



Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Original: Approved by Faculty Vote on April 26, 2019
Revised: Approved by Senior Faculty Vote on December 12, 2020
Revised and Approved by a Faculty Vote on August 1, 2023

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE.....	2
II. SCOPE.....	2
III. FACULTY CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES	2
IV. GENERAL COLLEGE GUIDELINES	3
V. INCLUSION, DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND ACCESS.....	5
VI. REVIEWER GUIDELINES	6
<i>Internal Reviewers</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>External Reviewers</i>	<i>6</i>
VII. AREAS OF FOCUS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY	7
1. EDUCATION AND TEACHING.....	8
A. Introduction	8
B. Evaluation	9
2. SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH INCLUDING COMMUNITY ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP	10
A. Introduction	10
B. Evaluation	11
VIII. GENERAL INFORMATION ON PROMOTION AND THE AWARD OF TENURE .	13
A. STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	13
B. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	14
IX. PROMOTION OF LECTURERS	14
A. Standards for Lecturer Promotion.....	14
X. APPENDIX 1 – STANDARDS FOR ALL AREAS OF FOCUS	17
<i>Competence in Teaching</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Competence Scholarship and Research or Community Engaged Scholarship</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Excellence in Teaching</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Excellence in Scholarship and Research or Community Engaged Scholarship</i>	<i>18</i>

I. INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

The University of New Mexico's College of Population Health (COPH) is built on a framework of integrated health strategies, the COPH prepares its graduates to work collaboratively with their communities to improve health and expand access to affordable, quality healthcare. College faculty research critical public, individual, and systems health issues impacting individuals and communities and the public health.

The COPH's faculty play a critical role in the goals and purpose of the College.

The University's Faculty Handbook provides requirements as to what evidence reviewers of tenure candidates shall consider. The purpose of this document is to provide specific guidance regarding the disciplines within the college.

II. SCOPE

These guidelines apply to:

- Probationary faculty undergoing mid-probationary retention review
- Probationary faculty seeking tenure and promotion in rank on all college tenure tracks
- Probationary faculty undergoing retention review
- Tenured faculty seeking promotion in rank to professor
- Lecturers seeking promotion to senior or principal lecturer
- Lecturers seeking promotion

Tenured faculty seeking promotion in rank to Distinguished Professor should see <http://www.unm.edu/~acadaffr/faculty-information/unm-distinguished-professors.html>.

III. FACULTY CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Candidates for retention, promotion or tenure bear the primary burden of assembling the review materials and are obligated to put forward a complete dossier of their work for review. Elements of the dossier will differ depending upon the type of review. The College of Population Health aspires to help candidates prepare for the promotion and tenure process. To that end, during annual reviews, the faculty member and the dean/dean designee should discuss progress toward meeting criteria for promotion or tenure and any barriers or challenges the faculty member is encountering.

The Faculty Handbook states: "The dossier is a collection of documents that summarize and evaluate a faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work, and service and contain evidence of personal and professional effectiveness.... The faculty member shall provide the following elements:

1. statement of professional goals and progress toward achieving them;
2. complete and current curriculum vitae¹ using the standard COPH template;

¹ Candidates should include for review all items listed on a C.V. that are not yet published; e.g., rough drafts listed as 'in progress' should be provided, or else not listed. Items still in the outline or rough concept stage may best be addressed in the research statement rather than appearing on the C.V.

3. systematic collection of professional materials documenting the faculty member's achievements in the evaluation categories of teaching; scholarly work; and service.

Candidates are required to participate in all review processes leading up to retention, promotion and tenure decisions. These will include, at minimum, timely and full provision of dossier materials and communication with faculty administrators to ensure that annual reviews and external reviews of scholarly and creative work (if required) are included and made readily available to all reviewers.

IV. GENERAL COLLEGE GUIDELINES

The normal time in rank before submitting a promotion dossier or a tenure and promotion dossier is at most five years as assistant professor and at least five years as associate professor. Typically, the dossier must be submitted no later than the sixth year as assistant professor and no earlier than the sixth year as an associate professor. There are circumstances where these requirements may be modified in conversation with the college dean. For example, during parental leave or in situations such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

2.5 Tenure Clock

The running of the probationary period will be suspended, unless otherwise requested in writing, when a faculty member is on parental leave. Subsequent mid-probationary and tenure reviews will be one (1) full year later. Deans, department chairs, and program directors should help faculty members to make informed decisions about suspending the probationary period.²

Extension of Probationary Period ("tenure clock") due to COVID-19

On April 10, 2020, Provost Holloway, in consultation with the UNM Committee on Governance, UNM Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, and with the endorsement of the UNM Faculty Senate Operations Committee, enacted an automatic one-year extension to the probationary period ("tenure clock") for all currently appointed UNM tenure-track faculty who are not presently under review for tenure and promotion.

