

**Mentoring Guidelines; and Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion Guidelines**  
**Department of Economics, University of New Mexico**  
**2012/2013; 2013/2014; 2014/2015; 2015/2016; 2016/2017; 2017/2018; 2018/2019; 2019/2020<sup>1</sup>;**  
**2020/2021<sup>2</sup>; 2021-2022; 2024-2025<sup>3</sup>**

## **I. Introduction and Background**

The Department of Economics at the University of New Mexico (UNM) is located in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S). The following provides background context, and then sets out:

- Mentoring Guidelines (for junior faculty), and
- Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion Guidelines,

It closes with considerations specific to continuing non-tenure track Lecturer appointments.

All Department faculty members, tenured or tenure track (T/TT) and non-tenure track, are guided by a collective vision statement (adopted August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011):

*“Our department (faculty, staff, and students) is an applied economics program. We value collegiality, intellectual diversity and excellence. We work to improve the well-being of communities. Collectively, we aspire to:*

- *Provide quality learning experiences that produce intellectually curious and highly capable graduates*
- *Conduct policy-relevant and high-quality research*
- *Serve the community, university, and discipline.”*

All faculty members (T/TT and non-tenure track) in the Department are subject to two primary governance documents:

- The UNM *Faculty Handbook* (<http://handbook.unm.edu/>)
- The Department’s *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* (effective as of January 1, 2001; revised March 25, 2016 and April 6, 2016)<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised in May 2019 to include language on Community Engagement (passed by super-majority vote).

<sup>2</sup> Revised in March 2020 to include appendices providing required operational definitions, separately, for *Research Excellence/Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* [see Appendix A] (passed with a majority vote, and implemented by Department Chair) and *Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* [see Appendix B] (implemented by Chair, consistent with past practices, when no majority document was passed). With respect to *grandfathering*, the expectation, as stated at the time of votes, is that the Department implements any new research and teaching guidelines under a principle of proportionality, with special consideration to less than a year's time under any new guidelines. That is, in all review cases (annual and milestone), any individual's time under the new guidelines will be explicitly noted and considered, and the expectation is that senior faculty and the Chair will weigh the time proportionally, with special consideration to anything less than a year.

<sup>3</sup> Revised in March 2025 to reflect the adoption by a super-majority vote of an updated version of Appendix B-*Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement*.

<sup>4</sup> The *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* document is available in the Department upon request from Unit Administrator, and also can be found online in the Department’s 2011 Academic Program Review (APR) Self

Where there are questions or conflicts, the *Faculty Handbook* is recognized as taking precedence. *Inter alia*, the *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* sets out the function of all committees in the Department, including the Tenured Committee and annual Salary Committee. The Salary Committee operates under the provisions of the current *Salary Determination Process* (as adopted by the faculty effective 12/1/2001, and appended to the *Rules of Governance and Decision Making*). Additionally, the Department has a *Variable Teaching Load Policy* (see Appendix), as required by the College A&S in 2011; that policy was adopted on February 3, 2011, with review set for 2014 in the Department. Finally, it is recognized that all Department faculty members are subject to A&S faculty rules and any changes, and any external revisions in the UNM *Faculty Handbook*, or internal revisions (under required voting rules) to the Department's *Rules of Governance and Decision Making*.

All full-time faculty members (T/TT and non-tenure track) in the Department are subject to meeting minimum faculty workload (teaching load equivalent) requirements as set out in their faculty appointment letter, the *Faculty Handbook* (see section C 110 on teaching load units and allowable reductions [and B 1.2.1 on definition of teaching], and C 100 on total workload unit requirements for all faculty).

As discussed in the Department's 2011 Academic Program Review (APR) Self Study Report [[www.unm.edu/~apr/Economics.html](http://www.unm.edu/~apr/Economics.html)] (pg. 24):

"According to the UNM Faculty Handbook ...the normal Academic Year (AY) teaching load for a T/TT faculty member is 9 formula unit loads per semester, Fall and Spring. This could be simply composed of three courses of 3 credits each, but the UNM formula (from 1975, and recently re-implemented in 2010 for the first time since the 1970s) allows for adjustments due to class size, readings and problems courses, dissertation and thesis supervision. Further, reductions in the 9 unit load requirement can be made on the basis of research productivity, grant preparation, curriculum development, special administrative assignment, and overload compensation from prior semesters. For approximately the last 20 years, a 2+2 (Fall + Spring) annual classroom-assignment teaching load has been the expectation in the Department of Economics for all T/TT faculty members maintaining active research programs. With respect to variable teaching load assignments, as reviewed by Department faculty in 2010, a faculty member may request a teaching focus and go to 3+3 classroom-teaching assignment, and have this considered in annual evaluations, etc. Administrative duties in the Department have historically been associated with a lower teaching load for the Department Chair (1+1), as assigned by the Dean, and are also allocated to the Undergraduate Director (1+2, or 2+1) and Graduate Director (1+2, or 2+1). Faculty may also obtain classroom teaching reductions (no more than one per semester) due to "course buyouts" from approved external research grants (e.g., with graduate student funding support) administered through UNM..."

Under the Department's formal *Variable Teaching Load Policy* adopted in February 2011, all tenured faculty may move to a higher base teaching load (3+3) either voluntarily (as discussed above), or be shifted to that under a triggering mechanism. That triggering mechanism is set off by reduced research productivity (e.g., submits and acceptances on peer-reviewed publications and/or grants). Any faculty member's move to a higher base teaching load would be taken into consideration in annual evaluations, and Salary Committee determinations (see Appendix C).

It is expected that the minimum total workload requirements in the UNM *Faculty Handbook* will typically be exceeded by Department faculty members. Thus, it is recognized that meeting minimum total workload (or teaching load equivalent) requirements, as set out in the *Faculty Handbook*, does not equate to meeting an accepted threshold for justifying positive support at the

Department level for a tenure and promotion decision, or a promotion decision for a T/TT or non-tenure track faculty member. (These guidelines are discussed in Section III below.)

## **II. Mentoring Guidelines**

The *Rules of Governance and Decision Making* sets out the Department's mentoring guidelines for junior faculty:

"The mentoring of junior faculty can greatly improve the atmosphere for, and productivity of, junior faculty. To this end a formal system of mentoring of junior faculty will be established. Each junior faculty member will be asked to select a mentor from the tenured faculty. It is also possible that a 2-3 person mentoring committee would play this role-and that one member of the committee may be from another department.

The mentor (or the mentoring committee) will meet at least twice a semester with the junior faculty member and be available for more informal interaction. The mentor (or the mentoring committee) will hold these conversations confidential and will not share the content with any other member of the faculty. These conversations must not play a negative role in the annual evaluation of junior faculty. The mentor (or members of the mentoring committee) should be willing to read the academic papers of the mentee and offer advice; make suggestions on outlets for research; perhaps provide academic opportunities for the mentee; and be willing to be an advocate for the mentee with the Department Chair regarding committee assignments, workload, etc."

While written prior to any continuing non-tenure track faculty appointments in the Department (e.g., Lecturers), these mentoring guidelines can be viewed as general enough to apply to any junior faculty (e.g., in their first six years), whether a tenure track appointment or a non-tenure track, teaching-centered appointment.

