

POLICY FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

I. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

- A. Teaching
- B. Research and Creative Work
- C. Professional Reputation and Activity
- D. Institute and Public Service

Annex I: Professional Appointments

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Visiting Appointment
- Adjunct Appointment

PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

I. Initial Appointment

II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

- A. Tenure Committee Formation
- B. Candidate's Review File
- C. Annual Tenure Review
- D. Non-reappointment
- E. Final Tenure Review
 - 1. Teaching Evaluation
 - 2. Research and Creative Work Evaluation
 - 3. External Review
 - 4. Committee Recommendation

III. Promotion or Appointment to Full Professor

Other Procedure Information

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Introduction

Nomination and Preliminary Evaluation

Criteria

Record-Keeping

Teaching

Research and Scholarship

For Scientific and Engineering Faculty

Scholarly and Creative Work in Humanities, Fine Arts, and other Nontechnical Fields

Research and Scholarly Work in all Fields

Professional Activity

Institute and Public Service

Basis for Evaluation

Documentation

APPENDIX

Length of probationary period

Procedures for selection of tenure committee

Procedures for annual tenure review

Procedures for non-reappointment

Final tenure review

Final tenure review deadlines

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

New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
POLICY FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
(Adopted by the Faculty on 3/14/90 & Revisions Adopted on 2/3/98 & 5/12/00)

I. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

The candidate will be evaluated with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional reputation, and (4) Institute and public service. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Considering both internal and external assessments of the candidate's ability and promise, the review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a sound and productive scholarly program. The scholarly work should be predominately in the field for which the candidate was hired. The review committee must take care to apply the criteria with sufficient accuracy but flexibility. Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions. Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the Institute's dedication to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

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

A. Teaching

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

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

It is important to emphasize that teaching activity extends beyond the classroom involving academic and personal counseling activities (including referrals), and research advising. The committee should also

pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instruction by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels.

B. Research and Creative Work

Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or literary and artistic creation. Publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. The evaluation of scholarly activities should be based on scholarly achievement, as evidenced by quality and quantity of papers presented at professional meetings and published in refereed journals and books, by the significance and editorial standards of the journals in which they appear, and by the quality of the textbooks written. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be considered whenever possible. When creative work is the result of joint effort and authorship, the quality and quantity of the candidate's contribution should be assessed. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field of scholarship or research. To ascertain those expectations, informed reviews by the candidate's peers should be considered important testimony. This should be represented implicitly by the peer-reviewed papers and proposals of the candidate, and explicitly by solicited letters.

Textbooks, papers and reports, circulars, patent activity, proposals for research activities, and similar efforts to advance professional practice or professional education should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate significant scholarly research. In certain fields, such as the fine arts and humanities, distinguished creation would include such things as literature, poetry, drama, dance, composition and artistic production.

C. Professional Reputation and Activity.

Participation in professional activities is an important aspect of faculty development. In evaluating the level of the candidate's professional participation and leadership, committees should consider the following: offices in professional organizations; service to a journal as a member of the editorial staff, regular contributor, or reviewer; organization of professional meetings and symposia; participation in meetings, symposia and short courses; involvement in educational or professional accreditation; widely recognized innovations, inventions, or designs; honors such as medals, prizes, and honorary appointments; or such other ways as the committee may perceive. Good professional standing is taken for granted, but indications of leadership are sought for promotion and tenure.

D. Institute and Public Service.

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

Specific criteria for each level of promotion are attached as an annex to these general guidelines. A separate guideline for Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure should be consulted for specific procedures by which this policy is to be implemented.

ANNEX I PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

(Adopted by the Faculty on 3/14/90)

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

Professor

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

Associate Professor

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

Assistant Professor

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

Visiting Appointment

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

Adjunct Appointment

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

New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
(Adopted by the Faculty Council on 3/14/90 & Revisions on 2/3/98 & 5/12/00)

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

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

I. Initial Appointment

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

The initial appointment at all levels is normally considered probationary. Tenure cannot be granted at NMIMT at the time of an initial appointment except through special approval of the Board of Regents.

II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are normally considered together. Tenure and promotion must be granted assistant professors within seven years of service, if they are to be continued. The decision will not normally be made prior to the fifth year. If the original appointment is at a rank higher than that of Assistant Professor, then the tenure decision will be taken alone. Tenure may be granted to Associate Professors within three years of their initial appointment. Full Professors may be granted tenure within two years. Tenure appointments will not be made in the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Visiting appointments or Faculty Adjunct appointments.

