

Last revised on: November 9, 2021

**UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW HANDBOOK:
Promotion to Associate Professor**

CONTENTS

Table 1. Timeline for Promotion and Tenure	3
1. UNM PHILOSOPHY ON TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	5
2. TIMELINE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	5
a. Probationary Period.....	5
b. Early Tenure and Promotion.....	5
c. Extended Tenure Clock	6
d. Tenure as Associate Professor	6
3. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	6
a. Overview	6
b. Summary Standards of Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor ..	7
c. Teaching.....	7
d. Scholarly Work.....	8
e. Service.....	9
Table 2. Department of Anthropology Standards of “Excellence” for Evaluation of Research and Teaching, and “effectiveness” for Evaluation of Service for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty	10
f. Diversity and Inclusion Statement.....	14
g. Personal Characteristics.....	14
4. MENTORSHIP OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY.....	15
5. APPOINTMENT AND CONSTITUTION OF REVIEW COMMITTEE	15
6. SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS.....	16
a. Requirements for External Reviewers	16
b. Candidate’s Selection of External Reviewers.....	17
c. Reviewer Solicitation Process	17
d. Reviewer Solicitation Letter.....	18
7. GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS FOR TEACHING REPORT	18
a. Responsibilities	18

b.	List of Contacts.....	19
c.	Solicitation of Student Letters	19
d.	Acknowledgment of Letters.....	20
e.	Preparation of Summary Report.....	21
8.	CANDIDATE DOSSIER.....	21
9.	CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS.....	22
10.	CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM	23
11.	PREPARATION AND DISSEMINATION OF REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT	24
a.	Responsibilities:	24
b.	Dissemination of Report	25
12.	Format of Review Committee Report.....	25
a.	Introductory Section	25
b.	Teaching Section	26
c.	Scholarly Work Section	26
d.	Service Section	29
e.	Concluding Recommendation.....	29
f.	Addendum: Table of Departmental Criteria (Table 2).....	30
g.	Table, entitled “External Reviewers 20XX-20XX Academic Year” using the attached template. This must be included separately in the candidate’s file.....	30
h.	Signature Page	30
13.	TEACHING REPORT.....	30
a.	Overview	30
b.	Format.....	30
14.	SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON TENURE/PROMOTION CASES:.....	32
15.	FINAL VOTING AND REPORT	32
16.	REFERENCES (in order of use):.....	33

TABLE 1. TIMELINE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Check the RPT website (<https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/faculty/promotion-tenure.html>) for any changes to the calendar.

Deadline	Action
<i>Academic year prior to review</i>	
FEBRUARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate notifies Department Chair of intent to undergo review.
MARCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Chair sends intent for review to College Office
APRIL	
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Chair appoints Review Committee, including Review Committee Graduate Student member
2 nd Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate submits to Review Committee Chair: (a) List of preferred and unacceptable reviewers (b) Curriculum vitae • Candidate submits to Review Committee Teaching member and Department Administrator: Complete, up-to-date list of current and former graduate students and postdocs
MAY	
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate submits review packet (CV, research statement, and grants/publications) to Review Committee Chair and Department Administrator
Monday after 1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Committee Chair approves review packet or requests revisions from Candidate
2 nd Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate submits revised review packet to Review Committee Chair and Department Administrator • Review Committee Chair submits to Department Administrator: (a) two rank-ordered lists of potential reviewers (with email addresses); (b) text of reviewer invitation • Department Administrator contacts 6 reviewers via email and sends review materials upon acceptance
<i>Academic year of review</i>	
SEPTEMBER	
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate and Department Administrator schedule research colloquium for October or November
Last Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Committee Graduate Student member sends request for letters to all students on candidate's list and to graduate listserv
OCTOBER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Committee Teaching member and Candidate verify that all necessary teaching observations have been secured or schedule additional reviews
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Administrator sends reminder to external reviewers

Oct 24 (or 1 st weekday thereafter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate submits signed “List of Supplemental Materials” to Department Chair, who signs and returns to candidate within two business days
3 rd Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters due from graduate students to Review Committee Graduate Student member

NOVEMBER	
Nov 1 (or 1 st weekday thereafter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters due from external reviewers to Department Administrator • Candidate submits final CV and full dossier via online RPT platform, notifies Review Committee Chair • Department Administrator releases dossier to faculty within the week
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Committee Graduate Student member letter submitted to Review Committee Teaching member
3 rd Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Committee report, including teaching report, due to Department Administrator
last Monday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Administrator sends review committee report to faculty
DECEMBER	
1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special faculty meeting/vote • Department Chair notifies candidate of outcome of straw vote within 24 hrs
Monday following 1 st Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty ballots due to Department Administrator by 5pm • Review Chair submits any revisions of report to Department Administrator
JANUARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Chair prepares letter that is included in Candidate dossier • Chair discusses review and recommendation with Candidate • Department Administrator releases final candidate RPT file to College Office. To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Department Chair letter, including summary of vote (b) Review Committee report (c) Complete Candidate dossier, with updates (d) Copies of all prior reviews (e) External review letters and summary table
MARCH-APRIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean informs candidate by letter of their recommendation to Provost
MAY-JUNE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost informs candidate by letter of final decision

1. UNM PHILOSOPHY ON TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom & Tenure (FHB) [4.7.2](#): “The awarding of tenure is the most serious commitment the department, college/school, and University make to a faculty member. Tenure is a privilege, not a right, and is awarded only after the most serious deliberation and review. The tenure review consists of evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarly work, service and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit. For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas, and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work.” (Note from [4.8.2](#): “A favorable decision on promotion to associate professor rank shall normally be a basic prerequisite for the awarding of tenure.”)

2. TIMELINE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

a. Probationary Period

[FHB 4.7.2](#) “The anticipated length of service in the rank of assistant professor is six years, with review for promotion to the rank of associate professor occurring in the sixth year. The review process for advancement to associate professor is normally conducted at the same time as the review for tenure (i.e., Fall semester of the final academic year of the probationary period). Recommendations for promotion in less time are to be carefully weighed and justified.”

b. Early Tenure and Promotion

Exceptions for shortened or delayed clocks may be made by contract at the time of hire or through formal approval by the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost.