Faculty members who wish to opt-out of the automatic one-year extension are encouraged to consult with their department chair before making a decision on the timing of the review. To opt-out of the automatic one-year extension, faculty members must submit the Opt-Out notification form to the Department Chair, Dean, and Sr. Vice Provost. (To sign with your adobe digital signature be sure to download the form to your computer.)³

The College of Population Health is committed to assuring a thorough, fair, and unbiased evaluation of each candidate. Accordingly, the following process will be followed:

- The Dean will appoint the P&T committee, and name the chairperson, to

² Faculty Handbook. Section 2: Eligibility, Requirements, and Limitations

³ Office of the Provost. Faculty Relevant COVID-19 Policies: <https://provost.unm.edu/covid-19-policies/index.html>

evaluate the credentials of candidates for promotion to associate professor, consideration of awarding tenure, promotion to professor or for initial appointment for incoming faculty at the rank of professor, either with immediate tenure or up to a two-year probationary period. The P&T committee will also evaluate faculty progress when it is required. The P&T committee is responsible for evaluating promotion for faculty on any track, though they may request additional reviews from approved individuals for promotion.

- The P&T committee will consist of up to three to six individuals including three professors and associate professors as dictated by the level of the candidate. Professors will evaluate all cases and associate professors will evaluate mid-probationary review cases and promotion and tenure decisions at the associate professor level. Individuals will serve on the P&T committee for three years.
- The chairperson of the committee will fulfill the duties assigned to a department chair by Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook, including making a positive or negative recommendation to the dean as stated in FH section B.4.3.1.
- Upon receipt of the recommendation from the P&T committee chair, the dean will follow the procedure stated in FH B.4.3.2, after which the procedures in subsequent sections of the Faculty Handbook will be followed.

The chair of the P&T committee must ensure that faculty members do not review a candidate with whom there is a conflict of interest. For example, a candidate's spouse or domestic partner may not review that candidate, nor should anyone supervised by a candidate participate in the review. However, the mere occurrence of a dispute between a senior and a candidate for retention or promotion does not necessarily create a conflict of interest.

Faculty reviewers should also be guided by the Faculty Handbook and additional CPH policies:

- For mid-probationary review, in consultation with at least the tenured faculty, the chair of the P&T committee will conduct a formal review of the faculty member's achievements in teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics

1.2.4 Personal Characteristics Definition (Faculty Handbook)

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

- Each member of the P&T committee will vote, in writing, whether they recommend or do not recommend the candidate advance at the Mid-Probationary review.
- The conclusions of the mid probationary review will be shared with the Dean.
- In general, tenure and promotion reviews “shall take account of the annual reviews of the faculty member.” Annual evaluation summaries should be included in a unique section of the promotion dossier.
- Faculty members must be informed by the P&T Committee chair of upcoming reviews with sufficient time to participate if they choose.

The chair of the P&T Committee shall discuss the review and college recommendation with the faculty member. The faculty member shall be advised in writing whether the recommendation is positive or negative.

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

Promotion and Tenure Letter to the Dean

The P&T letter to the dean must be written and signed by the chair of the P&T Committee. The letter should indicate in the committee’s recommendation how many reviewers were contacted and how many declined to review. One or two recusals can be anticipated, but if, for example, the P&T Committee has to contact twice as many potential reviewers as usual, that may signal peer concern about quality of the candidate’s work and should be noted with an explanation.

V. INCLUSION, DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND ACCESS

Evaluation metrics shall reflect standard and state-of-the-art assessment for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for public teaching and academic health centers and accredited colleges and schools of public health.

Examples of potential metrics include:

- Including a diversity of perspectives in course content with particular attention to centering the concerns of marginalized individuals/populations.
- Including writings by people who represent diverse social identities in required and recommended readings.
- Including multiple perspectives on each issue in a course that could be provided by a variety of mediums, such as videos, readings, and voices in the classroom.
- Recognizing that students may have visible or invisible disabilities that may impact their participation in the course.

