Mid-Probationary Tenure Review (Code 003) Process

I. Purpose and Standards

(a) The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to enable the university 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, professional development, 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 continued excellence in teaching. 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.

II. Procedural Overview (See the UNM-Los Alamos Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure for more detailed information)

In the spring semester prior to the review year, the candidate meets with the Dean of Instruction to begin assembling the final dossier. (Candidates should begin collecting and formatting documentation for the dossier at the start of their faculty appointments). The dossier must be assembled electronically. (See III a. and b. below)

In the Fall Semester of the review year, a review committee and a chair for the committee are appointed by the Dean of Instruction. The committee shall consist of at least four (4) tenured faculty at UNM-Los Alamos. If none or fewer than four exist, additional senior core faculty members will be appointed from UNM-Los Alamos. If necessary, committee members from other UNM campuses may be appointed.
The committee meets to establish a schedule of deadlines based on the final deadline determined by the Office of the Provost.

In mid to late fall of the review year, the candidate submits the completed dossier to the Office of Instruction by the designated deadline.

As soon as the Office of Instruction receives the completed dossier, committee members will individually review and evaluate the dossier and fill out the evaluation form entitled “Mid-Probationary Review: UNM Branch Campuses.”

In the Spring Semester following individual examination of the dossier by committee members, the committee chair schedules a final review meeting for the committee to evaluate and vote whether or not the candidate should be passed and advanced to the Code 6 process. The candidate is not present at this meeting.

Following the final review meeting, the committee chair writes a letter summarizing the committee members’ assessments of the candidate’s strengths and areas needing improvement (with suggestions for improvement), their numerical scores, and the committee’s recommendation. This letter is placed with the dossier. In the event of a negative recommendation, the letter will be shared with the candidate as well. According to UNM policy, the candidate has two weeks to respond to and/or appeal the committee’s assessment and recommendation if a negative recommendation is given.

The Review Committee Chair’s summary letter is forwarded to the Dean of Instruction, then to the Branch Executive Director, and finally to the Office of the Provost at UNM-Albuquerque.

The candidate is notified by UNM of the final Code 3 decision (usually by June 30).

The Dean of Instruction, as part of the annual review process, will meet with the candidate to review the Tenure and Promotion Committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. If the candidate has successfully passed the Code 3 process, the Dean of Instruction will also advise the candidate of recommended actions toward achieving a successful Code 6 decision.

If the candidate does not successfully pass the Code 3 process, a terminal-year contract will be issued. Thereafter, the candidate may not teach anywhere within the UNM system.

### III. The Dossier

The candidate selects documentation for review in the four areas designated as appropriate for the UNM Branches (teaching excellence, professional development, service, and personal characteristics), and assembles this material electronically. Although not required, documentation of published works and research may be included.

Folders and subfolders should be created electronically and named following the guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost.
III a. Minimum contents required in digital dossier – Code 003 Mid-probationary Review

- UNM recommendation & signature form with Chair’s signature (provided by chair of branch review committee)
- Complete CV (to include education, professional experience, service to the college and community, and professional development)
- Teaching Statement
  - Teaching Philosophy
  - Teaching Goals
  - Teaching Objectives, Strategies, Methodologies
  - Courses taught
- Candidate statement/summary regarding professional development activities and accomplishments (may include research and publishing but not required)
- Candidate statement/summary regarding service
  - Service philosophy
  - To the college
  - To the community
- Teaching Record
  - Summary of course evaluation (IDEA, ICES, etc.) data presented in a table with a sampling of student comments (both positive and constructive criticism)
  - Sample Course materials (syllabi, assignments, exams)
  - Peer evaluations
- Annual Reviews
  - Department Chair’s summary of candidate’s annual reviews
  - Annual teaching evaluations from department chair and peer evaluations as applicable
  - Mid-pro review letter from Dept. Chair to Dean of Instruction
- Letter from Department Chair
  - Making a case for or against tenure and promotion
- Branch Committee Vote and Comments (provided by committee chair)
  - Summary of Committee Chair
  - Individual committee reviewer recommendations
- Three letters of support obtained by candidate from within the institution, which speak to the candidate’s personal characteristics and collegiality

III b. Contents of Supplemental Materials folder (See the UNM-Los Alamos Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure for more detailed information)

Contents of the supplemental materials folder are intended to be more detailed supporting documentation to the other documentation.