## **III. Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines**

As discussed in the Department's 2011 APR Self Study Report (pg. 32):

"All T/TT faculty members are subject to regular performance reviews and workload reporting requirements. Annual reviews are conducted for all faculty members, and forwarded to the Dean's Office. Junior faculty members are evaluated annually by the Chair, with input from senior tenured faculty members. Assistant professors meet multiple times annually with the chair, and are also asked to identify one of more mentors, from the Economics faculty, to help provide counsel and feedback on research, teaching and service questions that might arise. Under the University's post-tenure review policy, all senior faculty members are also evaluated annually by the Chair. Of course, the keenest assessments of are made in conjunction with personnel decisions for Code 3 renewal, tenure and promotion to associate professor (Code 6), and promotion to full professor.

Annual reviews are conducted by the Chair subsequent to the deliberations of the annual Salary Committee, and include discussion of any assessment of performance and merit recommendation from the Salary Committee.

Milestone reviews are built up from annual reviews, which are based on work done in the Department in the prior calendar year [FH 4.2.1]). Effective Fall 2019, per the UNM Provost's Office, in all annual and milestone reviews, research and teaching must be evaluated against the standards of "excellent," "effective and "needs improvement." The Department of Economics' required Operational Definitions for *Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* are provided in Appendix A, and *Operational Definitions for Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* are provided in Appendix B.

The required information collected from all faculty members each Spring semester includes an updated CV, as well a Calendar Year Salary Document (CYSD). The following shows the 2011 CYSD format as an example:

- I. Publication(s) accepted in 2011 (include title, name of journal, names of authors and acceptance date).**
  - A. Journal Article(s):**
  - B. Book(s):**
  - C. Book Review(s):**
- II. Manuscript(s) submitted. (A manuscript should be listed only once in its lifetime; do not list again -- whether it is a resubmission at the invite of the editor or a submission to another journal. Include title, name of journal and date submitted.)**
- III. Paper(s) presented at professional meetings. (Include title of paper and name and date of the meeting.)**
- IV. Grant proposal(s)**
  - A. Submitted (full title, agency, etc.; no repeats from year to year that are substantively the same)**
  - B. Accepted (full title, agency, etc.)**
  - C. Accepted with graduate student support (full title, amount of student support and period of that support).**
- V. Committee work and other service (nature of service and dates of participation)**
  - College or University:**
  - Community Service:**
  - Professional:**
- VI. MA Thesis Committee**
- VII. Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Chair**
- VIII. Journal Editor/Board (name of journal and dates of service)**
- IX. Courses taught and Evaluation Kit mean for response to question 1 only:**
  - A. Spring Semester Year**
  - B. Fall Semester Year**
- X. Other Information**

As stated in the *Salary Determination Process*, individual faculty members may include any additional information (e.g., honors and awards, future plans, missing activities, etc.) in the CYSD the individual feels pertinent. Finally, in addition to providing to the annual Salary Committee, the Unit Administrator makes all annual Salary Document binders (with all faculty information) from the current and past years available for faculty review. The Unit Administrator also makes a spreadsheet of all faculty base salaries (since late 1980's) available annually to all faculty members prior to the start of the annual Spring salary determination process. All faculty members, including junior faculty members, are encouraged to review current and past years' information.

As stated in the Department's 2011 APR Self Study Report (pp. 32-33):

"In making recommendations to the College of Arts and Sciences, tenure and promotion cases are considered and voted on by the tenured faculty members, for tenure and promotion decisions to associate professor, and by the full professors for promotion cases to full professor. The quantity and quality of publications or other scholarly works expected for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, and promotion to professor relies on the expertise and wisdom of the internal and external evaluators."

And:

The Department Chair is evaluated annually by the Dean of the College of A&S with input provided by faculty.

All faculty reviews are conducted under the guidelines of the UNM Faculty Handbook."

Further, the UNM *Faculty Handbook* identifies the four categories for faculty performance evaluation (section B 1.2), and establishes the tenure and promotion requirements of achieving "effectiveness" in all four areas, and "excellence" in either teaching or research:

#### **"1.2 CATEGORIES FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

(a) The categories in which faculty performance will be evaluated are the following:

- (1) Teaching
- (2) Scholarly Work
- (3) Service
- (4) Personal Characteristics

The University's general expectations in each of these categories are set forth below.

(b) In order to earn either tenure or promotion or both, faculty are required to be effective in all four areas. Excellence in either teaching or scholarly work constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion. Service and personal characteristics are important but normally round out and complement the faculty member's strengths in teaching and scholarly work."

The *Faculty Handbook* sets out general expectations for each of these categories, including: defining "effective teaching" criteria, and requiring both student and faculty evaluations of teaching; defining research as the "systematic, original investigation directed toward the generation, development, and validation of new knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems," subject to the criterion of critical peer review and publication; and recognizing that evidence of scholarly works may include evidence of integration of research and teaching.

We expand upon the Faculty Handbook definition of teaching effectiveness to recognize the value of providing experiential and community-engaged learning experiences.

We affirm that a research profile in our department must be anchored in peer-reviewed scholarly publishing. We also acknowledge that beyond this core scholarly work, other forms of scholarly activity can contribute to a faculty member's profile. A profile may include activities such as community engaged scholarship as defined by the Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement (<https://nerche.org/carnegie-engagement-classification/>) and work bringing academic expertise to bear beyond the university. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate a profile anchored in peer-reviewed scholarly publishing and the economic relevance of any supplementary activities.

The Faculty Handbook criteria and definition are as follows:

#### "1.2.1 Teaching

- (a) Due to the variety of subject matter and student populations at the University, teaching occurs in various settings and via a diversity of forms of instruction, such as didactic lecturing, small group seminars, problem-based learning, and clinical practicums. The term *teaching* as used here includes, but is not restricted to, regularly scheduled undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional instruction, and the advising, direction and supervision of individual undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, and professional students. Library faculty, in the discharge of their professional duties, shall be regarded as engaged in teaching. Teaching also includes the direction or supervision of students in reading, research, internships, residencies, or fellowships. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that confer no University credit should also be considered as teaching.
- (b) Effective teaching is one of the primary qualifications for promotion and tenure. The educational experience provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning. An effective teacher is best characterized as an individual who successfully promotes these goals. Although individual teachers bring to bear different sets of talents in pursuit of these goals an effective teacher, at a minimum, should:
  - Demonstrate effective communication skills.
  - Show evidence of strong preparation.
  - Present material that reflects the current state of knowledge in the field.
  - Demonstrate effective management skills.
  - Organize individual topics into a meaningful sequence.
  - Demonstrate an ability to interact with students in an encouraging and stimulating manner.
  - Demonstrate a commitment to the discipline.
- (c) Teaching is evaluated by students and faculty. Evidence to be evaluated for teaching during mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member, and written reports of peer observations of teaching.