Source: <https://advance.oregonstate.edu/metrics-evaluating-support-equity-inclusion-and-justice>

VI. REVIEWER GUIDELINES

- Written evaluations from outside experts in the field and colleagues within the institution must form part of the dossier for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks.
- Reviewers will receive written instructions on the college's standards for retention, promotion and tenure, a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, research/education statements, and three publications for review.
- All reviewers shall be advised that COPH will keep the reviewer's identity and candidate evaluations confidential, to the extent permitted by law.

Internal Reviewers

- The candidate should provide a list of 6 potential internal faculty reviewers to the chair of the P&T Committee. The P&T Committee must seek letters from at least 3 of the names provided by the candidate and may supplement it with additional names.
- Internal reviewers should be "reputable scholars, researchers, and critics who can evaluate the candidate's contributions to scholarship, research, or teaching, when feasible.
- For professor, the internal letters should comment on mentorship, contributions to the University and the COPH, and the candidate's area(s) of excellence.
- The internal review letters must be added to the dossier by the chair of the P&T Committee.
- The candidate should include two letters from mentees and two letters from learners..

External Reviewers

- Candidates for the award of tenure and promotion to associate professor should identify three individuals from outside of the University. The argument is stronger if the letters are from individuals who have never worked with the candidate but know of the accomplishments of the candidate.
- For promotion to associate professor with tenure the letters should indicate if the person is on a trajectory that is likely to establish a national and/or international reputation.
- For consideration for professor, letters should clearly indicate whether or not the candidate has achieved a prestigious reputation at the national and/or international level.
- Candidates for promotion to professor should identify three individuals from outside the university. External letters may focus on area(s) of excellence. For

those with a community engagement, policy, or practice-based focus, external letters may include community or policy stakeholders.

- External and internal reviewers will be sent the candidate's resume, research/education statements, and three publications for review.
- For all tracks, the P&T Committee considers letters from mentees and learners as optional.

Summary of Requirements for Internal and External Letters of Recommendation				
<i>Level</i>	<i>Internal</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Mentees/ Learners</i>	<i>Total</i>
Mid-Probationary Review	0	0	0	0
Advancement to Associate Professor (with tenure)	3	3	Optional	6
Advancement to Professor	3	3	Optional	6
Note: For a Community Engaged Scholarship focus there must be letters from community members, public health practice, or policy professionals, etc.				

VII. AREAS OF FOCUS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

COPH faculty seeking tenure must declare one of two areas of focus to show excellence. Areas of focus are not mutually exclusive; they may overlap with the other two areas.

Most faculty will choose an area of focus at hiring. However, those that do not will identify it by the end of their first year of appointment in conversations with the dean. In conversations with the dean, faculty can also change their focus at the end of their first year.

Promotion and the granting of tenure in the college requires established area of focus in one out of two major areas:

1. Education and Teaching
2. Scholarship/Research including Community Engaged Scholarship

For promotion, the candidate must exhibit excellence in their designated focus area and competence in the other two areas.

Competence in the following areas as well:

- a. service/administration/clinical
- b. professionalism (this includes engagement in college and university activities such as shared governance, faculty meetings, mentoring students, and collegiality; and
- c. teaching or scholarship (whichever area is not candidate's area of focus)

Instructions for presenting evidence for excellence and competence are below.

1. EDUCATION AND TEACHING

A. Introduction

The University of New Mexico has an international reputation for educational innovation, educational research, quality in teaching, and commitment to teaching within the faculty. It is within this context that parameters to define competence and excellence in teaching have been developed. Competence and excellence in teaching will be evaluated both on quality and quantity parameters that are compared to University and national peers.

There are a number of activities a faculty member may use to demonstrate competence or excellence in teaching. Listed below are some items that the candidate might consider as potential options to build their dossier.

