

## UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW HANDBOOK

### *Faculty Handbook 4.6.1:*

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

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

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

### **MENTOR:**

(Appointed by Department Chair from tenured faculty at or above Candidate’s rank and normally from the same subfield.)

Mentor receives a copy of this Handbook but does not serve on or participate in any Review Committee work. Rather, Mentor works closely with Candidate throughout the academic year as adviser and advocate, especially in matters relating to the review and tenure/promotion process.

### **REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

(Three appointed by Department Chair from tenured faculty at or above Candidate’s rank, with Review Committee Chair normally from the same subfield; AGSU appoints the graduate student from another subfield who participates in the teaching evaluation only.)

- Review Committee Chair is responsible for all committee work and for the final report to Department Chair.
- Review Committee Service member is from Candidate's subfield with primary responsibility for evaluating service.
- Review Committee Teaching member is from outside Candidate's subfield and responsible for the separate teaching evaluation.
- Review Committee Graduate Student from outside Candidate's subfield works separately with Review Committee Teaching member.

Each Review Committee member receives a copy of this Handbook. If tenure is involved, faculty Review Committee members receive copies of all Candidate's previous annual Review Committee reviews.

Throughout the review process, procedural or non-academic problems should be addressed to Department Administrator, the staff member who oversees all confidential faculty personnel matters. Academic problems should be addressed to Associate Chair. **The utmost confidentiality is essential.**

*Note:* Department Chair does not participate in the review process until after the final REVIEW COMMITTEE Report has been delivered.

#### **OUTSIDE REVIEWER LETTERS:**

Department mid-probationary reviews do not require outside reviewer letters.

#### **GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS FOR TEACHING REPORT:**

Working with instruction and oversight from Review Committee Teaching member, Review Committee Graduate Student solicits letters from Candidate's present and former graduate students and all current Department graduate students. These letters are read *only* by Review Committee Teaching member and Review Committee Graduate Student. The latter is responsible for handling these letters, which must be kept in a confidential location until the separate Teaching Report has been written and signed. The Graduate Student then e-mails all letters directly to Department Chair.

#### **Calendar for Graduate Student Letters:**

<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
By second Friday of October	List of current and former graduate students and contact info to Review	Candidate

	Committee Teaching member	
By third Friday of October	Electronic letters sent by Graduate Student	Review Committee Teaching member & Grad Student
By First Friday of November	Electronic letter text sent to Graduate Student listserv; Letters are due by the second Friday of November	Review Committee Teaching member & Grad Student

### Candidate's List:

The candidate provides a list of all past and present graduate students within and outside the Department (UNM and other universities) with e-mail addresses. For students who have received their degree, indicate current or last known position.

### Sample Letter Text for Candidate's List:

*The Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico is conducting a mid-probationary review of Professor xxx's progress toward eventual tenure at the rank of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor of Anthropology OR eventual tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology. As part of the process, the review committee solicits evaluations of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring from graduate students who have worked with her/him in a teaching and/or research capacity. We would be very grateful for your participation in this important deliberation.*

*We are requesting candid evaluations that specifically address the following points [list them on separate lines]:*

- (1) your relationship with Professor xxx and the extent of your knowledge of her/his work;*
- (2) your characterization and assessment of the quality of her/his teaching and mentoring;*
- (3) her/his impact on your own professional development.*

*Clear statements with concrete examples would be greatly appreciated.*

*If you are willing to assist us, we will need your letter e-mailed by by November xx, 20xx. These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law.*

*For the review committee report, graduate student letters are read only by Professor xxx, the review committee member from outside xxx's subfield of xxx, and by myself, the review committee*

graduate student representative from the xxx subfield. Anonymous summaries of and quotations from your statements will be incorporated into our comprehensive teaching evaluation report, which is a separately signed part of the committee's report to the faculty.

After Professor xxx and I have completed our report I deliver them to Department Chair who is the only other department faculty member to read your letter. He/she will use them in his/her confidential report to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Please e-mail your statement to me at xxxxx.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely, xxx

### **Sample Acknowledgment:**

I received your confidential evaluation of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring on xxx [date]. Professor xxx [Review Committee Teaching member] and I very much appreciate your participation in this important review process. Sincerely, xxx.

### **Graduate List Letter:**

The above letter with a changed deadline and a second paragraph added:

Personal letters have already been mailed to Professor xxx's present and former graduate students. In this e-mail I invite comment from any other current department graduate students.

Graduate Student posts this general solicitation to the anthropology graduate student list by the first Friday in November and notes the letter's due date one week later.