#### 1.2.2 Scholarly Work

- (a) The term *Scholarly Work*, as used in this Policy, comprises scholarship, research, or creative work. *Scholarship* embodies the critical and accurate synthesis and dissemination of knowledge. The term *research* is understood to mean systematic, original investigation directed toward the generation, development, and validation of new knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems. *Creative work* is understood to mean original or imaginative accomplishment in literature, the arts, or the professions.
- (b) The faculty member's scholarly work should contribute to the discipline and serve as an indication of professional competence. The criteria for judging the original or imaginative nature of research or creative work must reflect the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. To qualify as scholarship or creative work, the results of the endeavor must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field in question.
- (c) Evidence of scholarship or creative work is determined by the faculty member's publications, exhibits, performances, or media productions and may be supplemented by evidence of integration of the faculty member's scholarly work and teaching. Written evaluations from colleagues and experts in the field, both on campus and at other institutions, may be used at the discretion of the department for the mid-probationary review (Sec. 4.5 and 4.6). Such evaluations must, however, form part of the dossier for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks (Sec. 4.5, 4.7, and 4.8).

#### 1.2.3 Service

- (a) There are two broad categories of faculty service: professional and public.
  - (1) Professional service consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession. Within the University, it includes both the extraordinary and the routine service necessary for the regular operation of departments and colleges and the University as a whole, including, for example, facilitating the day-to-day operations of academic life, mentoring students and colleagues, and, in the Health Sciences Center, providing patient care. Universities, and their component colleges and departments, rely to a great extent for their operation and advancement on the active participation of faculty members in their administration and governance. Although service is not weighted as heavily as teaching and research or creative works, "service" is an essential element of faculty performance and duties. Faculty members,

particularly senior faculty members, have a responsibility to contribute to the government of the University through timely participation on committees and other advisory groups at the department, college, and University levels. Beyond the University, professional service includes service to professional organizations and other groups that engage in or support educational and research activities.

- (2) Public service consists of activities that arise from a faculty member's role in the University. These activities normally involve the sharing and application of faculty expertise to issues and needs of the civic community in which the University is located.

(b) Service to the University, to the faculty member's profession and to the local, national, and international communities beyond the University is reviewed in this category. Evidence of performance in this area includes committee work at the University, college and department levels, and participation in professional organizations of the discipline and in the community in the faculty member's professional capacity.

#### **1.2.4 Personal Characteristics**

This category relates to the personal traits that influence an individual's effectiveness as a teacher, a scholar, researcher, or creative artist, and a leader in a professional area. Of primary concern are intellectual breadth, emotional stability or maturity, and a sufficient vitality and forcefulness to constitute effectiveness. There must also be demonstrated collegiality and interactional skills so that an individual can work harmoniously with others while maintaining independence of thought and action. Attention shall also be given to an individual's moral stature and ethical behavior, for they are fundamental to a faculty member's impact on the University. Information used in the objective appraisal of personal traits may be acquired from peer evaluations (e.g., letters of recommendation for new appointees, or written evaluations prepared by colleagues for promotions or for other departmental reviews) and must be handled with great prudence. By necessity, the category of Personal Characteristics requires flexibility in its appraisal."

The *Faculty Handbook* further defines T/TT faculty ranks and titles (section B 2.2):

#### **"2.2 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY RANKS AND TITLES**

Faculty members with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or distinguished professor may be awarded tenure (for an exception in the Health Sciences, see Sec. 2.3.1). Probationary appointments potentially leading to tenure ("tenure-track" appointments) are made at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor levels.

##### **2.2.1 Assistant Professor**

Individuals who are demonstrably competent in the subject matter of the courses to be taught and who have indicated a serious commitment to a faculty career may be considered for this faculty rank. This appointment is typical for most faculty who are beginning their probationary service. While it is not expected that persons appointed at this rank shall have acquired an extensive reputation in their field, it is expected that they will continue to increase their knowledge, to improve their teaching ability and to present the results of their scholarly work in ways appropriate to their field.

##### **2.2.2 Associate Professor**

- (a) Individuals who have acquired significant experience beyond the terminal degree are appropriate for this faculty rank. They shall have demonstrated competence as teachers and have shown a conscientious interest in improving their teaching. They shall have demonstrated a basic general understanding of a substantial part of their discipline and have an established reputation within and outside the University in their fields of scholarly work. This implies scholarly work after the terminal degree sufficient to indicate continuing interest and growth in the candidate's professional field.
- (b) Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of associate professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college, and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions to teaching, scholarly work, and service. The appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments and promise in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership.

##### **2.2.3 Professor**

- (a) Individuals who have attained high standards in teaching and who have made significant contributions to their disciplines may be considered for this faculty rank. They shall also have developed expertise and interest in the general problems of university education and their social implications, and have shown the ability to make constructive judgments and decisions. It is expected that the professor will continue to develop and mature with regard to teaching, scholarly work, and the other qualities that contributed to earlier appointments.
- (b) Appointment or promotion to Professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college/school, and University that the individual has made significant, nationally recognized scholarly or creative contributions to his or her field and an expectation that the individual will continue to do so.
- (c) Professors are the most enduring group of faculty, and it is they who give leadership and set the tone for the entire University. Thus, appointment or promotion should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership."

Further the *Faculty Handbook* (section B 4) sets out the provisions for all faculty reviews including the specific provisions for T/TT faculty for mid-probationary reviews, tenure reviews and promotion:

#### **“4.6 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

##### **4.6.1 Purpose and Standards**

(a) The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to enable the department to evaluate progress towards tenure, to inform the probationary faculty member of his or her strengths and weaknesses, and to decide whether or not to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in the four categories of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit.

(b) The mid-probationary review requires identification of the specific areas of strength and weakness demonstrated by the faculty member and the evidence supporting conclusions to that effect. The aim of the required identification of areas of strength and weakness is to give the faculty member a clear picture of the performance levels by which he or she is to be judged and offer the opportunity to correct any noted deficiencies prior to subsequent reviews. The existence of some identified deficiencies in this review are considered normal, as it is not anticipated that the probationary member will have fully attained the standards required for the award of tenure by the time of the mid-probationary review.

(c) For a positive mid-probationary review there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, the competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty, as well as promise of excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. If the University concludes that insufficient progress towards tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and necessary.

#### **4.7 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR TENURE REVIEW**

##### **4.7.1 Purposes of the Tenure System**

The academic freedom of teachers and scholars is the means by which society is protected from hindrances to the search for knowledge and from limits on the dissemination of knowledge. The system of tenure for faculty members is the preeminent means of fostering and protecting academic freedom of the faculty. The tenure system consists of rules and procedures that establish an essentially self-regulated body of scholars, researchers, and creative artists enjoying the continuity of existence and economic security within which academic freedom is both fostered and protected. The protection of academic freedom shall be extended to all members of the faculty during their terms of appointment. The tenured faculty of a university serve the institution by providing continuity to the university and to its mission of instruction, scholarly work, and service. The awarding of tenure carries both benefits and responsibilities to the individual so recognized. As the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) notes, "freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." It is the responsibility of faculty members, supported by the tenure system, to use the opportunities thus provided for the advancement of the purposes of the University and of the community it serves. These purposes include teaching, scholarly work, and service.

##### **4.7.2 Purpose of the Tenure Review and Standards for Tenure**

The awarding of tenure is the most serious commitment the department, college/school, and University make to a faculty member. Tenure is a privilege, not a right, and is awarded only after the most serious deliberation and review. The tenure review consists of evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit. For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas, and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. Faculty in the School of Medicine are required to demonstrate excellence in two of the following categories of teaching, scholarly work, or service/administration as described in the Medical School tenure and promotion guidelines.