- i. Stimulation of critical thinking and reasoning – Good teachers role model and facilitate learners acquiring the necessary skills to gather information and critically examine information. They present information and evaluate understanding of that information in a way that does not encourage rote learning.
- ii. Facilitation of learning – Learning is a lifelong process. The teacher should facilitate acquisition of the skills necessary to continue that process of identifying problems and gathering information to solve them long after formal education is complete.
- iii. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion – Pedagogical approaches, learning processes, course content, and teaching assignments and reading should embody inclusion and belonging of diverse learners in a safe environment that creates equitable opportunities for optimal learning.
- iv. Presentation skills – Presentations should stimulate students and should encourage thinking and problem solving.
- v. Instructional innovation – Introduction and incorporation of improvements in teaching methods.
- vi. Quality of written materials used in teaching – Written material used in teaching (hand-outs, syllabi, lab manuals) should augment teaching. They should be clear and concise and should stimulate critical thinking and problem solving.
- vii. Effective evaluation – Faculty should be able to give students specific behavioral feedback, both formative and summative, that leads to a behavioral change (seeking new information, improved technical skill, improved critical thinking, improved communication with patients, etc.).
- viii. Identification of problems in education – Faculty should identify ineffective educational activity (from a lecture, case, lab, or seminar series to an entire curriculum) and implement corrective measures. The effectiveness of the corrective measures should be assessed.

- ix. Effectiveness in teaching/educational committees- Active participation in educational committees is the responsibility of faculty members. These can be within the College, within the Health Sciences Center, or in the University, community, regional, or national community.
- x. Receptivity and involvement with mentoring activity- For promotion to professor, a faculty member must actively participate in assisting less experienced faculty to improve their teaching. This is a long-term commitment to the less experienced faculty.

The COPH also recognizes that not all teaching happens within the boundaries of the University. Teaching can be demonstrated in several formats. An individual faculty member is not expected to excel or even participate in all of these activities.

Interdisciplinary teaching occurs within the multiple disciplines of the College, across campus with faculty from other disciplines, and within our various communities. Examples of engaged pedagogy and types of educational teaching beyond the classroom include:

- Development of Educational Products – This category includes those activities that are critical to public and population health education but may not include direct student contact. Examples include development of curricula and syllabi, faculty development, organization and development of courses and blocks, development of interdisciplinary curricula, presentation at professional meetings, peer reviewed publications, development of community educational sites, and/or community and policy educational and research activities.
- Educational activities within the community and as part of community engagement.
- Leadership – Educational leadership has a service component as well as an educational component. This would include service on an educational committee and/or chairing a committee, and directors/organizers of courses.
- Advising – This would include the advising of students and sitting on students on theses and dissertation committees.
- Field Schools or Educational Site Visits Outside the University –. Faculty may create learning opportunities off campus.
- Mentoring – Mentoring occurs when experienced faculty advise junior colleagues on how to improve educational productivity.

B. Evaluation

Promotion to Professor based on education and teaching excellence requires clear evidence that the individual has an established a national or international reputation in the area of emphasis. There should also be evidence that the individual has been an effective mentor to at least two other

faculty. In this context mentoring means establishing a long-term relationship that aids the other faculty member in reaching his/her career goal.

2. SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH INCLUDING COMMUNITY ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

A. Introduction

The UNM Faculty Handbook and the COPH include scholarship and research together in a single category. Faculty in this category should produce a body of peer reviewed published works or a balance of published works and publicly-engaged community engagement, policy, or practice-based products that has led to recognition beyond the boundaries of the University at the regional, national, or international level. The Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member's scholarship, research, and other creative work should make a contribution to the particular field of interest and serve as an indication of professional competence. The result of this kind of activity normally finds expression in publication, or other media appropriate to the field, and where appropriate, should be reflected in teaching. In no case, however, should a person's productive effort be measured by mere quantity. [B-19]

The term scholarship includes a contribution to knowledge creation, publication, dissemination, and application to practice, teaching, research, or policy to impact the health, well-being, and health equity of populations in New Mexico, the region, nationally or internationally. The candidate's work must have recognition beyond the boundaries of the University at the national or international level.

Evidence must be provided that the individual has an emerging or established national or international reputation.

Community Engaged Scholarship

Community Engaged Scholarship is an emerging field. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,

the purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and University knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility, address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Community engaged scholarship work including research, teaching, and service may be used to enhance the candidate's dossier for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for promotion to professor. For the areas of teaching and service it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly document the impact and value of the community engagement in annual review materials and in the promotion/tenure dossier.

The candidate is also responsible for documenting the impact and value of community engagement in scholarly activity. A faculty member wishing to pursue community-engaged scholarship that may not be published in peer reviewed journals should first consult with the department chair and senior department faculty to ensure the project has: clear goals, methodological rigor, significance, effective dissemination of results, a plan for reflective critique, and a strategy for obtaining acceptable peer review.

The acceptability of community-engaged scholarly activity should be documented in annual reviews or a memo from the department chair to the candidate prior to, or in early stages of, the scholarly activity.