Guidelines from Provost ([Parker, 2017](#)):

- “candidates should not determine how long their probationary period... will be. Setting an appropriate probationary period...are assessments made in consultation with the senior faculty of the department, at a minimum, and will ideally include a faculty vote on the question(s). These determinations are incorporated into the written appointment letter and become part of the employment contract. The Provost’s Office does not encourage shortened probationary periods. The decisions to set a probationary period of less than six years must be justified concurrently with submitting the candidate’s hiring justification in UNMJobs, in a separate memo detailed the candidate’s record review process and the circumstances which led the faculty to approve a shortened probationary period.”

- “A probationary period may be shortened upon request by the faculty member, but only if the chair, dean, and provost approve.”
- Regardless of whether the candidate’s probationary period has been shortened, “only the body of work amassed at UNM should be considered during the review”

c. Extended Tenure Clock

Guidelines from Provost ([Parker, 2017](#)):

- “A minimum period of one-semester’s worth of extended sick leave, parental leave or leave without pay will extend the probationary period by one year. An FTE reduction, e.g., switching to a 0.5 FTE part-time appointment, will also extend a probationary period.”
- “Candidates whose probationary period was extended through an approved leave should be assessed as if the dossier was produced during a probationary period of typical length, i.e., the body of work produced during a seven-year probational period should be assessed as if it was produced during a typical six-year probationary period.”

d. Tenure as Associate Professor

“It is the policy of the University that tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will normally be granted together.” ([FHB 4.8.2](#)).

[In the case of candidates who hold the rank of Associate Professor without tenure] Unless otherwise indicated by contract or other written agreement, the record under consideration for tenure as Associate Professor is that accrued since promotion to Associate Professor, and the departmental review criteria follows that outlined herein.

3. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

a. Overview

Of the four categories that constitute the basis for appointment: Teaching, Scholarly Work, Service, and Personal Characteristics, the Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations. Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and 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” ([FHB 1.2.4](#)).

“For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas, and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work.” ([FHB 4.7.2](#)).

b. Summary Standards of Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Unless otherwise indicated by contract or other written agreement, the record for consideration for tenure should be that accrued since beginning the tenure-track position at UNM. Departmental faculty and all external reviewers should be informed of the time frame under consideration.

The faculty handbook [B1.2](#) provides general guidance on *effective* performance in each area of evaluation and tasks each department with specifying standards for *excellence*. Anthropology-specific criteria for *excellence* in teaching and scholarship are provided in Table 2. A faculty member whose scholarship, teaching, or service is not determined to be *effective* receives a rating of *needs improvement*. Such a rating may be justified if major weaknesses have been identified in previous annual and mid-probationary reviews and have not been remedied.

c. Teaching

The candidate should be involved in teaching at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, and the teaching record should have contributed to meeting the teaching needs of the department/subfield. Chairing at least one PhD committee is expected by the time of tenure.

Teaching is evaluated based on the following materials:

- i) a 5-10 page teaching portfolio, following the College guidelines: “The teaching portfolio will include your philosophy of teaching, materials for a few courses that illustrate how you have developed courses and what you think did and did not work, assessment of student learning goals and your reflection on progress towards these goals. It will also include summaries of peer evaluation of teaching, summaries of student evaluation of teaching, and your reflections on what you have learned and how your teaching has changed due to that feedback.” ([A&S Teaching Portfolio Guidelines, rev. 2018](#)) Candidates are encouraged to consult the College [rubric \(rev. 2018\)](#) for evaluating teaching portfolios. The teaching portfolio should be single-spaced.
- ii) Summary of student evaluations for all courses at UNM (graduate and undergraduate), using the College’s standardized Summary of Student Evaluations form. To be prepared by candidate. UNM requires a summary for the past 6 semesters taught, but the Department requires a summary of all teaching from the time of hire. If the Candidate’s term at UNM has been abbreviated, prior teaching evaluations may be included if stipulated in the faculty contact at

time of hire.

- iii) Department-solicited letters assessing the candidate as a teacher and mentor from the candidate's present and former graduate students and postdocs and from all current Department graduate students with knowledge of the candidate.
- iv) Peer evaluations of teaching. See [Section 9](#).
- v) Awards and grants for teaching, and/or formal training on teaching enhancement, as applicable.
- vi) Statement on diversity and inclusion (section 3f), portions applicable to teaching.

d. Scholarly Work.

The candidate should demonstrate high-quality scholarship and a developed independent research program beyond the dissertation, as indicated by a strong publication record and evidence of a growing national reputation. The evaluation of scholarly work is based on:

- i) Curriculum vitae. CVs must conform to the format in the UNM Standard Faculty Vitae. Candidates should retain all major headings from the Standard Faculty Vitae in the same order, even if some headings have no contents. Candidates may add subheadings.
- ii) Research statement. "There is no minimum or maximum page requirement; the candidate should decide the length of the document needed to adequately represent their research to the many and varied reviewers of their dossier... The goal of the Research Statement is to showcase the candidate's research, both past and anticipated, in a clear and concise manner, taking into consideration that College-level and Provost-level reviewers likely will be from other disciplines." ([A&S Promotion and Tenure FAQ, rev 2017](#)). The research statement should be single-spaced.
- iii) Electronic copies of all scholarly products. To be included in the "Supplemental Materials" portion of the candidate's dossier. The materials should include all published or accepted works and research grant proposals (including unfunded proposals) and may additionally include completed materials that have been submitted for review (clearly labeled as such). While the College encourages submission of all scholarly materials, including those completed prior to hire, the department will only evaluate work done after the time of hire unless otherwise indicated by contract at the time of hire.
- iv) Research Colloquium. The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on Candidate's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly

meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Only current Department faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and faculty from other departments with whom the Candidate collaborates, attend.

- v) External peer reviews, as solicited by the review committee.
- vi) Statement on diversity and inclusion (section 3f), portions applicable to research.

e. Service

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" ([FHB 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" ([FHB 1.2.3.a.2](#)).

Active subfield participation and Department service is expected, as is service to the discipline and/or community. Public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public, is considered professional and/or public service according to UNM criteria.

The basis for evaluation of service will be:

- i. Curriculum vitae.
- ii. Service statement.
- iii. Statement on diversity and inclusion (section 3f), portions applicable to service.