#### **4.8 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR ADVANCEMENT IN RANK: PROMOTIONS**

##### **4.8.1 Purpose**

(a) The promotion process is the mechanism by which the University promotes and recognizes the professional development of faculty members, and thereby maintains the quality of the University. A description of the faculty ranks is provided in this policy (Sec. 2) to set a framework for the promotion process. The promotion review consists of evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics (Sec. 1), according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit, both as appropriate for the promotion level.

(b) Decisions to promote a faculty member are made after a thorough evaluation of his or her performance in all the areas of faculty professional activities and the corresponding categories of performance evaluation specified in this Handbook. The candidate's performance is judged by all recommending parties in the light of the categories and definitions set forth in this Policy, the assignments of the candidate, and any special conditions pertaining to the candidate's appointment.

##### **4.8.2 Promotion to Associate Professor**

(a) It is the policy of the University that tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will normally be granted together. A candidate for tenure who does not already hold the rank of associate professor shall simultaneously be considered for promotion to the associate professor rank. A favorable decision on promotion to associate professor rank shall normally be a basic prerequisite for the awarding of tenure. Requests for departures from this policy must be made prior to the initiation of the tenure or promotion review process with the concurrence of the department, the dean, and the Provost/VPHS.



- (b) Timetable for promotion to associate professor: The anticipated length of service in the rank of assistant professor is six years, with review for promotion to the rank of associate professor occurring in the sixth year. The review process for advancement to associate professor is normally conducted at the same time as the review for tenure (i.e., Fall semester of the final academic year of the probationary period). Recommendations for promotion in less time are to be carefully weighed and justified. Notification of the outcome of the review shall be made during the Spring semester no later than June 30 of that year.

#### 4.8.3 Promotion to Professor

(a) Qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor include attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly work, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank in comparable universities. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.

(b) Timetable for promotion to professor: The anticipated length of service in the rank of associate professor prior to consideration for promotion to the rank of professor is at least five years. Recommendations for promotion in less time must be carefully weighed and justified. The review for advancement in rank to that of professor is initiated during the Fall semester. Notification of the outcome of the review is made during the Spring no later than June 30 of that year.”

Consistent with the *Faculty Handbook's* general guidelines, established protocols in the Department include seeking 8-12 external reviewers for T&P, or promotion files, with half from names provided by candidate and half from names provided by the eligible review faculty, and the final set of reviewers selected by the Department Chair according to those proportions.

As noted above, Operational Definitions for *Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* are provided in Appendix A, and Operational Definitions for *Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* are provided in Appendix B.

As a benchmark for student evaluation of teaching, the 2011 APR Self Study Report (pg. 56) also provides summaries of recent Department performance with respect to the percentage of economics courses at or above IDEA averages [and updated for EvalKIT averages for 2015-2018<sup>5</sup>]. In addition to the regular collection and annual reporting (e.g., in our CYSD) of student evaluations of teaching, all junior faculty are encouraged annually by the Department Chair to receive regular written faculty peer reviews of their classroom teaching (e.g., at least annually if not every semester). It is expected that these written peer reviews of teaching would be included in both T&P and promotion files.

Similar to prior 10-year reviews, the 2011 APR Self Study Report also provides: measures of average research productivity per UNM economics faculty member (2000-2010) of peer reviewed publications (pg. 35) [and now updated for 2011-2018<sup>6</sup>], with comparisons to recent NRC national averages for PhD economics programs (pg. 194); measures of external grant funding (pg. 42); and references to at least seven recent independent ranking of economics-related journals, with total departmental productivity across various top-10, top-20, top-40 and top-100 journal rankings lists (pg. 38). These figures help to provide benchmarks. Faculty members are further encouraged to stay current with various disciplinary and interdisciplinary journal rankings as indicators of quality assessments.

---

<sup>5</sup> In moving in recent years to the EvalKIT student evaluation system, the department average for 2015-2018 across all instructors on question Q1 (Instructor's Overall Effectiveness) was approximately 4.17 on a 5-point scale (with 1=Highly Ineffective and 5 =Highly Effective).

<sup>6</sup> For historical perspective, in the 2000-2010 period, the average faculty FTE member (T/TT) produced approximately 1.2 authored or co-authored peer-reviewed publication (journal articles and book chapters) annually. Approximately one quarter of those publications were placed in “top 100” rankings of economics journals (using various published rankings). More recently, for the period 2011-2017, the average faculty FTE member (T/TT) produced approximately 1.6 authored or co-authored peer-reviewed publications (journal articles and book chapters) annually, with approximately one-fifth of those publications placed in “top 100” rankings of economics journals (using various published rankings).

Finally, the Department's 2011 APR Self-Study Report includes statements on the valuing co-authorship (especially with students), collaboration and interdisciplinary scholarly activity.<sup>7</sup>

#### **IV. Considerations for Continuing, Non-tenure Track Lecturer Appointments**

Continuing non-tenure track faculty (e.g., Lecturer) appointments in the Department are guided by the same collective vision statement, and subject to the same governance documents as all T/TT faculty members. Lecturers are subject to meeting UNM *Faculty Handbook* minimum workload requirements, consistent with the terms of their individual appointments (e.g., specific teaching and service appointments). Also, consistent with the terms of their individual appointment, Lecturers are subject to Departmental *Operational Definitions for Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* Appendix B, and *Operational Definitions for Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement* Appendix A.

As noted, Department **Mentoring Guidelines** (section II above) are flexible enough to incorporate teaching-centered faculty Lecturer appointments.

The UNM *Faculty Handbook* (section B 2.3) explicitly identifies non-tenure track faculty titles including Lecturers:

##### **"2.3.2 Lecturer**

Faculty may be appointed to the position of Lecturer I, II, or III. These appointments are for professionals with appropriate academic qualifications, who are demonstrably competent in the relevant areas of their disciplines. While not eligible for tenure, lecturers in each numerical class may hold the rank of Lecturer. Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer.

(a) Lecturer I—The title used for individuals who have qualifications equivalent to teaching assistants or graduate students and who are not currently graduate students at the University in the same department as their academic appointment.

(b) Lecturer II—The title used for qualified professionals who have completed all requirements except the dissertation for the terminal degree (or equivalent) in their fields of study and who are not currently graduate students at the University in the same department as their academic appointment. It may also be used for professionals who have the terminal degree but only limited experience in teaching or scholarly work, or for professionals who do not have the terminal degree but have extensive experience.

(c) Lecturer III—The title used for qualified professionals who hold the terminal degree (or equivalent) in their fields of study and who have additional experience in teaching and scholarly work."

The *Faculty Handbook* sets out the provisions for appointments for continuing non-tenure track faculty Lecturers (Section B 3.4.2):

##### **"3.4.2 Lecturers**

Lecturers are initially appointed to annual terms renewable at the discretion of the University. Written notice regarding the status of a lecturer shall be given according to the following minimum periods of notice: (1) not later than March 31 of the first academic year of service or (2) not later than December 15 of the second or subsequent academic year of service. Lecturers who have completed at least three academic years of continuous service are eligible for renewable two-year term appointments. Senior Lecturers serve on renewable two-year term appointments, and Principal Lecturers serve on renewable three-year term appointments. Two- and three-year term appointments are renewable at the discretion of the University. Notice of the status of these term appointments will be given no later than December 15 of the final year of the term appointment."