The candidate and the dean should understand that a case for excellence or competence requires documentation that the candidate's activities have led to a productive academic career, including publication of peer-reviewed scholarly work. The balance should include publicly recognized community-engaged, policy, or practice-based products that garner state, regional, tribal, national, or international recognition. For promotion to professor, evidence of mentoring/co-mentoring of junior faculty and students or community members is required. Mentoring means establishing a long-term relationship that aids the other faculty member or student reach his/her career goals.

B. Evaluation

Promotion to Professor based on excellence requires clear evidence that the individual has established a national or international reputation in the area of emphasis. There should also be evidence that the individual has been an effective mentor to at least two other faculty. In this context mentoring means establishing a long-term relationship that aids the other faculty member in reaching his/her career goal.

STANDARDS FOR RETENTION AT THE MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

The mid-probationary review serves to enable the College to evaluate a candidate's progress towards promotion and the award of tenure and to show the probationary faculty member his or her strengths and weaknesses at this critical juncture. The college supports faculty advancement and annual performance reviews are an opportunity to clarify expectations and ensure that faculty have an opportunity to strengthen their work.

For those faculty whose evaluation demonstrates significant areas of concern, the mid-probationary review informs the College on whether to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in four categories: teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics. The review is conducted according to the standards specified in this policy.

The mid-probationary review requires identification of the specific strengths and weakness evidenced by the faculty member and the evidence supporting conclusions to that effect. The aim is to provide the faculty members with a clear picture of their performance midway to the promotion and award of tenure decision. This allows the

opportunity for the faculty member to correct any noted deficiencies prior. The identification of deficiencies at this point is considered normal, as it is not anticipated that a probationary member will have fully attained the standards required for the award of tenure by the time of the mid-probationary review.

For a positive mid-probationary review there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, competence in all categories, as well as a promise of excellence in either Teaching or Scholarship/Research work. If the University concludes there is insufficient progress towards tenure and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the remaining time before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and required.

Timetable for Mid-Probationary Review

The review shall occur at the approximate midpoint of the faculty member's probationary period at the University. The year of a probationary faculty member's mid-probationary review shall be specified in writing at the time of appointment to probationary status. If, as a result of a mid-probationary review, it is decided that a faculty member should not be continued at the University, written notice must be provided by June 30 and the faculty member shall be given a terminal contract for an additional year.

During their third year, tenure track faculty shall undergo the mid-probationary review. The mid-probationary review shall be conducted by a committee appointed by the P&T Committee. The mid-probationary review committee shall be composed of at least three faculty who hold the rank of professor. If possible, at least one of the member of the P&T Committee should share the same general concentration area as the candidate (e.g., the committee for an epidemiologist, should include at least one epidemiologist).

If the University concludes that insufficient progress towards tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and required.

The mid-probationary dossier should be submitted by March of the third year and include:

1. a statement by the faculty member of his/her professional goals in the areas of teaching, scholarly work, and service and progress toward achieving them; a complete and current curriculum vitae using the standard COPH template and;
2. a collection of professional materials (publications and other documents) that demonstrate the faculty member's achievements in the evaluation categories of teaching, scholarly work, and service.

The P&T Committee will evaluate the candidate's dossier. There should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty [teaching, scholarly work, service and personal characteristics], as well as promise of excellence in either Teaching or Research/Scholarly work. The committee's vote and recommendations will be sent to the dean and will describe how the candidate meets or fails to meet the standards. The

dean will discuss the review and recommendations with the faculty member and will make the final decision.

VIII. GENERAL INFORMATION ON PROMOTION AND THE AWARD OF TENURE

A. STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To be promoted to the rank of associate professor, faculty shall have acquired significant experience beyond the terminal degree and shall have demonstrated competence as teachers and have shown a conscientious interest in improving his/her teaching. They shall have demonstrated a basic general understanding of a substantial part of their discipline and have an established reputation within and outside the University in their fields of scholarly work. This implies scholarly work after the terminal degree sufficient to indicate continuing interest and growth in the candidate's professional field.⁴

To earn tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty are required to be competent in teaching, scholarly work, service, and professionalism. However, excellence in the candidate's chosen tenure track constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion.⁵

