

Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty

Office of Academic Affairs
Policy Document Number: AA-01.1-2025

Adopted by the Board of Regents: May 16, 2025
Policy Updates: March 2020
April 2019
May 2000
February 1998
March 1990

Policy Purpose: This policy establishes the criteria for faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure.
--

Policy Statement	4
General Policy.....	4
Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure	4
A. Teaching.....	4
B. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity	5
C. Service.....	6
Hiring Faculty with Tenure	7
A. Associate Professor Rank	7
B. Professor Rank	7
Professional Appointments	8
A. Professor	8
B. Teaching Professor.....	8
C. Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor.....	9
D. Assistant Professor and Assistant Teaching Professor	9
E. Lecturer	9
F. Visiting Appointment.....	9
G. Adjunct Appointment.....	9
Procedures for Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure of Faculty	11
I. Initial Appointment.....	11
II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	12
III. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor	16
IV. Promotion or Appointment to Professor	17
V. Promotion to Teaching Professor.....	18
VI. Non-Renewal of Non-Tenured Faculty	19
VII. Dismissal of Non-Tenured Faculty.....	20
Appendix A: Important Dates and Processes for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty	21
A. Length of Probationary Period.....	21
B. Procedures for selection of tenure committee.....	21
C. Procedures for annual tenure review.....	21
D. Procedures for non-reappointment.....	21
E. Final tenure review	21

F.	Final tenure review deadlines	22
G.	Typical (5-year) Tenure Track Timeline	22
Appendix B: Important Dates and Processes for Promotion to the rank of Professor		24
A.	Introduction.....	24
B.	Nomination and Preliminary Evaluation	24
C.	Criteria	25
D.	Record-Keeping	26
E.	Teaching.....	26
F.	Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity	27
G.	Service.....	29
H.	Basis for Evaluation.....	29
I.	Documentation.....	30

POLICY STATEMENT

Faculty are critical to advancing the Institute's mission and in achieving its educational, scholarly, and service goals. Faculty receive academic appointments to achieve these goals and receive recognition (e.g., promotion, tenure) that reflect their career accomplishments and professional distinction they have received.

GENERAL POLICY

Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

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

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

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

A. Teaching

Effective teaching is essential to the achievement of tenure and promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made or promotion granted unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in teaching. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider the following: the candidate's present command of the subject; continuous learning in the subject area; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to work creatively; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; the instructional techniques they use, the way they engage students, how they have used feedback to refine their instruction, and its overall impact on student success; and the extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the academic advising and

general guidance of students. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence considered in its appraisal of teaching skill.

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

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

B. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

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

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

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

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

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

C. Service

An appropriate amount (depending on the faculty member's terms of employment) of service to both the profession at large and to the Institute (including professionally related community service) is expected of all faculty.

1. Professional Service

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

2. Institute and Public Service

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

Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence.

Hiring Faculty with Tenure

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

A. Associate Professor Rank

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

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

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

B. Professor Rank

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

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

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

Professional Appointments

The professorial appointments at the Institute include the three customary professorial ranks: Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. In addition, faculty members may hold the non-tenure-track positions of Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Assistant Teaching Professor. These ranks are assigned to full-time instructional faculty members with assignments primarily devoted to teaching. Lastly, the Institute recognizes three other professorial appointments: Lecturer, Visiting (Assistant, Associate, or Professor, and Teaching Assistant, Teaching Associate, or Teaching Professor), and Faculty Adjunct.

The "Teaching" positions are anticipated to be at least one full academic year in duration. Faculty members holding these titles are expected to remain current with developments in their fields so as to maintain the highest quality of instruction and are encouraged to attend and participate in department activities and shared governance in keeping with the normal practices of the academic unit(s) that form the locus of their positions. They are required to fulfill all applicable faculty expectations. Teaching faculty may serve as the co-advisor for graduate students and as the principal investigator on NMT proposals. They may request to serve as the primary advisor to graduate students, consistent with NMT's *Policy on Minimum Qualifications for Instructional Staff*. Teaching faculty are voting members of the Faculty Senate. Teaching Faculty will submit annual PAR forms for evaluation and assessment. While not tenure-line positions, NMT will renew these positions annually, pending enrollment demand, funding availability, satisfactory performance, continuation of a program/department, etc.