The *Faculty Handbook* establishes the requirement for the Department to conduct annual reviews of these faculty members (Section B 4.10).

It is expected that annual reviews for Lecturers will be conducted by the Department Chair, with input from tenured faculty. It is expected annual Salary Document information for Lecturers will

---

<sup>7</sup> Relatedly, Appendix A, passed by a majority vote of eligible faculty in March 2020, provided operational definitions that discuss how: (i) a sole-authored publication is granted a bonus multiplier of 1.5 in the points system; (ii) no penalty is placed on number of authors, or where an author's name occurs in a co-author list; and (iii) interdisciplinary research is recognized and assigned points.

be collected and reviewed by the Department's annual Salary Committee, with recommendations made under provisions of the Department's *Salary Determination Process*. It is expected that all evaluations will take into account individual appointments (e.g., teaching load) and other assignments (e.g., specific service appointments or duties).

It is expected that opportunities for promotion for continuing non-tenure-track Lecturers (i.e., from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer) under the UNM *Faculty Handbook*, would follow a consistent time frame (e.g., expectations on minimum years) as set out for opportunities for promotion for tenure-track positions (i.e., assistant professor to associate professor to professor). The promotion opportunity is available at each level, but is not a required step (as is the tenure decision in the typical move from assistant to associate professor). The promotion process would be initiated at the request of the individual in writing to the Department Chair in the preceding Fall semester prior to the AY of any proposed promotion. The candidate would prepare a professional dossier for departmental review. The dossier would be due at the start of the subsequent Spring Semester, and the review would be conducted in that Spring Semester. Candidates would be free to include letters of support from any source, but the process would only include internal reviews. Specifically, the tenured faculty members would provide their individual written reviews of the dossier materials, and their support decisions, as requested by the Department Chair. The Department Chair would then summarize those reviews and the aggregate level of support and submit his or her written recommendation, along with the complete dossier (as supporting materials for the decision), to the Dean of A&S.

Finally, the Department process for annual reviews and promotion decisions for continuing non-tenure-track Lecturers would be subject to any guidelines or rules set out by the College of A&S or the Provost's Office at UNM.

## **Appendix A**

### **UNM Economics Operational Definitions for Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement**

The objective of this document is to provide operational definitions for “excellence, effectiveness, and needs improvement” in research for the Department of Economics at the University of New Mexico.

As background, per the UNM Faculty Handbook Section 1.2.2 on Scholarly Work:

1.2.2.a “The term Scholarly Work...comprises scholarship, research, or creative work. Scholarship embodies the critical and accurate synthesis and dissemination of knowledge. The term research is understood to mean systematic, original investigation directed toward the generation, development, and validation of new knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems...”

1.2.2.b “The faculty member's scholarly work should contribute to the discipline and serve as an indication of professional competence. The criteria for judging the original or imaginative nature of research or creative work must reflect the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. To qualify as scholarship or creative work, the results of the endeavor must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field in question.”

1.2.2.c “Evidence of scholarship ...is determined by the faculty member's publications... and may be supplemented by evidence of integration of the faculty member’s scholarly work and teaching. Written evaluations from colleagues and experts in the field, both on campus and at other institutions..., must...form part of the dossier for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks...”

Building from the UNM Faculty Handbook Section 1.2.2. the following evaluation system provided herein will be used in *operationally defining* Excellence/Effective/Needs Improvement in Research for all Department of Economics Faculty members who have research requirements in their workload (anything less than a 4+4 teaching appointment).<sup>8</sup>

The operational definitions, and various thresholds, will be used as recommended guideposts in annual salary process assessments, annual reviews and primary milestone reviews (Tenure and Promotion to Associate, Promotion to Professor). Milestone reviews also require the support of external reviews of scholarship against “disciplinary standards”, with further review by the

---

<sup>8</sup> This evaluation (points) system and all uses in defining Excellent, Effective and Needs Improvement in Research applies to all T/TT faculty on a standard Department workload (2+2 teaching load). Other cases are adjusted specifically according to hiring or administrative appointment letters. To encourage seeking external grants no increase in points requirements are made for a faculty member who secures a course buyout(s) (e.g., 1+2 or 1+1 teaching load). Research requirements in the points system shall be proportionally adjusted based on a faculty member’s administrative appointment letter in the College of Arts and Sciences or elsewhere at UNM. For example, a faculty member serving a half-time appointment as Department Chair will have their research requirements in the points system adjusted proportionately for the time they serve as chair. Similarly, for a continuing faculty member (e.g., Lecturer) on an adjusted workload, by initial hire letter or letter from Dean or Provost, then the research requirement in the point system is adjusted proportionately for that period. (This is accounted for in Workload spreadsheets). A Lecturer on a 4+4 teaching load has no research expectation.

senior faculty and chair. It is expected that external review letters will be an important weighting consideration in milestone reviews.

For further background, the University of New Mexico is considered the “flagship university” for the state of New Mexico and is one of only two Public, Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the United States that is also classified by the Carnegie Foundation as RU/VH (Research University–Very High Research Activity). The department of economics is an applied economics program that strives to conduct policy-relevant and high-quality research. Currently, there are three graduate fields: (i) Environmental and Resources; (ii) Public Economics; and (iii) International Development and Sustainability.

In the 2011 Academic Program Review [APR], the goals for the UNM Department of Economics are described in the following way:

*“A major objective of the Department is to contribute to the understanding of economic issues and problems through high quality research both within our discipline, and in interdisciplinary efforts. This is consistent with the University’s mission as a Carnegie RU/VH institution that contributes not only to the education of its citizens but also the advancement of knowledge.*

*Our goal is to further enhance the Department’s research record in peer-reviewed professional publications, and recognition both nationally and internationally. This can only be achieved through an increase in quality research output, which includes publications of high impact, funded research, and participation in national and international professional meetings. Recognizing the importance of student involvement in the research effort, we will continue to pursue an integrated program of research and teaching.”*

There are numerous components to a research career and numerous paths to research excellence (e.g., publications, book chapters, grants, citations, etc.). Overall, in the discipline of economics, highly ranked peer-reviewed economic journals are the most valued form of scholarly work, particularly early on in a research career for establishing national and international reputation. Our department also values interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal publications, and peer-reviewed interdisciplinary publications that are community based and/or policy relevant. Additionally, a sustained funded research program is valued in our department, particularly a funded research program that integrates (and supports) graduate students.

In terms of overall structure and process, a point system is provided that is designed to create a metric of measurable output from an active research program along with recommended thresholds to categorize research excellence, effectiveness, and needs improvement. The data for this point system is based on achievements in the prior calendar year, and shall be collected annually each Spring semester along with the Department’s Calendar Year Salary Document and updated CV’s.<sup>9</sup> Specifically, a spreadsheet calculator will be provided to all faculty members for the points systems.<sup>10</sup> Suggested point thresholds are provided for both annual and milestone review cases. It is expected that milestone reviews “shall take account of the annual reviews of the faculty member” (UNM Faculty Handbook B4.3.1(a)). Finally, consistent with the UNM

---

<sup>9</sup> A publication shall be included in the year that it was accepted for publication.

