

## Department of Anthropology Mid-Probationary Reviews (rev. 8/2021)

### 1. SCOPE/PURPOSE

The mid-probationary review process and report mirror those of the tenure and promotion review with few exceptions. For reasons of continuity, we refer Candidates and Review Committee members to that document. This document serves as an addendum, noting only the minor differences in procedure and in the timelines for mid-probationary reviews.

### 2. UNM POLICY ON MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

From *Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom & Tenure (FHB)* [4.6.1](#):

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

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

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

### 3. TIMELINE FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

[FHB 4.6.1](#) "This review shall occur at the approximate mid-point of the faculty member's probationary period at the University. The year of a probationary faculty member's mid-probationary review shall be specified in writing at the time of appointment to probationary

status. If, as a result of a mid-probationary review, it is decided that a faculty member should not be continued, written notice shall be provided by June 30 and the faculty member shall be given a terminal contract for an additional year.”

#### 4. PROCEDURES FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

Mid-probationary reviews will follow the procedures for tenure and promotion to associate professor, with the following exceptions:

- Candidates do not present a research colloquium
- External review letters will not be solicited
- Candidate must submit a Teaching Portfolio (see [http://artsci.unm.edu/faculty/docs/faculty/lecturer-forms/2018\\_teaching-portfolio-guidelines.pdf](http://artsci.unm.edu/faculty/docs/faculty/lecturer-forms/2018_teaching-portfolio-guidelines.pdf))

Noting the above exceptions, the review committee report should follow the format of the tenure and promotion report, including the submission of a separate teaching report. As in the T&P report, each section must include a summary evaluation of the candidate’s record as *Excellent, Effective, or Needs Improvement*.

The key difference between the mid-probationary report and the tenure report is that the summary evaluations for each section should explicitly note shortcomings that need to be remedied before the tenure review.

The final summary in the tenure report should recommend or not recommend the continuation of the probationary period.

Sample concluding paragraph for a positive review [modify as appropriate]:

The Committee unanimously recommends that Assistant Professor xxx receive a second probationary period leading to review for tenure and promotion/tenure in 20xx-20xx on the basis of [Excellent/Effective] teaching, [Excellent/Effective] scholarly work, and service appropriate to rank. If xxx weaknesses are remedied, there is a strong likelihood that s/he will successfully pass the tenure review.

#### 5. TEMPLATE FOR GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS

By the third Friday in October, 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 mid-probationary review of Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_ toward eventual tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As part of the process, a*

Revised November 9, 2021

*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 Professor \_\_\_\_\_'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 Professor \_\_\_\_\_ 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 in your letter about whether the candidate should receive a second probationary period.***

*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 November \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ [Second Friday of November]. 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, \_\_\_\_\_*

## 6. TIMELINE

<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Action</b>
<i>Academic year prior to review</i>	
<b>FEBRUARY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Candidate</b> notifies <b>Department Chair</b> of intent to undergo review.</li> </ul>
<b>MARCH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Department Chair</b> sends intent for review to College Office</li> </ul>
<b>APRIL</b>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Department Chair</b> appoints Review Committee, including <b>Review Committee Graduate Student member</b></li> </ul>
<i>Academic year of review</i>	
<b>OCTOBER</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Review Committee Teaching member</b> and <b>Candidate</b> verify that all necessary teaching observations have been secured or schedule additional reviews</li> </ul>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Candidate</b> submits complete, up-to-date contact information for graduate students and mentees to <b>Review Committee Teaching member</b></li> </ul>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Student Representative</b> sends template request for letters to all students on candidate's list and to Anthropology Graduate Student listserv</li> </ul>
<b>NOVEMBER</b>	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters due from graduate students to <b>Review Committee Graduate Student member</b></li> </ul>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Candidate</b> submits final dossier to <b>Department Administrator</b> via RPT.UNM.EDU</li> <li>• Graduate Student Representative letter due to teaching member</li> </ul>
<b>JANUARY</b>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed <b>Review committee</b> report due to <b>Department Administrator</b> and uploaded to RPT.UNM.EDU</li> </ul>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special faculty meeting/vote</li> <li>• <b>Department Chair</b> notifies candidate of outcome of straw vote within 24 hrs</li> </ul>
Monday following 3 <sup>rd</sup> Friday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Faculty</b> ballots due to <b>Department Administrator</b> by 5pm</li> <li>• <b>Review Chair</b> submits any revisions of report to <b>Department Administrator</b></li> </ul>
4 <sup>th</sup> Friday*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chair</b> prepares letter that is included in Candidate dossier</li> <li>• <b>Chair</b> discusses review and recommendation with <b>Candidate</b></li> <li>• <b>Department Administrator</b> releases final candidate RPT file to College Office. To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Department Chair</b> letter, including summary of vote</li> <li>(b) <b>Review Committee</b> report</li> <li>(c) Complete <b>Candidate</b> dossier, with updates</li> <li>(d) Copies of all prior reviews</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>MAY-JUNE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provost</b> informs candidate by letter of final decision</li> <li>• <b>Review Committee Teaching member</b> and <b>Graduate Student member</b> destroy all copies of the graduate student letters</li> </ul>