appropriate to rank as evidenced by facilitating training in methodology, teaching practice, assessment; mentoring others; routinely sharing materials; etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participates in supporting roles, but needs assistance in developing leadership appropriate to his/her rank.	<input type="checkbox"/> Has not taken or sought leadership roles appropriate to his/her rank.	
Average Score for Teaching:					
Comments for Teaching:					

Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development					
Criterion	The following are assumptions pertaining to the Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development criterion:				Comments
Performance appropriate for rank	Instructor should be encouraged to attend prof. dev. opportunities., but only required for online trainings & similar requirements.	Asst. Prof. may express leadership, but is active and routinely participates in scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. opportunities.	Assoc. Prof. takes facilitator role. Might collaborate in organizing or delivering scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. opportunities.	Full Prof. routinely takes a leadership role and/or facilitator role. Should achieve Level 4 in "leadership" above.	
Rating	4	3	2	1	
SCP1 - 25% - Development of knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development including attendance at confs., prof. dev. events, earning additional degree, seminars, staying current in literature, brown bags, etc. This includes both within the discipline and pedagogy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of ongoing scholarship, creative activities, and/or professional development.	
SCP2 - 25% - Application of knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills to curriculum development., course (re)design, assessment processes, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of application of acquired knowledge and skills.	

SCP3 - 25% - Sharing of knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills in the classroom, campus, community, professional organizations, advisory boards via publishing, presenting, holding exhibitions, etc. Sharing must be communicated through a variety of venues and modalities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of sharing newly acquired knowledge and skills.	
SCP4 - 25% - Demonstrate leadership in Scholarship, Creative Activity, or Professional Dev.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence in organizing or providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence in providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence in providing scholarship, creative activity or prof. dev. training.	
Average Score for Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development:					
Comments for Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development:					

Service					
Criterion	The following are assumptions pertaining to the Service criterion:				Comments
Performance appropriate for rank	Instructor should be encouraged to participate in committees.	Asst. Prof. will participate and contribute to division's service needs.	Assoc. Prof. takes an active role in collaborating, leading, and contributing to divisions' service needs.	Full Prof. routinely takes an active role in collaborating, leading, and contributing to divisions' service needs. Could also include mentoring junior faculty.	
	4	3	2	1	
S1 - 50% - Service to the institution (Helping the institution to run)	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of significant service and/or accomplishment in committees (including at least one major*), subcommittees, taskforces, statewide articulation, student organization advisor, and events that support the NMSU-A Strategic Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of significant service and/or accomplishment in committees, subcommittees, taskforces, statewide articulation, student organization advisor, and events that support the NMSU-A Strategic Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence and/or minimal evidence of committee participation. Limited to no participation in events related to NMSU-A Strategic Plan.	*Major committees as established in the Operations Manual
S2 - 25% - Service to the community	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participation in multiple volunteer activities or an activity that involves ongoing service during the year that supports the community.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participation in at least one volunteer activity during the year that supports the community.	<input type="checkbox"/> No participation in events related to community involvement.	

S3 - 25% - Demonstrate leadership in institutional or community service	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of leadership in service appropriate to rank for example chairing committees, leading taskforces, chairing subcommittees, organizing community service events, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence shows participation in supporting roles, but may need assistance in developing leadership appropriate to his/her rank.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence in leadership in service.	
Average Score for Service:					
Comments for Service:					

Reassigned Time (Only complete if applicable)					
	4	3	2	1	Comments
R1 - 100% - Criteria depends on reassigned time	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor exceeds all criteria for level 3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence of completing reassigned time activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of completing reassigned time activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of completing reassigned time activities.	
Score for Reassigned Time:					
Comments for Reassigned Time:					

Scoring:

Teaching				
T1	T2	T3	T4	Average
4	3	4	2	3.25
Scholarship, Creative Activity and Professional Development				
SCP1	SCP2	SCP3	SCP4	Average
3	3	2	3	2.75
Service				
S1 (50%)	S2 (25%)	S3 (25%)		Weight Score
4	3	3		3.5

Weighted Average - Overall Score

	Score (Times)	% from AOE	Rating
Teaching	3.25	.75	2.44
Scholarship & PD	2.75	.20	0.55
Service (Institution & Community)	3.5	.05	0.18
Reassigned Time (Only if Applicable)			0.00
Total Score			3.17

4.00-3.90 – Level 4

2.00-2.99 – Level 2

3.00-3.89 – Level 3

Below 2.00 – Level 1

General Information About Scores:

A score of 3 is the expected rating in each area and for *overall* performance.

A score of less than 3 rating overall requires an action plan if that rating is earned 2 years in a row.

A score of less than 2 overall requires the division head to create an action plan to improve faculty performance.

If a faculty member should score a 1 in any of the rated elements within a criterion, the division head and the faculty member shall negotiate an improvement plan regarding that rated element.