<sup>10</sup> The faculty are collectively responsible for maintaining and correcting any errors in this spreadsheet. Any issues or disputes with the spreadsheet calculator will be handled through the regular faculty governance process.

Faculty Handbook (e.g., 4.2.1), points will be calculated based on research performance achieved while a faculty member is at UNM.

To summarize, the point system and suggested thresholds are meant to provide a measure of transparency to both faculty researchers, as well as to senior faculty and the Department Chair in conducting annual and milestone reviews. This points system provides **recommended** guidance for, but does not replace, annual reviews and the promotion process (which includes the collection of a set of external reviews).

There are numerous ways to rank economics publications. Thus, a points system for two different lists is provided: (i) Research Papers in Economics (RePEc)<sup>11</sup>; and (ii) SCImago<sup>12</sup> Journal Rank (SJR). At annual and milestone reviews a faculty member will be able to choose which list they want to use to score their publications.

Finally, defining research excellence, effectiveness, and needs improvement is an important and complicated task. While continual change is not desired, it is suggested that this document be revisited periodically (e.g., every 3 years) and reviewed by Department faculty and updated as appropriate under the faculty governance process.

## **1. Peer Reviewed Publication**

### **1.1 Economic Journal Rankings**

A journal article will be considered an economics publication if it appears on the RePEc journal list. To determine the number of points awarded for publications at annual reviews and milestone reviews, a faculty member will be able to choose the list they would like to use (i.e., RePEc or SCIMago). All economic publications will be evaluated using the particular list chosen (a faculty member will choose one list for all of their publications, not the list for each particular publication).

For an example of this process, consider a year where a faculty member published an article in *Journal of Environmental Economics & Management* and an article in *Contemporary Economic Policy*. Because both of these journals are on the RePEc list, they will both be considered an economics journal. The faculty member will then have to choose either the RePEc or the SCIMago list, which will be used to evaluate both articles.

#### ***1.1.a RePEc Scoring Metric***

The first scoring metric used to evaluate economic publications will come from the RePEc journal rankings. Because there are numerous different journal rankings within RePEc (Simple, Recursive, Discounted, Discounted Recursive, h-index, Euclid, Downloads, Abstract views, and Aggregate) a RePEc composite score will be calculated using the first six metrics (Simple, Recursive, Discounted, Discounted Recursive, h-index, and Euclid) for publications in the last 10

---

<sup>11</sup> The RePEc project is the largest *open-access* meta-data source in the field of Economics (hosting publishers' data). Originating in mid-1990's and maintained by volunteers, it is currently sponsored by the *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis*, and collaborates with the *American Economic Association's* EconLit project. The RePEc journal ranking as of 2020 contains more than 2,000 journals and paper series with registered economic content. See: <https://ideas.repec.org/top/top.journals.all.html>

<sup>12</sup> SCImago is based on the [Scopus®](https://www.scimagojr.com/) database (currently owned by Elsevier) and includes citations, dating back to the mid-1990's, from more than 34,000 journals, as of 2020. See: <https://www.scimagojr.com/aboutus.php>

years. Specifically, to convert RePEc journal rankings into scores, the average rank of every journal across the six metrics is first calculated. Then, the journals are re-ranked (the rank\_final) based on this average rank. To calculate a score based on the rank\_final, the following nonlinear function is used:  $\text{composite\_score} = \sqrt{1/\text{rank\_final}} * 25 - 1$ . To remove extreme values, the score will be truncated so that no publication will be worth more than 10 points (e.g., a publication with a composite score of 14.2 will be reduced to 10). Also, the list will be truncated so that all publications with a value of less than 0.25 will be increased to 0.25 (e.g., a publication with a composite score of 0.11 will be rounded up to 0.25).

### *1.1.b SCImago Journal Ranking*

Using the SCImago Journal Ranking list, the value of a publication will be determined using the SCImago Journal Rank indicator (SJR) score. The SJR score will be truncated by the same method as described above with the RePEc composite score (i.e., between 10 and 0.25 points).

### 1.2 Interdisciplinary Publication Ranking

Journals that are not in the RePEc journal list will be considered interdisciplinary journals. Interdisciplinary publications will be valued using a transformed SJR score. First, interdisciplinary journals will be reweighted by multiplying the SJR score by 0.66. After the scores have been reweighted, the distribution will be truncated so that no publication will be worth more than 6 points and no publications will be worth less than 0.25 points. Peer-reviewed publications not on the SJR list will also receive 0.25 points.

### 1.3 Other considerations for valuing peer-reviewed publications

- ✓ The number of points for sole authored publications will be multiplied by 1.5.

## **2. Books**

The author of a peer-reviewed book will receive 2 points. An editor of a peer-reviewed edited volume will receive 1 point and an author of a peer-reviewed book chapter will receive .25 points.

### 2.1 Other considerations for valuing books

- ✓ The number of points for sole-authored books or book chapters will be multiplied by 1.5.
- ✓ Points will not be allocated for pay-to-publish presses and book contracts should be provided.

## **3. External Contracts and Grants**

External contracts and grants not only signal the external impact of a research program, but they also signal potential future research streams. Additionally, as stated in the 2011 APR, the Economics Department recognizes the importance of student involvement in the research effort. To encourage seeking externally funded research, 1 point will be allocated for each yearly full-time (0.5 FTE for AY Fall Spring)<sup>13</sup> economic graduate that is funded by an external contract or grant.

---

<sup>13</sup> Points will be proportionally adjusted according to this 9 month, 0.50 FTE AY base (e.g., considering 0.25 FTE, or considering summer semester funding support for students).

### 3.1 Other considerations for valuing grants

- ✓ Partial points are allowed (e.g., .25 points for a half-time graduate student who is funded for a semester).
- ✓ Grants must be officially run through UNM (i.e, a grant must be run through pre-award.)
- ✓ If multiple UNM economics department faculty are listed investigators on a grant, authors are allowed to determine how the points are allocated (this allocation should generally correspond to the effort on the grant and the effort spent supervising graduate students).
- ✓ Money from contracts and grants must come from external sources. However, a one-time allocation of up to 1 point will be allocated to a faculty member who obtains funding for a graduate student through an internal grant structure (such as a RAC grant).

## 4. **Annual Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement**

### Annual research excellence:

The recommended threshold for annual research excellence is 3 or more points in a particular calendar year.

### Effectiveness:

Because there are ebbs and flows, and sometimes long lags in the research process, research effectiveness will be defined on a three-year rolling average. The recommended threshold for research effectiveness is a rolling average of at least 0.5 points over the last three (calendar) year period, with 0.25 of those points explicitly coming from peer-reviewed publications as described in section 1 of this document.

### Needs Improvement

If a faculty member does not reach the rolling-average number of points required for annual research effectiveness, it is recommended that she/he be categorized as needs improvement. A pattern of multiple years of needs improvement (3 or more) would reflect the absence of an active research program.