### **CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS:**

During November, by prior arrangement, Review Committee Teaching member visits one session of each department course and/or seminar taught by Candidate during the review semester and writes a 2-3-paragraph report on each class attended.

### **CALENDAR FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
During November	Classroom observations	Review Committee Teaching member

By First Friday of January	Dossier finalized	Candidate
By Wednesday of Second week in January	Faculty notified dossier open online	Review Committee Chair
By 5 pm Friday of Second week in January	SIGNED Review Committee Report to Dept. Admin.; The Report should include the separate Teaching Report as well	Review Committee Chair & all members of Review Committee
By Monday of Third week in January	Review Committee Reports available online	Department Administrator
Last Friday of January	Special Faculty Meeting	
Last Day of January	Revised (if necessary) Review Committee Report to Department Administrator	Review Committee Chair & all members of Review Committee

#### **CANDIDATE DOSSIER:**

By the first Friday after January 1, the Candidate completes assembling the “Mid-Probationary Dossier.” Specifications are online in A&S “Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies/Procedures.” The dossier must be uploaded into the specified application. (As of 2017, the current application is RPT)

The Department Administrator helps with procedural questions. The Candidate is responsible for the dossier contents and their timely placement in the file. The dossier must include:

- 1) The standard faculty vitae,
- 2) Arts and Sciences summary of teaching evaluations (form on A&S website), as well as copies of past Annual Reviews.
- 3) A Research Statement
- 4) A Teaching Statement
- 5) A Service Statement
- 6) A List of Supplementary Materials (form on A&S website)

Candidate notifies Review Committee Chair when dossier is complete. At the time of submission, candidate signs the Arts and Sciences Form 3 “List of Supplemental Materials” certifying that the dossier is complete, which is then signed by the Department Chair. Thereafter, Candidate has no further access to the dossier and must submit any changes to Department Administrator.

Review Committee Chair determines that the dossier is ready for viewing after Candidate attests that her/his part is completed. Review Committee Chair notifies the faculty and instructs them to follow the viewing procedures set up by Department Administrator, who is responsible for maintaining the files' integrity and confidentiality.

#### **CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM:**

No research colloquium is required for mid-probationary review.

#### **REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

The Review Committee Report is written during January. Each committee member is responsible for their respective areas of the report:

- 1) Review Committee Chair:
  - a) Report section on Scholarly Work;
  - b) Review and oversight of final document;
  - c) Creation of separate signature page;
  - d) Obtaining all committee member signatures on report;
  - e) Presenting an overview of the review and the specific review on Scholarly Work to the full faculty;
  - f) Incorporating any revisions specified during the special faculty meeting.
  
- 2) Review Committee Service Member:
  - a) Report section on Service;
  - b) Presenting the Service section of the review to the full faculty.
  
- 3) Review Committee Teaching member:
  - a) Working with Review Committee Grad Student to obtain review letters from former and current graduate students;
  - b) Report section on Teaching in the form of a separate Teaching Report to be signed by both the Review Committee member and Grad Student;
  - c) Presenting the Teaching section of the review to the full faculty, including a summary of graduate student comments.

One week prior to the Special Faculty Meeting at the end of January the Review Committee Chair submits the signed, original Review Committee Report (which includes the separate Teaching Report signed by the Review Committee Teaching member and the Grad Student) to Department Administrator (and electronically to Review Committee Member and Review Committee Teaching). The Department Administrator sends the report electronically to voting faculty by

the following business day.

The Review Committee Report will go forward and be read at all levels of the review process (faculty, chair, dean, provost). It should follow the format outlined below so that each candidacy is clearly and uniformly informed by College and Department criteria, policy and procedure.

**Review Committee Introductory Section Format:**

ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR XXX

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

January x, 20xx [date of special faculty meeting]

*Committee Members:*

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (Chair, X subfield)

Associate Professor/Professor (X subfield)

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (X subfield)

*For the Separate Teaching Report only:*

Graduate Student xxx (X subfield)

Assistant/Associate Professor xxx received her/his doctorate in [field] from xxx University in [date]. Proceed to account for all their positions/time since receiving the doctorate and before assuming the tenure-track position at UNM. Also include any significant time spent in visiting faculty or temporary research/fellowship positions away from UNM after assuming the tenure-track job here. This is the “elsewhere” paragraph.

A member of the X subfield, Dr. Xxx joined the tenure-track faculty in the Department as an assistant/associate/full professor in August/January xxxx [if there is some kind of joint appointment, so state here]. According to the *UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*: “Unless otherwise indicated by contract or other written agreement, the record under consideration for tenure and promotion to associate Professor/tenure as Associate Professor/tenure as Full Professor is that accrued since beginning the tenure-track position at UNM....” [If this is not the case, quote directly from the contract or other written document.]