A. Professor

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

B. Teaching Professor

The rank of Teaching Professor is the highest rank attainable in the "Teaching" ranks. Promotion to this rank therefore requires evidence of exceptional distinction in teaching with a combination of other activities relevant to the individual's responsibilities.

C. Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor

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

D. Assistant Professor and Assistant Teaching Professor

The ranks of Assistant Professor and Assistant Teaching Professor require evidence of exceptional future promise and preparation for an academic career.

E. Lecturer

All other appointments, full- or part-time, including individuals teaching dual-credit courses have the title of Lecturer. These appointments are at will, based on the needs of the institution, and there is no expectation of continued appointment. They may be annual, one-semester or term, or semester-by-semester appointments. These appointments are for professionals with appropriate academic qualifications, consistent with NMT's *Policy on Minimum Qualifications for Instructional Staff*, who are demonstrably competent in the relevant areas of their disciplines. These positions are generally teaching positions with individuals required to perform all duties pertaining to teaching including assigning grades, holding office hours, assessing student performance and course outcomes, and participating in departmental curriculum evaluations and discussions. These positions may have a service and/or research expectation. These positions will not be primary advisors for undergraduate or graduate students.

Academic departments and programs will respectively determine the voting rights of individuals serving as a Lecturer within their respective departments and programs. Individuals serving as a Lecturer may be members of the Faculty Senate, as determined by the requirements outlined in NMT's Faculty Senate Standing Rules. Pending satisfactory performance, individuals who serve as a Lecturer may be rehired on an as-needed basis. In between appointments, departments may request individuals they plan to rehire as lecturers retain their access to NMT email, library, etc.

F. Visiting Appointment

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

G. 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.

H. Non-Tenured Faculty

The term *Non-Tenured Faculty* includes Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, Lecturers, and Visiting Appointments. It does not include probationary positions.

Exceptions to faculty titles may apply (e.g., grant funded requirement). Other faculty titles may be recommended for an individual by the VPAA with approval by NMT's President. A separate policy addresses emeritus status.


Mahyar A. Amouzegar
President


David Lepre, Sr. Chair
Board of Regents

To preserve the integrity of this document, any revisions to the *Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty* including any changes to the procedures and appendices below, must follow the process outlined in the *Policy on Development, Amendment, and Rescindment of Policies*.

Procedures for Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure of Faculty

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

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

The initial appointment at all levels is normally considered probationary. Tenure can only be awarded at the time of appointment through the policy that outlines the hiring of faculty with tenure.

Some faculty may have a joint appointment with a research center (e.g., Petroleum

Recovery Research Center, New Mexico Bureau of Geology & Mineral Resources). Such individuals must follow the policies, procedures, and deadlines for reappointment, promotion, and tenure as outlined in *Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty*, regardless of any requirements and deadlines stipulated as part of the research appointment.

II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are normally considered together. Tenure and promotion must be granted to assistant professors within seven years of service only at the Institute, if they are to remain employed at the Institute. The promotion and tenure decision will not normally be made prior to the fifth year of service. If the original appointment is at a rank higher than that of Assistant Professor, then the tenure decision will be taken alone. Unless tenure is granted at the time of appointment, tenure will not normally be granted to Associate Professors and Professors prior to the third and second years, respectively, of service at the Institute. Tenure appointments will not be made in the ranks of Lecturer, Assistant Professor, the “Teaching” ranks, Visiting appointments, or Faculty Adjunct appointments.