TABLE 2. DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY STANDARDS OF “EXCELLENCE” FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING, AND “EFFECTIVENESS” FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF FACULTY

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 for tenure (column 2). 	<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. Regular national/international presentations 4. A record of receiving funding appropriate for the candidate's research program³ 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. Regular additional national/international presentations since tenure 4. A record of receiving additional funding since tenure appropriate for the candidate's research program 5. Evidence of an international reputation, e.g., citations, awards, invited talks

The Department of Anthropology has defined benchmarks indicative of excellence in scholarship and teaching, and of effectiveness in service, at each career milestone. The tables provide candidates and evaluators with target expectations and are intended to promote effective mentorship and objective evaluation. However, these criteria do not comprise strict requirements for tenure and/or promotion, and faculty may demonstrate excellence in different ways. 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 2-3 articles per year, at least 1 of which should be as 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 Ethnology the publication of a sole-authored book, or evidence of its final**

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
3 In ethnology, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, excellent research can, depending on the candidate’s geographic area and type of research, be conducted without funding or with internal funding. In Archaeology and Evolutionary Anthropology, for Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a record of excellence in Scholarly Work will include external funding, and for promotion to Full Professor, a record of excellence will include being PI on one or more externally-funded grants.

acceptance, is required, but should not be the sole scholarly product for tenure or promotion. Annually, the candidate should establish candidate-specific benchmarks in consultation with members of their subfield, their mentoring team, and the Department 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 subfield, but the visibility and impact of scholarly work will be a central basis for assessment by the department review committee and external reviewers.

Area of Productivity	Level of Review		
	3-Year	Tenure/Associate	Professor
Teaching	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date course syllabi⁴ 2. Teaching classes that contribute to goals of the subfield and department 3. 1-2 new course preparations 4. High-quality formal student evaluations of courses 5. High-quality peer review of at least one course taught each year by the annual review committee 6. Formative peer review⁵ of at least one course 7. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 8. Participation in at least one program for development/enhancement of teaching⁶ 9. Membership on at least one MA/MS/PhD committee 10. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate levels 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date course syllabi 2. Teaching classes that contribute to goals of the subfield and department 3. 1-2 additional new course preparations 4. High-quality formal student evaluations of courses 5. High-quality peer review of at least one course each year by annual review committee 6. Formative peer review of at least three classes 7. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 8. Participation in at least one development/enhancement teaching program since midpro 9. Chairing at least one MA/MS.PhD committee. 10. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate levels, including at least one subfield core sequence course 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, up-to-date course syllabi 2. Teaching classes that contribute to goals of the subfield and department 3. High-quality formal student evaluations of courses 4. High-quality peer review of at least two courses, since tenure, by review committee 5. Formative peer review of at least one class since tenure 6. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students 7. Participation in at least one development/enhancement teaching program since tenure 8. As committee chair, graduated at least one MA/MS and one PhD student 9. Taught courses at undergraduate and graduate levels 10. Accomplishments of former students and advisees, e.g., employment, publications, grants
Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service on at least 1 committee at department or college level 2. Manuscript or grant review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service on at least 2 committees at department or college level 2. Involvement in professional or community organizations beyond membership^a 3. Manuscript or grant review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuing service in all areas previously mentioned 2. Leadership^a in departmental, college and professional organizations 3. Manuscript or grant review 4. Service as member of at least one faculty mentoring committee

4 Following guidelines from the registrar (<https://registrar.unm.edu/faculty--staff-resources/sample-syllabus.pdf>)

5 Solicited by candidate. Per Center for Teaching Excellence (<https://cte.unm.edu/assets/docs/conf-svcs/peer-observation-process.pdf>) and Departmental guidelines (appendix X)

6 From the UNM Center for Teaching Excellence (<https://ctl.unm.edu/>) or similar organization

^aTo include professional organizations, NGOs, community, or governmental entities that are related to research or the field of study. Involvement might include 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.

f. Diversity and Inclusion Statement

“The University has an enduring commitment to support equality of employment and educational opportunity by promoting a diverse environment free from unlawful discrimination and harassment.” (*Regents Policy 2.3*).

Candidates must include, as a separate document, a statement describing how their academic record promotes diversity, equity, and a safe, respectful campus. The Department considers this work to be an important contribution to effectiveness in scholarly work, teaching, and service, and candidates may use their statement to address any, or all, of these areas. Examples of relevant activities include, but are not limited to:

- Efforts to design classroom materials to increase enrollment, participation, inclusion, or retention of students from underrepresented backgrounds,
- Outreach to schools or community groups that promote diverse participation in STEM or promote scientific literacy,
- Engagement of participant communities in designing, implementing, and/or disseminating research,
- Efforts to recruit diverse student participation in research,
- Actions to promote community/belonging in the academic environment,
- ‘Broader impacts’ contributions of service related to research that improves the health, education, rights, and/or welfare of underserved groups,
- Efforts to increase the representation of diverse populations in research,
- Work on committees, panels, and/or professional organizations to address barriers to inclusion and diversity.

The diversity and inclusion statement should be included in the “Supplemental Materials” portion of the dossier, under section 6 (“Other”).

g. Personal Characteristics

Per the 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.” ([FHB B1.2.4](#))

4. MENTORSHIP OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The goal of collective mentoring is to help junior faculty to achieve promotion and tenure by providing timely and effective access to advice, information, and professional networks.

During the first month of employment for new tenure-stream Assistant Professors, the department chair will appoint a mentoring committee comprising:

- a tenured member of the mentee’s subfield;
- a tenured member of one of the two other subfields;
- a tenured faculty member from another UNM department or program.

Please refer to the Department’s Collective Mentoring Policy.

Mentors receive a copy of this Handbook but do not ordinarily serve on or participate in any Review Committee work, though there may be mutually agreed exceptions. Rather, Mentors work closely with Candidate throughout the academic year as advisor and advocate, especially in matters relating to the retention, promotion and tenure process.