A. Tenure Committee Formation

A tenure (and promotion) committee will be formed for each Assistant Professor or non-tenured Associate or Full Professor within three months of the candidate's initial appointment. The committee will consist of five tenure Associate or Full Professors appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, on recommendation of the Department Chair. At least two of the committee members will come from outside of the department. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint one member as

the chair. In order to ensure the independence of the administrative appraisal and recommendation, it is desirable that administrators signing recommendations on the tenure report not also be members of the tenure committee. It is desirable that Department Chairs, unless essential to an informal appraisal and recommendation on the tenure committee, not be members of the tenure committee. In small departments, insufficient to form a tenure committee, a reviewer or reviewers from outside of New Mexico Tech may be appointed. The Vice President for Academic Affairs has the latitude to replace committee members if necessary.

B. Candidate's Review File

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

C. Annual Tenure Review

Each year the tenure committee will review the candidate's review file and, if necessary, request additional information from the candidate. The committee will then meet, evaluate the candidate's progress, and report its findings in writing on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form. The committee report will be sent by February 15 to the Department Chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the candidate. Before March 1, the tenure committee chair will meet with the candidate and discuss that individual's prospects for future and permanent appointment at the Institute, and promote constructive activities which that individual should consider pursuing.

For the first year review, the tenure committee will describe their expectations for the candidate regarding research, teaching, and service. It is desirable that the tenure committee meet with the candidate in person in the first year to review the expectations for progress. Permission may be granted for an additional probationary year, provided the candidate is clearly making good progress toward tenure. The additional year should not be used to prolong probation for a candidate making insufficient progress.

D. Non-reappointment

Tenure committees may conclude the candidate is making insufficient progress during any probationary year. If the tenure committee finds that the candidate is making insufficient progress, it will send to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a recommendation of non-reappointment. This notice will be sent in accordance with the timetable outlined in Section IID1 of Regulations Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure. This schedule requires that a preliminary, if not a final, recommendation of non-reappointment should be included on the February 15 submittal of the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form.

E. Final Tenure Review

The final tenure review will be initiated in May, the (academic) year before the (academic) year of the decision. By August 15, the candidate will submit the final review file to the tenure committee chair. It will include formal internal and external assessments of the candidate's ability and promise, following the criteria given in the Policy for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.

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

Teaching Evaluation

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

Research and Creative Work Evaluation

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

External Review

Letters from all tenured department members will be invited. Letters from other individual tenure faculty or research staff on campus can be solicited. The tenure committee will also obtain written letters from no less than three distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as the candidate. The candidate can be asked to suggest possible outside reviewers. In addition to the reviewers suggested by the candidate, the committee chair shall seek the names of other distinguished individuals who should be familiar with the candidate's work. In no case, will more than one of the three outside reviewers be a present or former close associate, supervisor, or mentor of the candidate.

The tenure committee chair is responsible for informing outside reviewers of the criteria and procedures for evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion at New Mexico Tech, including the expectations for teaching, research or creativity, and service. Tenure committee chairs should send the candidate's review file and a copy of the New Mexico Tech Policies and Procedures on tenure and promotion to outside reviewers of candidates for tenure.

Committee Recommendation

The committee will send its recommendation with supporting documentation, along with any minority opinions, to the Department Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15 of the decision year. It is essential that the recommendation report of the tenure committee, for every review but especially in the decision year, make an informed and complete argument for the committee's recommendation. Evidence should be cited, including specifics from the letters of the outside reviewers, details about the candidate's teaching and publishing achievements, and discussion of the candidate's

professional service. In the final analysis, the committee's report must provide convincing supporting evidence for their recommendation. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review the recommendation, and forward the package with his/her own considered recommendation to the President by March 15. The President does the same, forwarding his/her recommendation to the Board of Regents. It is advisable that the Board of Regents consider tenure recommendations at their April meeting.

III. Promotion or Appointment to Full Professor

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

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

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

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

Other Procedure Information

See Regulations Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure

**Guidelines for the Assessment of Candidates
For Promotion to Full Professor**
(Adopted by the Faculty Council, 5/96 revisions 5/12/00)

Introduction

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

Nomination and Preliminary Evaluation

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

Criteria

The Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure gives the following four areas of activity in which evidence of "exceptional distinction" by candidates for promotion should be sought: (1) teaching, (2) research and creative work, (3) professional competence and activity, and (4) Institute and public service. Definitions and examples of these areas are described in the Policy. This document provides specific guidance on methods for comparative evaluation of performance in these areas. Separate guidelines are provided for faculty in scientific and engineering fields and for those in the humanities and other fields.