A. Tenure Committee Formation

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

Throughout, and after, the entire probationary review process, confidentiality (e.g., faculty member’s materials, committee discussions) is essential. Beyond the committee and the faculty member, discussions should be limited to the Department Chairperson and members of the administration who are part of the review process (e.g., dean of instructional unit, graduate dean, VPR).

B. Candidate’s Review File

Each year the candidate will prepare and submit an annual review file, addressing the

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

C. Annual Tenure Review

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

By March 1, the Department Chair will submit their comments on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form to the VPAA. The Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form should be returned to the committee chair, Department Chair, and candidate by May 1 in order to provide the candidate with complete feedback in time to adjust plans for the remainder of the year.

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

The candidate may petition the VPAA 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 VPAA a recommendation of non-reappointment. This notice will be sent in accordance with the schedule outlined in Section II.D.1 of the Institute's *Regulations Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure*. This schedule requires that a preliminary, if not a final, recommendation of non-reappointment should be included on the February 15 submittal of the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form.

E. Final Tenure Review

The final tenure review will be initiated in May of the academic year before the academic year of the tenure decision. By August 15 of the same year that the final review is initiated, the candidate will submit the final review file to the tenure committee chair, Department Chair, Dean of the Instructional Unit, Vice President for Research, and VPAA.

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

1. Teaching Evaluation

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

2. Research and Creative Work Evaluation

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

3. Internal Review

The tenure committee chair, in coordination with Academic Affairs, will invite all tenured department members, tenured Institute faculty, and research staff to submit letters. These letters are for internal review of the candidate, but are not to be sent as part of the external review. Letters of evaluation collected by the candidate are not appropriate to be included in the final tenure packet.

4. External Review

The tenure committee will attempt to obtain written letters from no less than five distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as or a closely related field to the candidate. The external reviewers should include an appropriate balance of tenured faculty members, research staff, and other professionals (e.g., a traditional tenure-track faculty member may have external reviews entirely by tenured faculty members at other universities; a tenure-track faculty member with a higher than usual research expectation may have reviewers including tenured faculty members, research staff at National Laboratories, or industry researchers). The candidate will be asked to suggest possible outside reviewers. In addition to the reviewers suggested by the candidate, the committee chair must solicit letters from other distinguished individuals who should be familiar with the candidate's work. Ideally the collected letters will include at least four outside reviewers with no conflict of interest with, or bias toward, the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, coauthors, collaborators on sponsored research, supervisor). While the identity of external reviewers is confidential from the candidate, the letters available for administrative review must be clearly identified with statements appropriately attributed in the final tenure recommendation. If there are fewer letters obtained from outside reviewers than the proposed minimum, the review of an individual's promotional materials will neither be hindered nor negatively impacted. However, the tenure committee chair is responsible for informing the Dean of their Instructional Unit and Academic Affairs at least a month before the report deadline of the possibility of receiving a fewer number of external reviewer letters so that additional assistance can be obtained.

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

5. Committee Recommendation

The tenure committee will meet with the candidate before submitting its final recommendation and share its final recommendation with the candidate. The

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

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

The Department Chair shall review the tenure package and committee recommendation and forward their own recommendation to the VPAA by January 15.

The VPAA shall review the recommendations and forward the package with their own considered recommendation to the President by March 15. The President shall forward their recommendation to the Board of Regents. If the Board of Regents has an April meeting, it is advisable that the Regents consider tenure recommendations at that meeting.

III. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Promotion in the teaching rank is based on the quality of a faculty member's fulfillment of their professional responsibilities and overall performance in teaching, service, and scholarship in a manner that is commensurate with the workload and expectations associated with their position. Promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor requires a minimum of five years of service at NMT as an Assistant Teaching Professor and an earned doctorate or terminal degree; all course work completed toward a doctorate; or a master's degree + 30 graduate credits. The annual review and promotion

process will mirror that of the promotion to Associate Professor as closely as is reasonable respective of the fundamental differences in the positions.

The promotion process will be similar to that of the final tenure review.