5. APPOINTMENT AND CONSTITUTION OF REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Department Chair appoints three members from tenured faculty and 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. The Review Committee Chair is normally from the Candidate’s subfield.
- Review Committee Service Member is from Candidate’s subfield and is responsible for evaluating service. The Service Member also assists the Review Committee Chair with the selection of external reviewers.
- Review Committee Teaching member is from outside the Candidate’s subfield and is responsible for the teaching evaluation.
- Review Committee Graduate Student member is from outside the Candidate’s subfield and works separately with Review Committee Teaching member to solicit and summarize graduate student letters. The Graduate Student does not have access to any other Candidate review materials.

Each Review Committee member receives a copy of this Handbook. Faculty Review Committee members receive from Department Administrator copies of all Candidate's previous annual and mid-probationary reviews.

Throughout the review process, procedural or non-academic inquiries should be addressed to Department Administrator, the staff member who oversees all confidential faculty personnel matters. Academic inquiries should be addressed to the Associate Chair. All materials are confidential and may not be shared outside of the Review Committee and Department Administrator.

Department Chair does not participate in the review process until after the final Review Committee Report has been delivered.

6. SOLICITATION OF EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS

a. Requirements for External Reviewers

The College recommendation for external reviewer letters is 6 letters. Given the possibility that a reviewer may fail to send a promised letter, the review committee will solicit 7 letters: 3 reviewers suggested by the Candidate and 4 selected by the Review Committee that are not on the Candidate's list. If for some reason a 4th name is chosen from Candidate's list, then there must be 4 reviewers of the Review Committee's choosing. There should be no more than 8 letters. If there are more, the reasons should be fully documented.

Outside reviewers must be:

- At or above the rank sought, or, if from outside the academy, having a national or international reputation for excellence in the area of Candidate's scholarship,
- If academic, tenured,
- Neither from the Candidate's PhD committee nor a research collaborator during the previous three years,
AND
- From institutions which are UNM's peers or betters. Per Provost guidance, the majority of reviewers should be from R1 institutions or their international equivalents (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research_1_university).

Exceptions must be justified in Review Committee Report.

In designating potential reviewers, Review Committee Chair consults with Review Committee Service member. The Review Committee Chair may also confidentially solicit suggestions from other tenured

faculty in the candidate's subfield. In no case should Review Committee Chair seek suggestions from faculty or staff outside the UNM Anthropology Department.

b. Candidate's Selection of External Reviewers

By the *2nd Friday of April* in the academic year prior to review, the Candidate provides to the Review Committee Chair:

- i) Six names of possible outside reviewers, listed in ranked order of preference, with their titles, mail and e-mail addresses, and phone number,
- ii) Optional, without penalty or rationale: Names and affiliations of reviewers unacceptable to the Candidate,
- iii) Name and current affiliation of all members of Candidate's dissertation committee; of all editors and the date of volumes/collections in which Candidate's work appears as a chapter; and of all non-student co-authors, co-editors and co-PIs during the 3 previous years,
- iv) A current, UNM Standard Faculty Vitae

c. Reviewer Solicitation Process

By the *2nd Friday in May* in the academic year prior to review, Review Committee Chair provides the Department Administrator with an electronic version of the invitation letter and full contact information (name, titles, mail and e-mail addresses, phone numbers) for each potential reviewer. The Department Administrator will not fill in any missing contact information; each entry must be complete when submitted.

The Review Committee Chair submits two lists: one with 6 rank-ordered names from Candidate and one with 6-8 rank-ordered names from Review Committee.

By the *2nd Friday in May*, Department Administrator uses the department e-mail address to send the solicitation letter and the Candidate's Curriculum Vitae to the first 3 contacts from the Candidate's list and the first 4 contacts from the Review Committee's list. Each email should copy the Review Committee Chair.

Order of contacts: The Department Administrator initially contacts the first 3 reviewers on the Candidate's list, then the next one, and so on until 3 reviews are promised. If 3 Candidate-suggested reviewers cannot be secured, the Review Committee does not ask Candidate for further names; the complement of 7 is filled with names from the Review Committee list, ensuring that the majority of the total reviews are obtained from faculty at R1 or equivalent institutions. Specifically, the Department Administrator contacts the first 4 reviewers on the

Review-Committee list, then the next one, and so on until 4 reviews are promised. If at least 3 Review Committee reviewers and 6 total reviewers cannot be secured, then additional names will be added to the Review Committee list by the Review Committee Chair.

Department Administrator acknowledges receipt of acceptance or refusal electronically, with copy to Review Committee Chair. Reviewers who have accepted should immediately be sent the Candidate's review materials.

On the *1st Friday of September*, the Department Administrator sends the external reviewers any updated materials submitted by the Candidate using the RPT platform.

When the review letter arrives, Department Administrator acknowledges receipt electronically. Department Administrator handles logistics of this acknowledgment process, including timely electronic reminder(s) in October about the impending November deadline. Each reviewer is contacted separately.

d. Reviewer Solicitation Letter

By the *2nd Friday in May* in the year prior to review, the Review Committee Chair will submit the two rank-ordered lists of reviewers (the Candidate's List and the Committee's List) to the Department Administrator, along with the text of the letter in Appendix A:

7. GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS FOR TEACHING REPORT

a. Responsibilities

Working with instruction and oversight from Review Committee Teaching member, Review Committee Graduate Student member solicits letters from Candidate's present and former graduate students and postdocs and all current Department graduate students. These letters are read *only* by Review Committee Teaching member, the Review Committee Graduate Student, and the Department Chair. The Review Committee Graduate Student member maintains confidentiality and is responsible for handling these letters until the separate Teaching Report has been written and signed. Review Committee Graduate Student member then sends all the letters electronically directly to Department Chair. Once the Department Chair acknowledges receipt of the letters, the Review Committee Graduate Student member should destroy any copies (hard copies or electronic) in their possession.

Should the Review Committee Graduate Student member have any questions or concerns about the process or the content of the letters, they should address these first to the Review Committee Teaching member and, if necessary, to the Department Chair.

b. List of Contacts

By the 2nd Friday of April, at the same time that the candidate submits their list of external reviewers, the candidate provides electronically a list of all past and present graduate students and postdocs within and outside the Department (UNM and other universities) with full contact information (if unknown, so indicate). For students who have received their degree, indicate current or last known position. This list will not include undergraduate students.

c. Solicitation of Student Letters

By the *last Friday in September*, the Review Committee Graduate Student member will email the letter below to (a) the Candidate's list of students and postdocs, and (b) the Departments' graduate student listserv.