## 5. **Milestone Promotion Criteria for Research Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement**

### *5.1 Criteria for promotion to associate professor*

At the tenure decision node research points will be aggregated for publications, books, and grants as a metric of active research output while serving as a faculty member at UNM.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, citations are an important metric a candidate's work's influence and importance. Therefore, citations will be used by the Department Chair as an additional consideration in designating Research Excellence, Effectiveness, and Needs Improvement at milestone reviews.

### Research excellence for promotion to associate professor

---

<sup>14</sup> At the time of a milestone review, points for publications will be recalculated based on the most recent journal ranking lists.



The recommended threshold for research excellence for promotion to associate professor is a point level that meets or exceeds 12 points and at least 5 points must come from economics journals.

#### Research effectiveness for promotion to associate professor

The recommended threshold for research effectiveness for promotion to associate professor is a point level that meets or exceeds 8 points and at least 4 points must come from economic journals.

#### Needs improvement in research for promotion to associate professor

It is recommended that needs improvement in research for promotion to associate professor is not reaching the number of points required for research effectiveness for promotion to associate professor.

### *5.2 Criteria for full professor<sup>15</sup>*

At the full professor decision node, research points will be aggregated for publications, books, and grants as a metric of active research output while a faculty member is at UNM. Additionally, citations are an important metric a faculty member's work's influence and importance. Therefore, citations will be used by the Department Chair as an additional consideration in designating Research Excellence, Effectiveness, and Needs Improvement at milestone reviews.

#### Research excellence for promotion to full professor

The recommended threshold for research excellence at full professor is a point level that meets or exceeds 26 points, with at least 10 points coming from economics journals. Additionally, at least 14 points and 5 economic points must come after the faculty member received promotion to associate professor.

#### Research effectiveness for promotion to full professor

The recommended threshold for research effectiveness for promotion to full professor is a point level that meets or exceed 9 points since the faculty member received promotion to associate professor, with at least 4 points coming from economic journals.

#### Needs improvement in research for promotion to full professor

It is recommended that needs improvement in research for promotion to full professor is not reaching the number of points required for research effectiveness for promotion to full professor

---

<sup>15</sup> The following provides point thresholds that apply to promotion candidates who are assumed to go up at the earliest possible point for years on-track as an associate professor (which would include time on sabbatical leaves, but exclude time on LWOP or parental or medical leave). For a candidate who exceeds this time frame thresholds are scaled proportionally.

## Appendix B

### Operational Definitions for Teaching Excellence, Effectiveness and Needs Improvement

Per the UNM Faculty Handbook Section 1.2.1 on Teaching:

1.2.1.a “The term teaching ...includes, but is not restricted to, regularly scheduled undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, and professional instruction, and the advising, direction and supervision of individual undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, and professional students. ...Teaching also includes the direction or supervision of students in reading, research, internships, residencies, or fellowships. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that confer no University credit should also be considered as teaching.”

1.2.1.b “Effective teaching is one of the primary qualifications for promotion and tenure. The educational experience provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning. An effective teacher is best characterized as an individual who successfully promotes these goals. Although individual teachers bring to bear different sets of talents in pursuit of these goals an effective teacher, at a minimum, should:

- Demonstrate effective communication skills.
- Show evidence of strong preparation.
- Present material that reflects the current state of knowledge in the field.
- Demonstrate effective management skills.
- Organize individual topics into a meaningful sequence.
- Demonstrate an ability to interact with students in an encouraging and stimulating manner.
- Demonstrate a commitment to the discipline.”

1.2.1.c “Teaching is evaluated by students and faculty. Evidence to be evaluated for teaching during mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member, and written reports of peer observations of teaching.”

All of the items above in 1.2.1.c (student evaluations, description of courses taught and their development, and peer evaluations), as applied to milestone reviews, are part of the current UNM College of Arts and Sciences Teaching Portfolio Guidelines. It is expected that any updates to these College (or Provost) Guidelines will be followed. The practice in Department of Economics has been to review such evidence at all *milestone* reviews for both T/TT faculty and Lecturers.

Evaluations are based on information provided in the Department’s calendar year salary document (CYSD), current CV and Workload documents submitted every year in early Spring semester, and reviewed by the Salary Committee, Senior Faculty and Chair, and based on the prior calendar year. The evaluation system includes flexibility to allow *multiple paths to excellence*. Evaluations are also expected to include qualitative judgement by both senior faculty and the Department Chair, which can include a menu of possible evidence that can be used to help indicate excellence in teaching (especially when a significant number of these items are present). These include but are not limited to:

- a. Receiving a UNM award that recognizes excellent teaching or mentoring (including broader awards for overall performance, e.g., Regents Lecturer etc.)

- b. Receiving a community or professional award that recognizes excellent teaching or mentoring
- c. Having a course quality-certified at UNM or by an outside body
- d. Adding a new course to a faculty member's teaching portfolio (beyond the minimum requirement of five courses); this can include an online course version
- e. Chairing multiple completed PhD dissertations and/or Masters theses/projects in a year
- f. Participating as committee member on three or more completed PhD dissertations and/or Masters theses or professional projects in a year
- g. Teaching an undergraduate study abroad class
- h. Securing new funding for student travel (e.g., conferences or training)
- i. Attending multiple special teacher trainings or certifications
- j. Having a student you chair or are primary advisor (or co-advisor) to win an award (undergraduate or graduate)
- k. Mentoring multiple graduate students in a year who are developing and teaching their own class (including assisting with online formats)
- l. Having outstanding teaching evaluations for all courses in a year, which are more than 1 standard deviation above overall department average (all courses, all instructors) from prior year, with more than 70% of students reporting.
- m. Teaching one or more extra course in a year (without extra compensation)
- n. Mentoring undergraduate students as research assistants or in departmental honors, El Puente, McNair, ASSURE, and other similar programs.
- o. Leading a teacher training session (e.g., in the Department, or a UNM program)
- p. Undertaking a major course restructure to improve student learning (e.g. creating a flipped classroom, incorporating undergraduate research experiences in a gen ed course), development of a teaching tool or curricular product that can be adapted to other coursework or in other learning settings.
- q. Participating as a course reviewer for quality assurance.
- r. Participating in teaching fellowships, special teaching initiatives, or grants for teaching innovations (e.g., SEP, ECURE, OER)
- s. Presenting on pedagogical practices at local, national and international workshops or conferences

The list is recognized as not being exhaustive, and a faculty member might identify other items that they believe contribute to excellence. All these items can be included in the "Other Information" category in the annual salary document. And, if desired to help present their case, **faculty members are encouraged to include an appended teaching reflection statement with their annual salary document.**

Finally, it is recognized that faculty members may contribute greatly to the teaching mission through serving successfully as the Department's Undergraduate Director, Graduate Director, MA3 Director, Gen-Ed Outcomes Assessment Coordinator, or AOP (Accelerated Online Program) Coordinator. In and of itself, simply occupying one of these Department roles is not evidence of, or an indicator of teaching excellence, and overlaps greatly with an individual faculty member's service role. However, sustained outstanding performance, especially as recognized by the Department Chair, can be a contributing factor in "rounding out" an evaluation of teaching excellence.