- For example, the department will create a promotion committee (similar to a tenure committee) who will review the candidate's file.
- The promotion committee would evaluate the candidate's file using the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor – recognizing that the accomplishments should be commensurate with their job duties/appointments.
- The same review process (internal and external) should be followed, with several exceptions including:
 - There should be a total of five reviewers, at least two of which should be external to NMT;
 - Candidates should include in their file at least two classroom observations by NMT faculty performed during the review period, with one from a faculty member inside their department and another outside their department (individuals with joint appointments may have classroom observations performed by faculty from both departments);
 - External reviewers should be selected based on their instructional experience and expertise (e.g., chairperson of a department with teaching faculty, teaching faculty member at a rank equivalent to Associate Teaching Professor or above). Consequently, reviewers may be from a variety of institutions (and institution types).
- Deadlines for this process will align with those of tenure recommendations.

IV. Promotion or Appointment to Professor

(See Appendix B: Assessment of Candidates for Promotion to Professor, Adopted by the Faculty Council, 4/96 and revisions 5/00, 5/25)

Initiation of appointment or promotion to Professor will be based on the nomination from faculty holding the rank of Professor/Teaching Professor or department chair. A nomination must be made in writing to the VPAA by the end of September of the year in which it is to be considered. The VPAA will submit the request to the Institute's Promotion Committee for review.

The Promotion Committee consists of five tenured Professors appointed by the VPAA. 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 coordinate with VPAA to invite letters from all of the Institute's tenured Professors, from tenured faculty within the candidate's department, and if appropriate from one or more directors of Institute divisions (e.g., New Mexico Bureau of Geology & Mineral Resources). The Committee will also attempt to 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. If there are fewer letters obtained from outside reviewers than the proposed minimum, the review of an individual's promotional materials will neither be hindered nor negatively impacted. However, the committee chair is responsible for informing the Dean of their Instructional Unit and Academic Affairs of the possibility of receiving a fewer number of external reviewer letters so that additional assistance can be obtained.

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

Throughout, and after, the review process, it is essential the Promotion Committee maintain confidentiality (e.g., faculty member's materials, committee discussions, external review letters). Beyond the committee, discussions should be limited to the VPAA.

V. Promotion to Teaching Professor

Promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor requires a minimum of five years of service at NMT as an Associate Teaching Professor and an earned doctorate degree or terminal degree. The promotion process will mirror that of the promotion to Professor as closely as is reasonable respective of the fundamental differences in the positions.

The promotion process will be similar to Appendix B.

- For example, the individual will be evaluated by the Institute's Promotion Committee.
- The promotion committee would evaluate the candidate's file using the criteria for tenure and promotion to the rank of Professor – recognizing that the accomplishments should be commensurate with their job duties/appointments.
- The same review process (internal and external) should be followed, with several exceptions including:
 - There should be a total of five reviewers. Up to two of the reviewers may be individuals who performed classroom observations. For the remaining reviewers, they should be external to NMT with at least two having no conflict of interest;
 - Candidates should include in their file at least two classroom observations by NMT faculty performed during the review period, with one from a faculty member inside their department and another outside their department (individuals with joint appointments may have classroom observations performed by faculty from both departments);
 - External reviewers should be selected based on their instructional experience and expertise (e.g., chairperson of a department with teaching

faculty, teaching faculty member at a rank equivalent to Teaching Professor or above). Consequently, reviewers may be from a variety of institutions (and institution types).

- Deadlines for this process will align with those of promotion recommendations.

VI. Non-Renewal of Non-Tenured Faculty

A. Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Assistant Teaching Professor

While a teaching faculty member (e.g., Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor) is not a tenure line position and remains at will based on the needs of the institution, NMT will renew these positions annually, pending enrollment demand, funding availability, satisfactory performance, etc. Teaching faculty whose contract will not be renewed for the subsequent academic year due to performance shall be notified of that fact in a letter from the VPAA by April 15. Except for dismissal, for non-renewal:

- an Assistant Teaching Professor shall be notified of that fact in a letter from the VPAA by April 15,
- an Associate Teaching Professor shall be notified of that fact in a letter from the VPAA by April 15 with an offer for at least one semester of employment, and
- a Teaching Professor shall be notified of that fact in a letter from the VPAA by April 15 with an offer for at least one academic year of employment.