The text is:

The Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico is conducting a review of Assistant Professor _____ for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As part of the process, a Departmental Review Committee appointed by the Department Chair compiles a Review Committee Report, which is read by faculty members inside and outside of the department. As the Review Committee Graduate Student, I have been tasked with soliciting evaluations of Dr. _____'s teaching and mentoring from graduate students and postdoctoral scholars who have worked with them in a teaching and/or research capacity

We are requesting candid evaluations that specifically address the following points:

- (1) Your relationship with Dr. _____ and the extent of your knowledge of their work;*
- (2) Your characterization and assessment of the quality of their teaching and mentoring;*
- (3) Their impact on your own professional development.*

Clear statements with concrete examples would be greatly appreciated. Please do not make a recommendation about tenure outcomes in your letter.

My summary will include anonymous quotations from your evaluations. The summary will be incorporated into the Teaching Report section of the Review Committee report.

If you are willing to assist us, we will need your letter postmarked by October _____, 20____ [third Friday]. These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law. Note that, as “Responsible Employees,” faculty members and graduate assistants are required to report Title IX allegations to the Office of Equal Opportunity.

For the review committee report, student letters are read only by Professor _____, Review Committee teaching member from outside _____’s subfield of _____, by me, the committee graduate student representative from the _____ subfield, and by the Department Chair.

After Professor _____ and I have completed our report, I will deliver all letters electronically to the Department Chair, who will use them to prepare a confidential report to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University Provost.

Please send electronic statements to me at _____@unm.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely, _____

d. Acknowledgment of Letters

The Review Committee Graduate Student member will acknowledge receipt of each letter by email within two business days of receipt, using the following text:

Dear _____,

I received your confidential evaluation of Dr. _____’s teaching and/or mentoring on _____ [date]. Professor _____ [Teaching member] and I very much appreciate your participation in this important review process.

Sincerely, _____

e. Preparation of Summary Report

The Review Committee Graduate Student will write a summary report to be included in the final teaching report. The Review Committee Graduate Student member may consult with the Review Committee Teaching member for feedback on writing the letter, but the other committee members do not contribute to or edit the report. The summary report will not include recommendations about whether the candidate should be promoted. For further instructions, see Section 11: [13. Teaching](#) REPORT.

8. CANDIDATE DOSSIER

By the *1st Friday in May* in the academic year prior to review, Candidate delivers to the Department Administrator and the Review Committee Chair the following materials for the external reviewers:

- i) Updated UNM Standard Faculty Vitae,
- ii) Research Statement,
- iii) Electronic copies of books or scholarly works published/accepted since hire,
- iv) Grant applications
- v) Any other relevant materials for outside reviewers. The Candidate should discuss these inclusions with the Review Committee Chair.

The Candidate should consult with the Department Administrator on the best way to deliver the materials (e.g., OneDrive or Dropbox). The Review Committee Chair will review the materials and request missing materials or additions by the *following Monday*.

By the *2nd Friday in May*, the Candidate delivers the revised reviewer packet to the Department Administrator and Review Committee Chair.

By the *1st Friday in September*, Candidate uploads the finalized materials for external reviewers, including all updates of the materials listed above, to the RPT (rpt.unm.edu) platform.

By *October 24*, Candidate emails signed "List of Supplemental Materials," to Department Chair. The Department Chair emails the signed List to Candidate within 2 business days.

By *November 1* (or the first weekday thereafter), the Candidate should upload the completed dossier, as below, to the RPT platform. The Candidate is responsible for uploading all other dossier contents and should not rely on the Department Administrator to do so. Materials

should follow the specifications outlined in the [A&S Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies/Procedures](#).

- i) The UNM Standard Faculty Vitae,
- ii) Arts and Sciences summary form of teaching evaluations,
- iii) Copies of previous Annual and Mid Probationary reviews,
- iv) Research Statement,
- v) Teaching Portfolio, including the Department Teaching Record Form as an attachment,
- vi) Service Statement,
- vii) List of Supplementary Materials (form on A&S website)
- viii) Supplementary Materials (e.g., publications), organized according to specifications of the A&S website. Supplementary materials should include the Diversity and Inclusion Statement.

Candidate notifies Review Committee Chair when dossier is submitted in the RPT platform. Thereafter, Candidate has no further access to the dossier and must submit any changes to Department Administrator. In such cases, the Departmental Administrator will release the dossier to Candidate, who will upload the changes and re-submit the dossier.

The Review Committee Chair determines that the dossier is ready for viewing. After the deadline for reviewer letters has passed, Review Committee Chair notifies the Department Administrator, who instructs faculty how to access the dossier using the RPT platform.

9. CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

The classroom observations should include the following:

A minimum of three peer evaluations obtained by the Candidate. Candidates are required to provide at least 3 peer evaluations from 3 tenured UNM faculty members from within the past 3 years before review. At least one evaluation must be obtained from a member of the same anthropology subfield, and at least one must be obtained from a different anthropology subfield. Letters from faculty outside of the department with relevant expertise in the candidate's field of study may be accepted by prior arrangement with the Department Chair.

The candidate is encouraged to seek reviews from multiple faculty, but, for Retention, Promotion and Tenure, they are only required to submit three total reviews in the Teaching Portfolio section of their dossier. One of the 3 peer evaluations may be an evaluation provided by the Teaching Committee member during a previous annual review. The evaluation conducted by the Teaching member in the year of tenure/promotion review will not be made available to the Candidate.

Prior teaching evaluations from the candidate's Annual Reviews will also be included in the dossier. These evaluations are uploaded to the dossier by the Departmental Administrator after the candidate submits the final dossier in November 1.

One classroom observation by the Review Committee Teaching Member. In the year of the Tenure and Promotion review, the teaching member will conduct a confidential teaching evaluation that is included word for word in the teaching report. This review will not be submitted to the candidate, and the candidate cannot include this review the Teaching Portfolio section of their dossier.

Reviewers are encouraged to provide constructive feedback and to use rubrics provided by the college, appended to this handbook.

