

**UNM DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW AND SALARY REVIEW**

DRAFT date May 17, 2020

Revised January 25, 2021

CY 2020-specific changes are in yellow.

OVERVIEW

Policies and procedures listed in this document are based on the UNM Faculty Handbook section B4.9 (<https://handbook.unm.edu/b4/>). In accord with the Faculty Handbook, the following procedures will be used for both annual salary review and annual faculty review with the following exceptions:

Annual reviews of probationary faculty and milestone faculty reviews will be handled in accord with policies and procedures specified in the *Annual Review of Probationary Faculty Handbook* and the *Tenure and Promotion Review Handbook*.

REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Post-Tenure and Salary Review Committee (hereafter the Review Committee) will evaluate the Scholarly Work, Teaching, and Service of each faculty member. The Review Committee is comprised of the Associate Chair and six tenured faculty members appointed by the chair, two from each subfield. Review Committee members will serve for no more than two consecutive years, and may not be reappointed to the committee for at least two years after leaving the committee.

The Associate Chair is responsible for administrative oversight of the salary review process, working with other Review Committee members to ensure fair evaluations and aggregating data. Faculty members with questions about the process should address them to the Associate Chair.

PERIOD OF REVIEW

Calendar Year (January-December)

DUE DATES

Annual Salary Review

Notice that Salary Review Packets are due by Friday, Jan 29

Salary Review Packets Due Monday, Feb 8

Probationary faculty notify Review Committee chair
of intent to include or exclude peer-observations Monday, Feb 8

Review Committee workload scores Friday, Feb 26

Associate Chair's report to Chair First March 5

Annual Faculty Review

Chair's written report and meeting with faculty member	Third Friday in April
Faculty rebuttal (if applicable)	First Friday in May
Chair's report to dean	Monday after First Friday in May

FACULTY SALARY/ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW PACKET

The faculty salary/post-tenure review packet are comprised of:

1. **Current full CV**, in UNM format. (https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/docs/faculty/retention-forms/cas-standard-faculty-vitae_rev5.7.15.doc)
2. **Abbreviated CV**, covering the calendar year of review only. Include *Works in progress*: book, article and chapter manuscripts, museum exhibits, films, presentations, papers grants, fellowships and all projects that you worked on during the calendar year but did not submit. Also list effort-intensive research activities such as heading a lab or managing a grant.
3. **Personal Statement of Accomplishments and Goals**. For probationary faculty, the statements accompanying annual, mid-probationary, or tenure review will suffice. For tenured faculty, provide a ≤ 500-word self-evaluation of their record of teaching, scholarly work, and service during the previous calendar year, and goals for the next calendar year.

For CY 2020:

a. per the provost, in their statements "faculty are strongly encouraged to summarize the changes that have taken place in one's practice, particularly as it has affected productivity (e.g., canceled or delayed events, activities; reduced access to facilities, personnel, research sites, research participants; reduced service responsibilities, etc.)."

b. to permit Personal Statements to address the impact of the pandemic on their performance in CY 2020, there is no word limit on the personal statements, but please make them as concise as possible for the review committee.

4. **Annual teaching effort**. Must include **Summary of Student Evaluations form** (<https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/faculty/promotion-tenure.html>), summary tables for graduate seminar evaluations, and independent study classes, including MA and PhD-student hours

For CY 2020,

a. the requirement of submitting summaries of student evaluation is optional

b. probationary faculty will decide, without penalty, whether peer-observation of teaching will be included in the annual review. The probationary faculty must inform the Review Committee Chair of their decision by Monday, Feb 8

5. **Peer-review report from at least one course.** Only required once every two years. Same instructions/format as in the Classroom Observations section of the department's *Promotion and Tenure Review Handbook*.

For CY 2020:

Relevant if a faculty member did not include peer observation for their CY 2019 review. In such cases, for CY 2020, this requirement is optional

The faculty salary/post-tenure review packet is submitted electronically to the Departmental Administrator. **Please submit the full CV in one pdf, and merged items 2-5 in a second single pdf.**

ANNUAL PEER-REVIEW OF TEACHING

For probationary faculty, the Review Committee will use the peer-evaluations that are collected as specified in the department's *Annual Review of Probationary Faculty Handbook*. Tenured faculty must solicit, from any tenured faculty in the department (or from a tenured faculty member in a department in which the faculty member teaches, or from the UNM Center for Teaching Excellence), written peer evaluation of at least one course each year. These peer evaluations should follow the instructions listed in the Classroom Observations section of the department's *Promotion and Tenure Review Handbook*. The reviews must be conducted during the calendar year under review.

PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. The Department Administrator will make the Review Packets available to the Review Committee via One Drive/Sharepoint.
2. Reviewers will score all faculty files except: their own, spouses/partners/family members, the Chair, and the Associate Chair. The Associate Chair will be evaluated by the Chair, while the Chair will be evaluated by the Dean.
3. All faculty will be scored in each of three workload categories (research, teaching and service) by seven peers, two from each subfield, plus the Associate Chair, using guidance from Section C of the UNM Faculty Handbook and the college.
 - a. The typical per semester academic load as defined in section C110 is 23 load units, which is the sum of 9 teaching load units, 9 scholarly work load units, and 5 service load units.
 - b. The maximum load per semester is 18 for teaching, 18 for scholarship, and 10 for service.
 - c. Due to the difficulty of separating scholarship and service by semester, the reviewers will score annual scholarship and service workloads out of a total of 36 units and 20 units, respectively.

- d. Per college guidelines, scores are not adjusted for course releases, sabbaticals, or administrative appointments.

For CY 2020:

Per instructions from the provost, in calculating faculty load scores, the Review Committee “shall take account of the disruptive, ongoing negative effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty working conditions and student learning conditions when making evaluative decisions about faculty.”

4. Once scoring is completed, for each category, for each faculty member, the Associate Chair will drop the lowest and highest of the seven scores and calculate a mean. The Associate Chair will provide the summary scores to the Department Chair.
5. Using the faculty load scores assigned by the review committee, and following careful review of faculty materials, the chair will assign the following overall rating to each faculty member:
 - Outstanding: total workload score in top two quartiles, and two of three areas in top quartile
 - Excellent: total workload score in top two quartiles
 - Effective: workload score in each area at or above typical faculty load and total workload score in 1st or 2nd quartile
 - Needs Improvement: total workload score in either semester below 46 units that is not the result of course releases, sabbaticals, approved leaves, or administrative appointments.

CY 2020

The chair ratings will be limited to “Outstanding,” “Excellent,” and “Effective.” The chair will not assign “Needs Improvement.”

6. The Department Chair will write a report (normally 50 to 100 words, more for those with ratings of “Outstanding” or “Needs Improvement”). All faculty will be eligible for cost of living allowance if it is available. Faculty with ratings of “Outstanding,” or “Excellent,” will be recommended for merit-based salary increase. If merit increase is not available, the next year that it becomes available, any faculty member rated as “Outstanding” or “Excellent” at any time since merit was last available will be eligible for merit increase. In the case of “Needs Improvement,” the report will identify areas of deficiency and suggest remedies, and the chair and the dean shall monitor improvements.
7. Two copies of the annual review, signed by the chair, shall be given to the faculty member, one to be signed as acknowledgment of receipt and returned to the chair.
8. A faculty member who disagrees with the review may add a comment or rebuttal. The review and any such statement shall be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. The faculty member, in addition, may appeal the chair’s evaluation to the dean.

9. The department chair will submit the report and the full text of any comment or rebuttal to the Dean. If the dean disagrees with the chair's evaluation, he or she shall so inform the chair and the faculty member.

REVIEW COMMITTEE SCORING AND CHAIR RATING

Evaluations will be based on criteria in the department's *Promotion and Tenure Review Handbook*.

The rating criteria created by each subfield will be consistent with the following principles:

- The chair will use the ratings "Outstanding" or "Needs Improvement" sparingly based on exceptionally low or high workload scores.

CY 2020

The chair ratings will be limited to "Outstanding," "Excellent," and "Effective." The chair will not assign "Needs Improvement."

- Scholarly work is assessed on the principle of external, discipline-specific peer-review, but annual reviews will consider other research products for which faculty provide evidence of substantial progress.
- Evaluation will take into consideration that the *Handbook* criteria span multiple years, and that performance with respect to scholarly work will vary from year to year.
- Evaluation will be based on expectations for a given rank. For example, junior faculty are not expected to undertake large service loads, so low service effort should not earn a "Needs Improvement".
- Faculty on leave or with any kind of teaching release or administrative position will not be penalized for their reduction in teaching or service effort. However, their scores must still reflect their actual workload. The rating given to a faculty member on the annual faculty and salary review will take into account the effects on workload of these non-standard activities.
- Performance will not be evaluated for faculty on medical and maternity leave during the full calendar year.