Determination of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department must have the concurrence of the NMT Board of Regents. If any nonrenewal is because of financial exigency, the discontinuance of a department/program of instruction, or a lack of enrollment demand, the individual's position shall not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the individual has been offered the position (full- or part-time) and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

Appeals:

- Nonrenewal due to reasons other than financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department are subject to appeal to the NMT President whose decision is final and not subject to further appeal.
 - To appeal, the faculty member should submit their rationale for renewal in writing to the President within 10 calendar days of notification. The President will investigate the issue and inform the faculty member and VPAA of their decision in a timely manner, ideally within 10 calendar days of the appeal being filed.

B. Lecturer and Visiting Faculty Appointments

These appointments are on an as-needed basis. There is no expectation of continued employment.

VII. Dismissal of Non-Tenured Faculty

Termination of an appointment before the end of a specified term for non-tenured faculty may only be taken for cause and is termed a dismissal. Dismissal shall not be used to restrain individuals in their capacity as a teacher and employee. Dismissal shall not be used to restrain individuals in their exercise of academic freedom or other legal rights.

Dismissal process and procedures will be handled in accordance with the *Regulations Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

Written notice of dismissal shall be transmitted to the individual by the President, or the President's designee, prior to any public announcement pertaining thereto.

Appendix A: Important Dates and Processes for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty

A. Length of Probationary Period

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

B. Procedures for selection of tenure committee

- Formed within three months of initial appointment.
- Consists of five tenured NMT faculty or research staff. Faculty should be tenured at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The VPAA appoints individuals recommended by the Department Chair with the majority of the committee composed of faculty.
- At least two tenure committee members will be from outside the department.
- The VPAA should strive to appoint a committee with which the candidate is comfortable, and which has no perceived bias against the candidate.

C. Procedures for annual tenure review

- January 15 or before, candidate's annual review file, following the format specified by the department, will be submitted to the tenure committee chair and Department Chair.
- February 15 or before, tenure committee will review the candidate's review file, meet with the candidate to discuss their progress, and report its finding on the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form. Normally by May 1 the Appraisal Form will be returned to the tenure committee chair, the Department Chair, and the candidate by the VPAA.

D. Procedures for non-reappointment

- February 15 or before, preliminary or final recommendation of non-reappointment must be sent to VPAA.

E. Final tenure review

- Initiated by VPAA in May, before academic year of decision.
- By August 15, the candidate's final review file will be submitted to the tenure committee chair, Department Chair, Dean of the Instructional Unit, Vice President for

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

- The tenure committee chair, in collaboration with Academic Affairs, invites letters from all NMT tenured faculty and research center directors. Letters are to remain confidential.
- Committee must obtain written letters from no less than five distinguished outside reviewers who work in the same field as the candidate. Letters are to remain confidential.
- Candidate can suggest outside reviewers, but committee chair shall seek the names of other distinguished individuals who should be familiar with the candidate's work.
- The collected letters will include at least four outside reviewers with no conflict of interest with or bias toward the candidate (i.e., dissertation advisor, coauthors, collaborators on sponsored research, supervisor, etc.).

F. Final tenure review deadlines

- December 15 or before of decision (academic) year, committee will send recommendation, along with any minority opinions, to Department Chair and VPAA.
- January 15 or before Department Chair will submit recommendation to VPAA.
- March 15 or before, VPAA will make recommendation to the President, who will then make their recommendation to the Board of Regents in April.