As per guidelines of the UNM [Center for Teaching Excellence](#), categories of practices that could be the focus of teaching observation and reporting include:

- Establishing and meeting goals for student learning
- Presentation, organization, clarity, pace
- Inclusive teaching techniques
- Active learning and interactivity
- Level of student engagement
- Varied methods for engagement
- Use of technology
- Instructional materials
- Teacher-Student interactions
- Formative and summative assessment practices

If a candidate is on leave from teaching during the Fall semester, it is their responsibility to make arrangements for the classroom evaluation to take place in the semester *prior to* their leave.

10. CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM

By the *1st Friday in September*, the Candidate and Department Administrator schedule the Candidate's research colloquium. The colloquium should occur between mid-October and mid-November during the regularly scheduled colloquium timeslot.

Department Administrator sends e-mail announcement to Department faculty and graduate students. No flyers are posted.

The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on Candidate's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Only current Department faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and faculty from other departments with whom the Candidate collaborates, attend.

The Review Committee Chair introduces Candidate and afterward sets out the terms of the question period, which is then turned over to Candidate. Priority for comments and questions is given first to faculty members, though graduate students may join the discussion if time allows.

11. PREPARATION AND DISSEMINATION OF REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

a. Responsibilities:

The Review Committee Report and the separate Teaching Report are submitted to the Department Administrator by the *3rd Friday in November*.

- i) **Review Committee Chair** is responsible for:
 - a. Writing the section on Scholarly Work;
 - b. Providing review and oversight of the final document, ensuring timely completion and adherence to all requirements;
 - c. Creating 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.
- ii) **Review Committee Service Member** is responsible for:
 - a. Writing section on Service;
 - b. Presenting the Service section of the review to the full faculty.
- iii) **Review Committee Teaching member** is responsible for:
 - a. Conducting a classroom evaluation in the fall semester of the review year;
 - b. Working with Review Committee Graduate Student to obtain review letters from Candidate's former and current graduate students and postdocs;
 - c. Ensuring Graduate Student report is submitted by on time;
 - d. Writing Teaching Report to be signed by both the Review Committee Teaching member and Graduate Student;
 - e. Presenting the Teaching section of the review to the full faculty, including a summary of graduate student comments.

b. Dissemination of Report

By noon on the Monday before the 1st Friday in December, the Department Administrator posts the confidential report electronically for faculty review.

On the *1st Friday of December*, the Review Committee Report and Teaching Report are presented to a special meeting of the faculty. The reports should not be read in full, though they should be excerpted to highlight each of the review criteria (Table 2) and fairly represent the balance of both positive and negative elements of the review. The *following Monday*, the Review Committee Chair submits a final report, including any revisions recommended by the faculty, to the Department Administrator.

The Review Committee report must be formatted as follows:

12. FORMAT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

a. Introductory Section

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR XXX
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

December 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 Professor xxx received her/his/their 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.

Dr. Xxx joined the tenure-track faculty in the Department as an assistant/associate in August/January xxxx [if there is some kind of joint appointment, state so here]. A member of the X subfield, she/he/they successfully underwent a mid-probationary review in xxxx. 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 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.]

b. Teaching Section

[n.b., This section provides only a summary of the recommendation. A separate [13. Teaching REPORT](#) is appended to the committee report.]

- i) Brief statement of departmental criteria for evaluation of [Teaching](#).
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, and the teaching record should have contributed to meeting the teaching needs of the department and subfield. Teaching performance is evaluated based on the CV, summary of student evaluations, department-solicited letters from graduate students, and peer evaluations of teaching. A summary of benchmarks for teaching excellence are attached to this report.
- ii) Single sentence of evaluation, modified as appropriate
Based on the attached Teaching Report by Professor xxx and graduate student xxx, the Committee has determined that Professor xxx’s teaching performance has been [Excellent, Effective, Needs Improvement], thereby [meeting/not meeting] the Department’s criteria for tenure and promotion.

c. Scholarly Work Section

- i) Brief statement of departmental criteria for evaluation of [Scholarly Work](#).
The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations. The candidate should demonstrate high-quality scholarship and a developed independent research program beyond the dissertation, as indicated by a strong publication record and evidence of a national reputation. The evaluation of scholarly work is based on the CV, research statement, scholarly products (including grants and peer-reviewed publications), research

colloquium, and external peer reviews. Annual and midprobationary reviews are also taken into consideration. A summary of benchmarks for scholarly excellence are attached to this report.

ii) Summary overview of scholarly record

In one or more paragraphs, summarize 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, professional presentations, etc.

iii) Date, title, and evaluation of the research colloquium

Include the expectations as stated in this Handbook: "The research colloquium is a 45-50-minute presentation on Candidate's current or just-finished research. It is geared to and evaluated as a professional, scholarly meeting presentation, not a public or classroom lecture. Only current Department faculty, postdocs, graduate students, and faculty from other departments with whom the Candidate collaborates, attend.."

iv) Summary of external reviews

The review committee solicited letters of evaluation from scholars/professionals with expertise in Professor xxx's research areas. A total of xx potential outside reviewers was contacted, xx [no.] from a list submitted by Professor xxx and xx [no.] from names proposed by committee members and other knowledgeable senior faculty members. A total of xx outside reviewer letters are in the file, [xx] from the candidate's list and [xx] from the committee's list.

The committee received the following reviews from xxx's list:

- (1) [name, title, thumbnail sketch of areas of expertise^[1]]
- (2) ...

The following individuals from xxx's list were unable to complete a review

Those from xxx's list unable to do the review, together with a thumbnail sketch of their areas of expertise and their reason(s) for declining, are:

- (1) [name, title, thumbnail sketch of areas of expertise, reason for declining]
- (2) ...

The committee received review letters from the following individuals selected from the review committee's list:

- (1) [name, title, thumbnail sketch of areas of expertise]
- (2) ...

The following individuals from the review committee's list were unable to complete a review:

- (1) [name, title, thumbnail sketch of areas of expertise, reason for declining]
- (2) ...