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

- Evidence to be evaluated for teaching must include student course evaluations, descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member, and written reports of peer observations of teaching.⁶ *Note the requirement that written reports of peer observations **must** be included.*
- Evidence of scholarship or creative work is determined by the candidate's publications, exhibits, performances, or media productions and may be supplemented by evidence of integration of the candidate's scholarly work and teaching.
- Written evaluations from external reviewers must be considered for both the tenure review and the review for promotion to the senior ranks.⁷

Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of associate professor represents a judgement on the part of the college and University that the individual has made and will continue to make sound contributions to teaching, scholarly work, and service. The appointment should be made only after investigation of the candidate's accomplishments and promise in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership.⁸

⁴ Faculty Handbook B2.2.2(a)

⁵ Faculty Handbook B1.2(b)

⁶ Faculty Handbook B1.2.1(c)

⁷ Faculty Handbook B1.2.2(c)

⁸ Faculty Handbook B2.2.2(b)

B. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Professors are the most enduring group of faculty, and it is they who give leadership and set the tone for the entire University. Thus, appointment or promotion should be made only after careful investigation.⁹

Qualifications for promotion to the rank of professor include attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly work, mentorship, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in their field at the same rank in comparable universities. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not, in itself, a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.¹⁰

It is important to note that references to 'national recognition in the field' and 'qualities that contributed to earlier appointments,' that candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence that their teaching or scholarly work continues to rise to the level of excellence originally required for tenure.

IX. PROMOTION OF LECTURERS

A. Standards for Lecturer Promotion

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

This document codifies the process for appointment and promotion of Lecturers (I, II, III as defined by the UNM Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Section 2.3.2) at the University of New Mexico College of Population Health.

Criteria for Appointment as a Lecturer I, II, or III

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

⁹ Faculty Handbook B2.2.3(a)

¹⁰ Faculty Handbook B4.8.3(a)

A candidate who aspires to the rank of Senior or Principal Lecturer should have the qualifications and expertise for the appropriate rank as described in the UNM Faculty Handbook, have demonstrated professional excellence and a conscientious interest in improving his or her professional skills. Promotion may be awarded to Lecturers in any of the three numerical titles (I, II, III) whose FTE has consistently been 0.5 FTE or higher. Consideration for promotion to a higher lecturer rank will occur during the annual College's Promotion and Tenure process. The dossier should be submitted to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Length of service and FTE requirements:

After a Lecturer I, II, or III has completed 5 years of employment in the College of Population Health at 0.5 FTE or greater, he/she is eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer and – if promoted – to be offered a renewable two-year term appointment as Senior Lecturer.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer will be based upon a dossier that demonstrates consistently high performance. The dossier should include recommendations from faculty reviewers. The candidate should prepare the dossier to reflect how they meet the standards listed below. The dossier should include a record of courses taught, number of students in the class, teaching evaluations, history of mentoring of students, efforts by the candidate to improve their teaching and knowledge of their discipline, their record of participating in the citizenship of the university, and examples of their leadership and professional accomplishments. Reviewers and the dean should state how the candidates meets, or fails to meet, the following standards:

Principal Lecturer

Candidates should “have sustained consistently high standards in their professional contributions, consistently demonstrated service to the University community and its mission and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills. It is expected that Principal Lecturers will continue to develop and mature with regard to their professional activities and leadership within the University.”

A record of mentoring students, staff and faculty is a valuable attribute for the Principal Lecturer that should be viewed positively in the promotion evaluation. Similarly, contributions to the community that reflect the academic role of the Principal Lecturer should be weighed positively in the evaluation.

Promotion to “the rank of Principal Lecturer represents a judgment on the part of the college, and University that the individual has attained and will continue to sustain an overall profile of professional excellence and engagement in the wider profession.” The review should include an evaluation “of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise.”

Length of service and FTE requirements:

After a Senior Lecturer I, II, or III has completed a total of 11 years of employment in the College of Population Health at 0.5 FTE or greater at the rank of Lecturer (including the provisional year and years as Senior Lecturer), he/she is eligible to apply for promotion to Principal Lecturer and – if promoted – to be offered a renewable three-year term appointment as Principal Lecturer.

Senior Lecturer

To obtain a promotion, candidates should “have demonstrated professional excellence and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills.”

A candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer should prepare a dossier addressing the criteria for promotion cited for Principal Lecturer. In addition to the criteria described there, the candidate should address how their efforts have changed or improved since promotion to Principal Lecturer.