G. Typical (5-year) Tenure Track Timeline

Action	(Deadline)	Year
Initial Appointment	Jan or Aug	x
Tenure committee recommended by Department Chair to VPAA	Nov 15	x
Committee chair meets with candidate to discuss expectations	Dec 31	x
1st Review		x+1
Candidate supplies Department Chair and Committee Chair with review package	Jan 15	
Committee meets with candidate to discuss progress and recommendation	Feb 15	
Committee reports to Department Chair, VPAA, and candidate	Feb 15	
Department Chair submits recommendation to VPAA	March 1	
Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form ideally returned to the tenure committee chair, Department Chair, and candidate	May 1	
2nd Review (same as 1st Review)		x+2
3rd Review (same as 1st Review)		x+3

4th Review (same as 1st Review		x+4
5th and Final Review		
VPAA initiates final review process	May 15	x+4
Candidate supplies tenure committee chair, Department Chair, Dean of the Instructional Unit, Vice President for Research, and VPAA with final review package, along with a list of suggested outside reviewers	Aug 15	x+4
Committee submits final report to VPAA and Department Chair	Dec 15	x+4
Department Chair submits recommendation to VPAA	Jan 15	x+5
VPAA submits recommendation to President	Mar 15	x+5
President submits recommendation to Board of Regents	Apr 1	x+5
Board of Regents final (approval) decision	April/May	x+5
New tenured appointment begins		x+5

Appendix B: Important Dates and Processes for Promotion to the rank of Professor

A. Introduction

The criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor is

“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 Professor.”

The Institute’s Promotion Committee has the responsibility for evaluating candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor and making recommendations regarding those candidates to the VPAA. The purpose of this appendix is to provide detailed guidelines for the evaluation process by the Promotion Committee. Guidelines are needed to help make the evaluation process objective and quantifiable, to provide consistency in the procedures used for evaluation from year to year, to help ensure fairness and equity in the outcome of the evaluations, and to ensure that the basis for recommendations is adequately justified and documented. The purpose of the Guidelines is not to impose a rigid formula for evaluation of candidates; it is explicitly recognized that each case is unique and that individual circumstances must be given full consideration.

B. Nomination and Preliminary Evaluation

According to the Procedures, candidates for promotion can be nominated by “faculty holding the rank of Professor/Teaching Professor or department chair.” Nominations should be sent to the VPAA 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 (typically up to two pages in length that highlights major accomplishments and identifies areas of exceptional distinction). Self-nominations are not permitted. Department chairs and tenured 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 screen nominations (e.g., appropriate nomination process, CV of sufficient standing) and for eligible candidates request they compose a review package similar in content to that used for tenure decisions that will be due by November 1. 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, Professors in the Institute, 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, and outside reviewers. Those nominations not passing the preliminary evaluation will be returned, with a justification of the decision, for the Vice President’s review. The VPAA may elect to discontinue consideration of the nomination or to return it to the Committee for full consideration. The VPAA may also not recommend a faculty member for

promotion following the final evaluation of their materials. The VPAA will provide the faculty member with the rationale for their decision. In their rationale, the VPAA may include a minimum number of years the faculty member shall wait until reapplying for promotion, which shall not exceed four years from their application (e.g., an individual not recommended for promotion during the 2024-2025 academic year may be asked by the VPAA to wait no later than the 2028-2029 academic year before reapplying). The VPAA will develop this recommendation following consultation with the Promotion Committee and members of the administration who are part of the review process (e.g., dean of instructional unit, graduate dean, VPR).

1. Appeal Process

Subsequent to notification that the VPAA will discontinue consideration of the nomination or if the faculty member is not recommended for promotion, the faculty member has five working days to submit a written appeal to the President. The submission should include a written rationale for the appeal and any relevant documentation.

The President will normally restrict their review to the written materials provided by the faculty member and VPAA. This appeal should be based upon procedural matters and errors of fact, rather than constitute a de novo review of the merits of the promotion case. The President constitutes the final appeal.