**Review Committee Teaching Section Format:**

**Teaching: (NOTE: There is a separate Teaching Report that is appended to the committee report [see below])**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should be involved in teaching at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels. [here insert the wording under Teaching for tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.] (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Sample of the single sentence: Based on the attached Teaching Report by Professor xxx and graduate student xxx, the Committee agrees that Professor xxx has fully met these criteria. Modify as appropriate.

**Review Committee Scholarly Work Section Format:**

**Scholarly Work:**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should demonstrate.... [here insert the paragraph on scholarly work from tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.]

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category. Scholarly work in public anthropology involves funding, research, conceptualization, and the presentation of a final product. The candidate documents their role in (1) obtaining external funding to carry out the research, (2) carrying out research to be used in the product, (3) providing a conceptual analysis, and (4) publication or promulgation of the product as well as statements about collaboration with communities, networks, or organizations that were part of the research, training that they may have offered students, community members or organization members, and a discussion of the dissemination of the scholarship (audience reached and significance). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Review Committee Chair's report on scholarly work (see below) begins here.

Review Committee Chair bases this evaluation on Candidate's CV, expanded statement of



professional achievements/goals, dossier materials, and previous annual reviews.

The first paragraphs of this section constitute a summary overview of the scholarly record: number and kinds of publications, status of work in press and/or in progress, public anthropology work completed or in progress, grants received or under review, other writing, etc. A discussion of that work follows, with attention to shortcomings that need to be remedied before the tenure review.

Sample last sentence: The Committee concurs that Professor xxx's record shows xxx strengths and xxx weaknesses, xxx of which can be remedied and xxx of which probably cannot. Modify as appropriate.

### **Review Committee Service Section Format:**

#### **Service:**

Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and teaching.... Untenured assistant professors..../Ongoing service to the University, the profession and the public is expected for promotion to full.... [Follow with the paragraph on service from tenure and promotion to associate professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure wording.]

The University recognizes “two broad categories of faculty service: professional and public.” The former “consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member’s discipline or profession.” It includes department, University, and “beyond the University...service to professional organizations and other groups that engage in or support educational and research activities” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.3.a.1*). The latter “consists of activities that arise from a faculty member’s role in the University...activities [that] normally involve the sharing and application of faculty expertise to issues and needs of the civic community in which the University is located” (*ibid 1.2.3.a.2*).

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category.... Public anthropology evaluated as service may be considered professional and/or public service according to the University criteria. (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion, January 19, 2007*)

Review Committee Member's report on service (see below) begins here.

Review Committee Member bases this evaluation on the CV, expanded statement of achievements/goals, dossier materials and previous annual reviews. Relevant categories should be presented in the following order: (1) subfield, (2) department, (3) university, (4) profession, and (5) public. Strengths and weaknesses should be evaluated in each appropriate category.

Sample first sentence: Professor xxx's service record is excellent with respect to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community. Modify as appropriate.

**Review Committee Concluding/Recommendation Section Format:**

The Anthropology Department expects faculty excellence in research that contributes to our national and international standing and "effective teaching...[that] provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning" (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.1.b*). Research is expected to inform teaching... Unless they compromise the Department's teaching and research mission, Personal Characteristics are considered part of the evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly Work, and Service as influencing "an individual's effectiveness as a teacher, a scholar, researcher, or creative artist, and a leader in a professional area" (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.4*). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Sample concluding paragraph: The Committee unanimously recommends that Assistant/Associate/Full Professor xxx receive a second probationary period leading to review for tenure and promotion/tenure in 20xx-20xx on the basis of very good teaching, a good record of scholarly work, and service appropriate to rank. If xxx weaknesses are remedied, there is a strong likelihood that s/he will successfully pass the tenure review. Modify as appropriate.

**Signature Page:**

On a separate but numbered page: space for three signatures [Review Committee Chair, Review Committee Member, Review Committee Teaching] and the date for each.

**Teaching Report:**

Review Committee Teaching member and Review Committee Grad Student base this evaluation on: (1) the CV; (2) expanded statement of achievements/goals; (3) ICES, IDEA, seminar and other

evaluation reports from the entire time period since beginning the tenure track or promotion to associate/full professor; (4) review-semester class observations by Review Committee Teaching member; (5) Candidate's record of student advisement and individual instruction; (6) Review Committee Grad Student-solicited letters from Candidate's list of past and present graduate students inside and outside the department and from all current anthropology graduate students. Annual reviews are also taken into consideration, but Review Committee Grad Student *does not have access to those documents*.