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

X. APPENDIX 1 – STANDARDS FOR ALL AREAS OF FOCUS

Competence in Teaching

In order to demonstrate **competence** in teaching, the candidate must show, when compared to University and national peers, evidence that he or she meets competence through learner and self-evaluation of the quality parameters.

- ✓ Total number and quality of hours are both important. For example, giving one great lecture per year is not adequate nor is giving a large number of poor lectures. The quantity of teaching is more than the number of student contact hours, for example, lecture preparation and evaluation may take many hours.
- ✓ Learner evaluation is critical in teaching. Faculty must seek out or develop mechanisms for gathering learner feedback to include in the narrative with behavioral examples.
- ✓ Peer evaluation of teaching.

Competence Scholarship and Research or Community Engaged Scholarship

To be considered **competent** in Scholarship and Research/Community Engaged Scholarship the individual must show activity comparable to others of the same rank within the discipline. This will typically include:

- ✓ Works published in appropriate peer-reviewed venues.
- ✓ Published works that concern public and population health subjects or issues of importance to the CPH and field of population/public health and science.
- ✓ Continued efforts to obtain extramural funding to support the scholarship and research, preferably success in doing so.
- ✓ Evidence must be provided that the individual has at least a regional reputation based on his/her scholarship and research activities.
- ✓ Works published in appropriate peer-reviewed venues.
- ✓ Published works that concern public and population health subjects or issues of importance to the CPH and field of population/public health and science.
- ✓ In general, a candidate should produce a minimum of two peer reviewed publications per year, not including the first year. In addition to including the number of publications, the candidate should address the impact factor of the journal in which the work is published. If the candidate has written a scholarly work or text, they should address the impact of the book on the field.
- ✓ Scholarship/research/creative activities that are characterized by continuity.
- ✓ The individual must demonstrate that the work could not have been done without the individual's contribution.
- ✓ Attempts to obtain extramural funding to support the scholarship/research/creative work, preferably success in doing so.
- ✓ Evidence that the individual has achieved a regional reputation based on his/her scholarship and research and the engagement of the relevant communities in effective work.

Excellence in Teaching

To achieve **excellence** in education and teaching compared to University and national peers, the candidate should provide evidence that he or she exceeds competence standard through learner, self-evaluation of the quality parameters, and other measures

such as a teaching portfolio. The candidate must demonstrate a progression in achievement and be widely recognized for excellence in teaching, curriculum development, or educational leadership. For advancement to professor, evidence of successful mentoring of other faculty in education is required. In this context, mentoring means establishing a long-term relationship that aids the other individual in reaching his/her career goals (e.g., helping develop a scholarly program that results in peer-reviewed works).

Promotion also requires clear evidence that the individual has an established national or international reputation or is on a trajectory to do so. The number or the quality of the published works or educational products that are disseminated should be substantial. It should be substantially more than what constitutes evidence of 'competence.' The actual number of published works or educational products will vary according to the discipline. Additional evidence of excellence can be documented by citing the impact factor of the candidate's work which can vary according to the candidate's discipline.

Scholarship for faculty on the Education Track may differ from scholarship of faculty on the Research and Community Engaged Scholarship tracks. The scholarship can be related to education OR it can be related to research appropriate to the faculty member's interest.

Excellence in Scholarship and Research or Community Engaged Scholarship

To be considered **excellent** in scholarship and research or community engaged scholarship the individual must show activity that exceeds others of the same rank within the discipline at peer institutions and clear evidence that the individual has an established national or international reputation in the area of scholarly emphasis. This will usually include:

- ✓ Works published in peer-reviewed venues of outstanding quality. For those faculty doing Community Engaged research, a balance of peer-reviewed (more than half) and community engaged products is required to meet this standard.
- ✓ The published works should be of outstanding significance to population health, public health, or the community.
- ✓ The number or the quality of the published works should be substantial and much greater than what constitutes evidence of "competence." The actual number of published works will vary according to discipline.
- ✓ The activity must be characterized by continuity.
- ✓ The individual must be a major contributor to the work. They must be first or corresponding author, or must demonstrate that the work could not have been done without the individual's contribution.
- ✓ The individual should have extramural funding on which he/she is the principal investigator. If the candidate is not the PI, they must demonstrate their contribution is crucial to the funding and to the success of the project. Obtaining funding for Community Engaged Scholarship can be more challenging.

Note: Accomplishments and activities substantially different from those listed above would require full documentation and justification in the tenure/promotion dossier.