## ***Operational Definitions***

Given these indicators and UNM Faculty Handbook Section 1.2.1, the Department has the following operational definitions of Excellent, Effective and Needs Improvement, for all continuing faculty with teaching requirements in their identified workload. This teaching requirement may vary from 1+1 in an academic Year (AY), to 4+4 for most full-time Lecturers, but is commonly 2+2 for T/TT faculty (with opportunities for buyouts for external grants).

**Effective Teaching (Annual):** Meets Department minimum Workload spreadsheet requirements that year for Teaching, AND has average student evaluations of teaching, for the primary Rate-the-Instructor question, over the prior 3 years (or at least prior 4 courses) that are *less than 2* standard deviations below the overall department average for the prior three years (e.g., given, say, a Department average of approximately 4.1 out of 5, with a standard deviation of approximately 0.6, then this threshold not to fall below would be 3.2.).<sup>16</sup> Further, for any faculty below the level of full Professor or Principal Lecturer, there should be at least one annual peer teaching review letter (as cc'd to the Chair), and no pattern of clearly identified deficiency, per FH Section 1.2.1.b criteria, as identified from prior 3 years from these letters.

**Effective Teaching (Primary Milestone Reviews – Tenure and Promotion to Associate, Promotion to Professor, Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer):** It is expected that the faculty member will be Effective in all years in Annual reviews, with allowance for one exception (for the years in any rank,) as long that evaluation of Needs Improvement is corrected in the subsequent year. There should be a minimum portfolio of 5 classes taught (and available to be assigned). The portfolio should typically include at least one general education course (ECON 2110 or ECON 2120), for all continuing faculty members, unless the curricular needs of the department require a different set of courses. Further, any T/TT faculty member should have also taught at least one graduate course in their portfolio (and available to be assigned). Further, the faculty member should have completed all suggested requirements in current College Teaching Portfolio guidelines. The faculty member should have a collection of at least one peer teaching review letter per year (including within the most recent calendar year), with no pattern of significant identified deficiencies, per FH Section 1.2.1.b. Finally, the evidence collected per 1.2.1.c (e.g., as incorporated in the College Teaching Portfolio) will be used by milestone reviewers from the Economics faculty to assess Effectiveness in their milestone reviews votes/letters to the Chair.

**Excellent Teaching (Annual):** First, the faculty member must meet the Effective teaching standard for that year, *and in addition* have multiple indicators from the above list (i – xvii), as necessary but not sufficient conditions. These indicators (a-s), and any other significant teaching achievements, should clearly be identified by the faculty member in annual CV and/or Salary Document information collected for prior calendar year (e.g., in the “Other Information” category). The Salary Committee may recommend individuals (of any rank) with majority support in their committee summary letter to the Department Chair as deserving Teaching Excellence consideration for that year.<sup>17</sup> Individual senior faculty in their confidential input to

---

<sup>16</sup> It is recognized that there is significant research literature demonstrating that student evaluations of teaching scores may represent highly flawed metrics (e.g., only reflecting popularity or ease of the course, and may have a variety of inherent biases). Further, slightly higher or lower scores may also not reflect any meaningful statistical differences. However, the position taken here is that a pattern of very low scores, relative to the overall department average (all instructors, all courses) is almost always a clear indicator of significant problems in the classroom.

<sup>17</sup> Recommendations for annual Teaching Excellence from the Salary Committee are not limited to two faculty members; this is treated separately from the case of two individuals who may be recommended by the Salary Committee to the Chair each year for Merit, and based on combined review of Teaching, Research and Service.

the Department's annual review process should clearly indicate whether they recommend any individual faculty for teaching excellence. All confidential comments from senior faculty are collected by Department Administrator and provided without attribution as an appendix in each faculty member's annual review letter. Finally, the Chair will review and make an assessment in each faculty member's Annual Review. In cases where others (i.e., Salary Committee or Senior Faculty) are recommending Teaching Excellence, the Chair should explain clearly in their review whether they concur or why they do not (e.g., comments or support may be mixed).

**Excellent Teaching (Primary Milestone Reviews – Tenure and Promotion to Associate, Promotion to Professor, Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer):** Effective in all years in Annual reviews, AND at least 2 years in annual reviews in rank that are Excellent, AND an assessment by the senior faculty and Chair of excellence in the year immediately prior to the submission of the RPT dossier, in their reviews of the dossier. While a necessary but not sufficient condition, the expectation is that the faculty member will have a broad accumulation of annual indicators from the above list (i –xvii).

**Needs Improvement** is defined as the absence of Effective, for either annual or primary milestone reviews.

## Appendix C

Department of Economics, UNM

Variable Teaching Load Policy

Effective Date: February 7, 2011 - (With re-evaluation required in 2014)

The standard classroom teaching assignment (annually) for all faculty in the Department of Economics at UNM has been a base 2+2 load (two assigned classroom courses in both Fall and Spring semesters), with the assumption of an active research program. This can be reduced through administrative or contractual agreements, and through signed course buyouts for external research grants (maintaining at least one classroom course each semester). Higher teaching loads for individual faculty members can also be implemented based on a reduced focus on research (a voluntary choice), or reduced research productivity (a triggering mechanism):

A. Any tenured faculty member, with their salary line in the department budget, may voluntarily choose to move to a higher classroom teaching load (e.g., 3+3) through a signed agreement with the Department Chair (kept on file in Department and forwarded to College of A&S). The signed agreement would be expected to articulate any reduced research expectations, as well as the increased teaching expectations including more than just additional course assignments. As previously noted by faculty meeting and review consensus, such a voluntary change can be accommodated within the current Rules of Governance and Decision Making and annual Salary Determination Process, and Annual Review process in the Department.

B. An increased teaching load can also be assigned for the next academic year (AY) to any tenured faculty member, with their salary line in the department budget, who fails to meet at least one of the following conditions, excluding time during approved leaves of absences (not sabbaticals):

- (i) at least one accepted or published piece, as author or co-author, in a peer-reviewed professional outlet (professional journal, edited book chapter or book) within the last 3 years (as listed, and verified, on annual salary data)
- (ii) at least one accepted or active external research grant, as listed Co-PI or PI, administered through UNM within the last three years (as listed, and verified, on annual salary data)
- (iii) at least two current submissions (under review consideration) of either manuscripts for publication (as author or co-author to peer-reviewed professional outlets) or external research grants (as listed Co-PI or PI) within the last year.
- (iv) other scholarly accomplishments of noteworthy distinction, within the last 3 years.

C. If the conditions in B are triggered for an increased teaching load for any faculty member, the increase in the first year will be to a 3+2 (or 2+3) assigned classroom-teaching load. Absent meeting the conditions in the B in the subsequent year, this will then increase to a 3+3 teaching load. The 3+3 teaching load would continue until the conditions in B are met. Notification of the faculty member of any increase in base teaching load for the next AY should be made within the required Annual Review process (kept on file in Department and submitted to College of A&S).

D. For the first time that the increased teaching load assignment in C is triggered for any faculty member, the individual may request in writing to the Department Chair a one year delay to the initial increase in the base teaching load. The faculty member would work with the Chair to identify current plans for moving their research program forward. It is expected that this request would be granted, conditional on the faculty member submitting a plan for current and future research activities. If the conditions in B are not subsequently met after the additional year, then the initial increase in the base teaching load in C would be triggered.