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

Record-Keeping

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

Teaching

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

One basis for judging teaching performance is student evaluations. Departments will provide to the committee summaries of student evaluations (compilations of numerical scores and written comments) for all classes taught since the candidate was promoted to Associate Professor, or for the last 5 years, whichever is shorter. The numerical scores should be averaged by grade level (i.e., 100-200, 300-400, 500 level) inasmuch as there are often systematic differences between evaluations at different grade levels. Average numerical scores above 4 in upper division courses, or 3 in lower divisions courses, can be taken to indicate distinction, if supported by other evidence. An additional form of evidence is numbers of undergraduate advisees, M.S. students, and Ph.D. students. Other evidence could include impressions gained from written comments by students on the evaluation form, opinions offered by other faculty members, written opinions submitted by former students, impressions gained from classroom visitations, and evidence of developing new and effective programs and techniques of instruction. Information on graduate advisees who have gone on to distinguished careers is another particularly important basis for judgment. Receiving official recognition for teaching achievement (such as the Institute Distinguished Teaching Award) is another. In cases where either teaching performance is a critical part of a case for distinguished achievement, or where teaching quality appears to be so low as to be an impediment to promotion, it is recommended that the committee verify the situation by conducting interviews with advisees and students who have taken courses from the instructor under consideration. The Registrar can provide a list of randomly selected students to interview.

Research and Scholarship

For Scientific and Engineering Faculty

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

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

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

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

Scholarly and Creative Work in Humanities, Fine Arts, and other Nontechnical Fields

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

Candidates should demonstrate significant achievement in scholarship and creative activity by the publication of books, monographs, translated books, a significant number of articles in refereed journals or book chapters, or a substantial number of performances or exhibitions of creative work that have achieved national or international recognition. Other evidence of significant achievement in these areas

includes the successful application for grants from major funding sources, editing of scholarly journals with national or international circulation, and major achievement awards.

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

Research and Scholarly Work in all Fields

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

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

Professional Activity

Evidence should be sought for both service and leadership in the candidate's professional field. Such evidence is not readily subject to quantification, but is relatively easily recognized. Important evidence includes service as associate editor or on editorial boards of professional journals. Service as chief editor is particularly noteworthy, as is being honored with a service award by a professional organization. Election to significant offices in professional organizations is also noteworthy, as is playing a major role in the organization of professional conferences. Minor offices in professional organizations, organizing sessions or symposia at professional meetings, and regularly serving as a reviewer for professional journals are all indications of worthwhile professional activity.

Institute and Public Service

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

Basis for Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Documentation

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

A P P E N D I X

Important Dates and Processes in Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Length of probationary period

Initial appointment at all levels is normally considered probationary.

Tenure and promotion must be granted within seven years of service, if candidate is to be continued.

Normally the tenure decision will not be made prior to the fifth year.

Tenure may be granted to Associate Professors within three years of initial appointment.

Tenure may be granted to Full Professors within two years.

Procedures for selection of tenure committee

Formed within three months of initial appointment.

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

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

Procedures for annual tenure review

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

February 15 or before, tenure committee will review the candidate's review file, met, evaluate candidate's progress, and report its finding on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form to Department Chair, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the candidate.

March 1 or before, the tenure committee chair will meet with the candidate and discuss individual's prospects.

Procedures for non-reappointment

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

Final tenure review

Initiated by Academic Affairs in May, before (academic) year of decision.

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

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

Letters from all tenure department members will be visited.

Letters from other individual tenured faculty or research staff on campus can be solicited.

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

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

No more than one of three outside reviewers can be a close associate, supervisor, or mentor of the candidate.

Final tenure review deadlines

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

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

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

Action	(Deadline)	Year
Initial Appointment	Jan or Aug	x
Tenure committee recommended by Department Chair to Academic VP	Nov 15	x
1st Review		x+1
Candidate supplies academic VP and Committee Chair with review package	Jan 15	
Committee reports to Department Chair and academic VP	Feb 15	
Committee Chair advises candidate on committee review*	Mar 1	
2nd Review (same as above)		x+2
3rd Review (same as above)		x+3
4th Review (same as above)		x+4
5th and Final Review		
Academic VP initiates final review process	May 15	x+4
Candidate supplies academic VP and Committee Chair with final review package, along with a list of suggested outside reviewers	Aug 15	x+4
Committee submits final report to academic VP and Department Chair	Dec 15	x+4
Academic VP submits recommendation to President	Mar 15	x+5
President submits recommendation to Board of Regents	Apr 1	x+5
Board of Regents final (approval) decision	April	x+5
New tenured appointment begins		x+5
* It is suggested that the entire tenure committee meet with the candidate in person at this time.		