**Teaching - supporting documentation** (see following suggestions as well as teaching performance criteria above)

- Details of teaching responsibilities
- Curriculum development
• Additional course syllabi
• Additional samples of course handouts, PowerPoint presentations, websites, etc.
• Videos, CD’s or photographs of teaching
• Outcomes assessment
• Samples of student work
• Student evaluations forms
• Classroom observations from peers
• Teaching recognition and awards

Professional Development (see following suggestions as well as professional development criteria above)
• Detailed list of Professional Development activities/accomplishments (may be taken directly from CV)
• Details of continuing education including additional degrees earned, workshops, trainings, etc.
• Examples of scholarship and professional development (books published, articles, conference presentations, research, conferences attended, new skills acquired, etc.)
• Professional honors

Service – supporting documentation (see following suggestions as well as service performance criteria above)
• Details documentation of service to the university
  o Administrative Responsibilities
  o Committee work
  o Faculty mentoring
  o Student Advisement
  o Outcomes assessment
  o Documents of acknowledgement (certificates, letters, articles, photos, etc.)
• Details of service to the profession
  o Service on professional committees
  o Conference/meeting planning and/or hosting
  o Documents of acknowledgement (certificates, letters, articles, photos, etc.)
• Details of service to the community
  o Related to profession
  o Not related to profession
  o Documents of acknowledgement (certificates, letters, articles, photos, etc.)

Personal Characteristics (see following suggestions as well as personal characteristics criteria above)
• Additional letters of recommendation (from teaching colleagues, students, community members, administrators and others)
• Other documentation as appropriate
Note: The dossier remains the property of the candidate, and shall be returned at the end of the Code 3 evaluation. Any confidential materials will be removed from the dossier before it is returned to the candidate and will be held secure at the UNM-Los Alamos campus. All letters, summaries, and recommendations of the Code 3 process with respect to advancing to the Code 6 process must be retained to be included later in the Code 006 dossier.

IV. Voting Constituency and Evaluation Procedures

The appointed Tenure Review Committee discusses and evaluates the candidate.

For decisions involving the Code 3 process, at the evaluation meeting of the candidate, the following rules of procedure apply:

All voting is conducted in person. No proxies will be accepted. A quorum will consist of a simple majority of the appointed committee members, including the committee chair. Attendance and participation via Skype or other appropriate technological methods is allowed. An effort will be made to have the full membership (excluding the candidate) present for the evaluation.

Each committee member evaluates the candidate orally, providing and explaining the numerical scores (to the first decimal on a 5.0 scale) that he or she assigns the candidate in the four recognized areas: teaching excellence, professional development, service, and personal characteristics.

Each member of the committee will record scores and brief explanations on the forms provided. Committee members will record their votes on these documents as well. These documents will be held confidential from the candidate and can be made available upon request to the UNM administration as part of the tenure evaluation process.

V. Appeal Process

Upon being made aware of a negative recommendation, the candidate may appeal as outlined below:

Appeal of negative recommendations:
For negative code 003 and code 006 recommendations made at any point in the process, candidates wishing to appeal must follow the process outlined in Sections 4.3.6 and 4.3.7 of the UNM Faculty Handbook as follows:

4.3.6 Negative Recommendations
If at any level of review, the recommendation is negative, the faculty member shall be given a copy of the negative recommendation and may request a copy of all other reports, recommendations and internal peer reviews and external letters (all redacted as necessary to preserve confidentiality). The faculty member shall have 10 working days after receipt of such materials, if requested, to present his/her views to the next level of review before the next recommendation, or the final decision, is made. In addition, if the Provost/VPHS makes a
negative decision, the faculty member may request reconsideration by the Provost/VPHS. Such request shall be made in writing by July 15. The Provost/VPHS shall respond within 10 working days of receiving the request.

**4.3.7 Appeal to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee or President**

The faculty member may appeal the final decision by the Provost/VPHS to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee on grounds that the mid-probationary, tenure, or promotion review involved academic freedom violations, improper considerations or prejudicial violation of the Policy procedures (Sec. 6). The faculty member may appeal a negative decision to the President on any other grounds. The faculty member may appeal a negative decision to the President on any other grounds.