[1] *The thumbnail sketches should be uniform and objective. Sources may include the scholar's profile from the AAA Guide or comparable disciplinary index, or a succinct characterization from the scholar's department or work website. Those lacking, give a brief characterization of the person's research areas and one or two important bibliographic references. If the reviewer has declined, succinctly give the reason(s) at the end, ideally using a direct quote from their response.*

Reviewers were sent a copy of *UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, the candidate's current vita, a brief research statement, and sample publications, and they were asked to provide the following information:

We ask external reviewers' letters to include a brief statement regarding your acquaintance with the candidate, and if you have any joint work with the candidate; and an evaluation of the significance, independence, impact, and promise of the candidate's scholarship/creative works, as well as the candidate's national/international scholarly/creative reputation. We would like to receive your assessment of the originality and impact of the candidate's work. Has the candidate's work contributed to new lines of research or deepened our understanding of existing debates within the discipline? Has the candidate demonstrated a meaningful and independent scholarly program? For candidates in the creative, visual, and performing arts, has the candidate had an impact within the field, reflecting recognition and respect among other professionals and scholars nationally or beyond? The more detailed your analysis and evaluation of the candidate's work, the more useful your review will be to our deliberations.

The remainder of this section is a careful reading of the letters. It should begin with a statement about their overall quality, e.g.: "Altogether, the xx [no.] letters are long, thoughtful and laudatory...." Address the kinds of significant positive or equivocal points raised by reviewers and all substantively negative critique. End with the reviewers' recommendation(s) for or against the tenure/promotion. Throughout, quote from the letters at enough length to show the context. If the reviewer has cited partial bibliography or esoteric jargon or theory not immediately clear to non-anthropologists, briefly explain or define the terms, give the full-title, dated citations, etc.

v) Summary evaluation of scholarly work, modified as appropriate

Based on the materials provided by the candidate and the evaluation of external reviewers, the Committee has determined that Professor xxx's performance in scholarly

work has been [Excellent, Effective, Needs Improvement], thereby [meeting/not meeting] the Department's criteria for tenure and promotion.

d. Service Section

i) Preface

Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and teaching. Untenured assistant professors should concentrate primarily on their teaching and scholarly work. However, active subfield participation and Department service is expected, as is service to the discipline and/or community.

ii) Evaluation of Service

Review Committee Service member bases this evaluation on the CV, expanded statement of achievements/goals, and dossier. In tenure cases, annual and mid-probationary reviews are also taken into consideration. Relevant categories should be presented in the following order: (1) subfield, (2) department, (3) university, (4) profession, and (5) public.

Sample summary: Professor xxx has demonstrated Effective service with respect to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community. [Modify as appropriate. n.b., the College evaluates service as "Effective" or "Needs Improvement"].

e. Concluding Recommendation

Sample concluding paragraph or modify as appropriate:

For a positive tenure review, the faculty member shall have demonstrated competence or effectiveness in all four areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics), and excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. Per Department policy, 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). The Committee recommends [or does not recommend] Professor xxx for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor of Anthropology on the basis of an Excellent/Effective/Insufficient teaching record, Excellence/Effective/Insufficient scholarly work, and Effective/Insufficient service to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community.

- f. Addendum: Table of Departmental Criteria (Table 2. Department of Anthropology Standards of “Excellence” for Evaluation of Research and Teaching, and “effectiveness” for Evaluation of Service for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty).**
- g. Table, entitled “External Reviewers 20XX-20XX Academic Year” using the attached template. This must be included separately in the candidate’s file.**
- h. Signature Page**

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

13. TEACHING REPORT

a. Overview

Review Committee Teaching member has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report, which is separate from the Review Committee report and appended to it. The rest of the Review Committee should review the Teaching Report only after it is signed.

Review Committee Graduate Student member writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to Review Committee Teaching member for review. The Review Committee Chair and Review Committee Service member have no involvement with the Review Committee Graduate Student member report; its wording remains as agreed upon between Review Committee Teaching member and the Review Committee Graduate Student member, and, if the Review Committee Teaching member deems it necessary, the Department Chair.

b. Format

- i) Summary of Candidate’s teaching career
Descriptive summary to include 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.

- ii) Concise summary of Candidate's teaching statement
To include direct quotations from teaching statement
- iii) Summary of Course Evaluations
Summary critique of undergraduate and graduate course evaluation data and the nature of student comments from evaluation forms.
- iv) Classroom observations. See [Section 9](#). This should include the full text of the teaching member's evaluation from the year of review. It should additionally summarize the content of prior teaching reviews and the peer evaluations obtained by the Candidate, and how the Candidate has or has not responded to these to improve their teaching.
- v) Student Advisement and Individual Instruction
Summary of student advisement, including the number of students advised (e.g., in 497, Honors, 597/598, MA/MS committee, MA/MS chair; 697/698, PhD committee, PhD chair), graduate external funding during the review period, and job placement of graduated students, followed by evaluative statements on this record.
- vi) Graduate Student Letters
This section, after being approved by the Teaching Member and signed by the Graduate Student, is not subject to further revision. In writing this evaluation from the confidential graduate student letters, Graduate Student must safeguard the anonymity of respondents. Make no reference to the number of letters from a particular subfield or a particular class/seminar. This letter is a general summation/evaluation of the letters as a group. The summation must not include any recommendations as to whether tenure should or should not be granted, either from the students who provided letters or from the Graduate Student representative.

Graduate 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 mailed (*not* how many could not be delivered) from Candidate's list and when that mailing went out. Then indicate when the graduate electronic list was contacted and when the reminder went out. 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.

- vii) General Summary of Teaching: This summation ends with the Review Committee Teaching member recommendation and is then appended to the Review Committee full

report. The recommendation should specifically state whether the Candidate's teaching has been Excellent, Effective, or Needs Improvement.

14. SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON TENURE/PROMOTION CASES:

A dedicated faculty meeting devoted only to tenure or promotion cases is held on the *1st Friday in December*. Both tenure-track and voting research faculty participate in this special, highly confidential meeting, but only tenure-track faculty receive the Review Committee Report and vote on tenure/promotion cases. No visiting faculty or presenters from outside the department attend. Department Administrator attends and takes notes for Department Chair's eyes only. Candidates and spouses/family members/domestic partners should leave the room for any portions of the meeting concerning their review but may be present for review of other faculty.

The order of presentation is junior to senior and alphabetically within each category (tenure/promotion to associate, tenure as associate, promotion to full, tenure as full). The 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 Review Committee Grad Student report on the graduate student letters). Should any committee member be unable to attend the special meeting, another member of the committee may present their portion of the report.