Review Committee Teaching member has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report. The Review Committee Chair and Review Committee Service member should review this only after it is written. The Grad Student writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to Teaching member for review. Either Grad Student or Teaching member may raise confidential questions about the letters directly to Department Chair only. Review Committee Chair and Review Committee Service member have no involvement with the Grad Student report in any way; its wording remains as agreed upon between Teaching member and Grad Student (and if necessary Department Chair).

The introductory paragraphs of the report constitute a summary of Candidate's career teaching history at UNM and elsewhere, with the kinds of courses taught in each place and a statement about the research that informs this teaching record. The total number of UNM courses taught during the review period, the titles of each course and the number of times it was taught, a statement about typical enrollments at each level, and the class(es) currently being taught complete this teaching history introduction.

Sections follow in this order:

(1) Teaching Statement: a characterization of (with quotations from) Candidate's expanded statement on teaching accomplishments and goals.

(2) Course Evaluations: (a) ICES, including a chart presenting the Form #2 data and general summary statements about the ICES scores and the student comments written on the forms; (b) graduate seminar evaluations, including a chart presenting the data and general summary statements about the scores and student comments. Other evaluation forms should be treated similarly.

(3) Classroom Observations by Professor xxx [Review Committee Teaching member]: The 2-3-paragraph classroom observations are included verbatim here.

(4) Student Advisement and Individual Instruction: a chart presenting the number of students in 497, Honors, 597/598, MA/MS committee, MA/MS chair; 697/698, PhD committee, PhD chair, Graduate external grant during the review period, and job placement of graduated students,

together with general summary comments on this record.

(5) Graduate Student Letters: This section, after being written and signed by Review Committee Grad Student, is not subject to any further revision. In writing this evaluation from the confidential graduate student letters, Grad Student must make every effort to safeguard the anonymity of respondents. Make no reference to the number of letters from a particular subfield or a particular class/seminar. This is a general summation/evaluation of the letters as a group.

The Review Committee Grad Student begins by identifying her/himself as an x-year graduate student in x subfield. Also indicate any previous association with Candidate, e.g., taking a class from or serving on a committee with them. Then in a list indicate how many review letter solicitations were successfully sent (*not* how many could not be delivered) from Candidate's list. Then indicate when the graduate electronic list was contacted and when the letters were due to the department. Finally, indicate the total number of letters received and thus used in the evaluation report. This is followed by a discussion of the letters, signed and dated at the end.

(6) General Summary of Teaching: This summation ends with the Review Committee Teaching and Review Committee Grad Student recommendations and is co-signed and dated.

#### **SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON MID-PROBATIONARY CASES:**

Both tenure-track and voting research faculty participate in this special, highly confidential, last-Friday-in-January meeting, but only tenure-track faculty receive the Review Committee Report and vote on mid-probationary cases. No visiting faculty or presenters from outside the department attend. The Department Administrator attends and takes notes for Department Chair's eyes only. None of the candidates and no spouses/domestic partners are in attendance for any part of the meeting. If any of these sits on a review committee, another committee member must substitute for them.

The order of presentation is junior to senior and alphabetically within each category (assistant, associate, full). Review Committee Chair introduces the case, followed by separate presentations on teaching (Review Committee Teaching member), scholarly work (Review Committee Chair), and service (Review Committee Service Member). Review Committee Chair concludes the presentation and moderates subsequent discussion, which may include suggestions for revisions to the Review Committee document (except the Grad Student report on the graduate student letters).

Department Chair does not vote or participate in the discussion of candidates except for points of order. At the conclusion of discussion about each candidate Department Chair (with Department Administrator help) conducts a secret, written, provisional yes/no/abstain ballot and announces the results (afterward conveying them non-numerically to Candidate by phone). Until

confidential ballots have been submitted by all tenure-track faculty, this department vote, which is advisory to the chair, is not official. It is possible that some of those voting at the meeting may change their vote before filing the full confidential ballot that goes forward in Candidate's dossier. (Candidate will learn the final department recommendation when they receive the redacted version of the chair's report to the dean.)

NOTE: Review Committee Chair and/or Review Committee Teaching member make any revisions called for during the special faculty meeting. Signature pages remain the same but a full, new version of the text (if necessary) must be delivered to Department Administrator by 5:00 on the Monday following the special meeting. After that, the Review Committee has no further involvement in the review process.