APPENDIX

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING AND SERVICE FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE FOR ANTHROPOLOGY FACULTY

According to the UNM faculty handbook Section B, faculty performance will be evaluated on four categories: (1) teaching, (2) scholarly work, (3) service, and (4) personal characteristics. “In order to earn tenure or promotion or both, faculty are required to be effective in all four areas. Excellence in either teaching or scholarly work constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion.” [emphasis added]. Accordingly, the Department of Anthropology has defined the attached benchmarks as indicative of excellence in scholarship and teaching, and of effectiveness in service, at each career milestone. The following table provides candidates and evaluators with target expectations appropriate to the discipline and is intended to promote effective mentorship and objective evaluation. However, it should be understood that these criteria do not comprise strict requirements for tenure and/or promotion at the University level, and faculty may demonstrate excellence in different ways.

Area of Productivity	Level of Review		
	3-Year ¹	Tenure/Associate ²	Professor
Scholarly Work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of a focused, independent research program beyond the dissertation 2. Evidence of a (a) consistent record of scholarship, and (b) significant progress towards each of the benchmarks outlined for tenure. The candidate should address each of the 5 criteria for tenure to demonstrate how they have made progress (e.g., finalized products, works contracted, in progress, or submitted, research logistics). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of a focused, independent research program beyond the dissertation 2. A record of peer-reviewed scholarship judged to be significant by departmental peers and by recognized experts in the field external to UNM*. 3. 4-6 national/international presentations 4. External grant received 5. Evidence of a growing national reputation, e.g., citations, awards, invited talks 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of an active research program 2. A continuing record of peer-reviewed scholarship judged to be significant by departmental peers and by recognized experts in the field external to UNM*. 3. 4-6 additional national/international presentations since tenure 4. PI status on additional externally funded research grant(s) since promotion 5. Evidence of an international reputation, e.g., citations, awards, invited talks

* There is no singular standard to which a candidate's scholarly work should conform, but the candidate must demonstrate both high quality of scholarship and consistent productivity. A general guideline for candidates publishing peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters alone is a rate of approximately 2-3 articles per year at least 1-2 of which should be as sole, lead, corresponding, or

1 Expectations at the end of year 3. Totals will be adjusted to account for the that fact that midpro dossiers are normally submitted at the end of year 2
2 Expectations at the end of year 6. Totals will be adjusted to account for the that fact that RPT dossiers are normally submitted at the end of year 5

supervising author. On approximately half of those 2-3 articles the candidate should be the sole, lead, corresponding, or supervising author. Articles of high impact (e.g., highly-cited or in top-tier journal) will be weighted comparatively heavily. In some subfields, the publication of a sole-authored book (or evidence of its final acceptance) or presentation of a major exhibit may be required or desirable but should not be the sole scholarly product for tenure or promotion. This should be discussed between the Candidate, their mentoring team, and the Chair. In all cases, the standard for quantity and quality in scholarship must be that of the discipline at peer or better institutions. The relative value of publication vehicles (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, edited volumes, monographs, site reports, exhibits) will vary by sub-field, but the and impact of scholarly work will be a central basis for assessment by the department review committee, the College, and the external reviewers.

<p>Teaching</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date course syllabi 2. Teaching schedule contributes to goals of the subfield/dept 3. 1-2 new course preparations 4. Formal student evaluations from every course taught 5. Peer review of at least one course each year by annual review committee 6. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 7. Participation in teaching enhancement workshops 8. Serve on or chair MA/MS/PhD committees 9. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date syllabi 2. Teaching schedule contributes to goals of the subfield/dept 3. 1-2 additional new course preps 4. Formal student evaluations for every course taught 5. Peer review of at least one course each year (by 3 different reviewers, see teaching portfolio guidelines) 6. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 7. Participation in teaching enhancement workshops 8. Chair at least one MA and one PhD student. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date syllabi 2. Teaching schedule contributes to goals of the subfield/dept 3. Formal student evaluations for every course taught 4. Three new peer reviews of teaching (see teaching portfolio guidelines) 5. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 6. Completed as committee chair, graduated at least one MA and one PhD student 7. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate levels 8. Accomplishments of former students and advisees, e.g., employment, publications, grants
------------------------	---	---	--

	levels, including required core courses	9. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate levels, including core required courses	
--	---	---	--

Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service on at least 1 department or college committee 2. Manuscript or grant review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service on at least 2 department or college committees 2. Involvement in professional or community organizations beyond membership^a 3. Manuscript or grant review 4. Service as faculty mentor 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuing service in all areas previously mentioned 2. Leadership^a in departmental, college and/or professional organizations
----------------	---	---	---

^aTo include professional organizations, NGOs, community, or governmental entities that are related to research or the field of study. Involvement might include any substantive service on organizing or award committees, organizations of symposia or workshops, panel or editorial board service, policy development, testimony, development of training or educational materials, etc.