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 or electronic, provisional yes/no/abstain ballot on a motion to accept the Review Committee recommendation for promotion and tenure, and announces the results. On the day of the vote, the Chair will notify the candidate whether the majority of faculty voted yes or no.

Faculty who are unable to attend the special meeting may not enter their votes in the straw poll by proxy, but they should submit written ballots, per the following section.

15. FINAL VOTING AND REPORT

The official vote is determined by all tenure-track faculty via written ballot due on *the Monday following the special faculty meeting*. Ballots will be submitted electronically to the Department Administrator only. Untenured faculty may decide to participate in the review without penalty. Written comments on ballots are important to the Chair and to the College RPT committee, and all faculty are encouraged to write detailed, thoughtful comments.

By the *Monday* following the special faculty meeting, the Review Committee Chair and/or Review Committee Teaching member submit the final report, including any revisions called for during the special faculty meeting. Signature pages remain the same, but they should provide a full electronic version of the text. Review committee has no further involvement in the review process. *On the same day*, the Review Committee Teaching member will send the confidential student letters to the department chair.

The Chair will advise the Candidate in writing if the recommendation was positive or negative and meet with the Candidate to discuss the review and recommendation. “If the recommendation is negative, a copy of the chair’s report, the internal peer reviews and external letters (all redacted as necessary to preserve confidentiality), if requested by the candidate, shall be furnished to the candidate.” ([FHB 4.3.1](#)) Information about appeals is provided by the [Faculty Handbook sections 4.3.6 and 4.3.7](#).

If the recommendation from the provost is positive, the confidential student letters, curated to this point by the Review Committee teaching member and the Department Chair, shall be permanently deleted.

16. REFERENCES (IN ORDER OF USE):

UNM Faculty Handbook, Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure (FHB)
<https://handbook.unm.edu/section-b/>

Parker, Carol. 2017. Guidelines for Implementing and Reviewing Shortened Faculty Probationary Periods. UNM Office of the Provost/EVP for Academic Affairs. May 30.
<https://ofas.unm.edu/faculty/compensation/documents/guidelines-for-managing-shortened-tenure-clocks.pdf>

UNM College of Arts and Sciences Teaching Portfolio Guidelines, 2018
https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/docs/faculty/lecturer-forms/2018_teaching-portfolio-guidelines.pdf

UNM College of Arts and Sciences Teaching Portfolio Rubric, 2018 <https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/docs/faculty/teaching-portfolio-rubric-rev.1.25.18.pdf>

UNM College of Arts and Sciences Retention, Promotion, and Tenure FAQ, 2018

https://artsci.unm.edu/for-faculty/docs/faculty/promotion-and-tenure-forms/faqs-for-all-rpt-reviews_rev11.13.17.pdf

External Reviewers for:	<i>(Candidate's Name)</i>	<i>(Department)</i>	<i>(Level of Review: T&P or Promotion to Full)</i>
--------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	--

Reviewer Name	Title/Faculty Rank	Department/Affiliation	Institution + Carnegie Research Classification – Doctoral Universities <i>(R1, R2)*</i>	Reviewer recommended by: (Candidate, Chair, Senior Faculty Member)	Brief Rationale for Recommendation	Response to invitation (Yes/No/No response)

Appendix A. Reviewer Solicitation Letter

Dear Professor _____:

On behalf of the UNM Department of Anthropology in the College of Arts and Sciences, I am writing to request your service as an external reviewer for _____ who has requested consideration for promotion to the rank of associate professor. The evaluations of outside reviewers are a necessary and valued component of the University of New Mexico's tenure and promotion review process. Therefore, we would very much appreciate your assistance in evaluating the merits of the candidate's record of research/scholarship/creative works, contributions to the discipline, and impact on the candidate's intellectual community.

Our review procedures require that experts in the candidate's field evaluate the candidate's position effectiveness, professional contributions and impact. Please note that quality and quantity are both important in evaluating the candidate's work. Attached is the candidate's curriculum vita, research/creative works statement, select publications/creative works, and the academic unit's tenure and promotion criteria.

We also note that this candidate was an active researcher in 2020 and 2021, during which the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the disease, COVID-19, that it causes, disrupted all aspects of faculty work. This candidate was in the cohort of scholars who had to pivot their courses online, work remotely, and in many cases manage their own children's education. For many scholars, research facilities and opportunities were unavailable some or all of the time of the pandemic.

During your evaluation of this candidates record, we ask you not to consider time since degree or time in rank; please assume that the candidate is coming up for review and promotion at the right time for our institution and refrain from any comment about time.

We ask external reviewers' letters to include a brief statement regarding your acquaintance with the candidate, and if you have any joint work with the candidate; and an evaluation of the significance, independence, impact, and promise of the candidate's scholarship/creative works, as well as the candidate's national/international scholarly/creative reputation. We would like to receive your assessment of the originality and impact of the candidate's work. Has the candidate's work contributed to new lines of research or deepened our understanding of existing debates within the discipline? Has the candidate demonstrated a meaningful and independent scholarly program? For candidates in the creative, visual, and performing arts, has the candidate had an impact within the field, reflecting recognition and respect among other professionals and scholars nationally or beyond? The more detailed your analysis and evaluation of the candidate's work, the more useful your review will be to our deliberations.

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation within the limits established by law. Neither the names of the referees nor the identifiable contents of their letters will be shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the faculty tenure and promotion review committee in the Department of Anthropology, and will become part of the candidate's file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels.

Your selection as a reviewer is based on the knowledge and appreciation that my colleagues and I have for your work in this field. However, institutional consideration of the candidate's case inevitably will entail review by faculty unfamiliar with this line of inquiry and your own work and achievements. To assist those individuals in assessing the information you provide, please include a copy of your curriculum vita.

We have attached a copy of Dr. _____'s current CV for your review. If you are able to provide this review, please let us know by _____. If so, we will make a full dossier of research materials available to you no later than the end of July. Please send your letter and copy of your current CV no later than _____. If you have any questions or if you need further information, please feel free to contact me at _____. Please copy _____, who handles our administrative matters, at _____.

Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation.

Sincerely,

Chair, Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee
Title
UNM Anthropology