C. Criteria

The *Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty* sets forth the following four areas of activity in which evidence of exceptional distinction by candidates for promotion should be sought: (1) teaching, (2) research and creative work, and (3) Institute and public service. Definitions and examples of these areas are described in the Policy. This appendix 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 three of the areas described above. However, distinction in at least two of these areas should be evident in order to meet the criteria. Teaching and research are the two essential activities of the Institute's faculty; and, as such, active participation and success in both of these areas and exceptional distinction in at least one should be demonstrated. The basis for comparison should usually be the faculty previously promoted in the Institute. In cases where appropriate comparisons within the Institute are not available, opinions should be sought on the prevailing standards at comparable institutions. In cases where there is doubt, decisions should be made that will ensure that the standards of excellence at the Institute will increase with time, rather than decrease. In order to demonstrate a sustained record of distinction, it is expected in most cases that five or more years will have elapsed since the promotion to Associate Professor.

D. Record-Keeping

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

E. Teaching

The *Policy for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty* states: "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."

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). 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, evidence of student learning, 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 faculty member under consideration. The Registrar can provide a list of randomly selected students to interview.

F. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

1. Research and Scholarly Work in Scientific and Engineering Fields

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 SCI listings. Nevertheless, the SCI provides one of the very few readily available and quantifiable measures of the impact of an individual's research or engineering work, and is thus of importance. Candidates who feel that the SCI does not adequately characterize the importance of their work may provide documentation for the cause of the situation and should provide some alternative basis for comparison.

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

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

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

Like distinction in research and engineering development for candidates in scientific and engineering fields, distinction in scholarship and creative work for candidates in Humanities, Fine Arts, and other nontechnical fields should be demonstrated by evidence that the candidate's work has made a significant contribution to the

particular field. Faculty awarded the title of 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 (particularly juried exhibits), demonstrations, and publications; invited presentations at local, regional, national or international meetings; invited lectures or artist-in-residence appointments at other universities; successful proposals for professional grants; professional awards for scholarship or creativity; editing of scholarly journals.

3. Research and Scholarly Work in all Fields

There are two types of significant but non-quantifiable evidence for the importance of a candidate's work.

- Honors and Awards: 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.
- External Review: The second is evaluations by distinguished, independent reviewers in the candidate's field. At least three such evaluations should be obtained. The reviewers should be made aware of the criteria for promotion at the Institute and should be able to affirm that the candidate has met those criteria. Reviewers should be particularly asked to focus on the significance of the candidate's work.

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

corroborative evidence.

G. Service

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.

Similarly, the quality of evidence for 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 Faculty Senate, serving as Department Chair, or chairing active Institute committees, or playing similar roles in public service organizations or other such bodies.

H. 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 (or the last five years),
- list of all M.S. and Ph.D. advisees, their thesis/dissertation titles, and completion dates, and
- contact information, including e-mail addresses, for four external referees (including their familiarity with the nominee) – this should only be included in the final review packet requested by the Promotion Committee (i.e., after the preliminary evaluation).
- The Promotion Committee will provide additional guidance to individuals upon their nomination.


I. Documentation

The only product of the committee's efforts and deliberations is the recommendation communication to the VPAA (after the preliminary and final evaluation, when applicable). 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 VPAA.

Policy Title: AA-01 Policy for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty

New Mexico Tech Policy Signature and Approval Document

Legal Review (if applicable):

 General Counsel May 9, 2025
Signature Title Date

Campus Community Review Dates: March 10 to March 31, 2025

Minimum of 10 Business Days

Approval by Sponsoring Vice President:


 Provost and VPAA May 9, 2025
Signature Title Date

Approval by President:

Approved on this date by Dr. Mahyar Amouzegar, President, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. Minor editorial revisions may be made. Content of this policy cannot be changed.

 5/12/25
Signature of the President Date

Approval by Chair of the Board of Regents (if applicable):

 5/16/25
Signature Title Date

