Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee  
May 2016  
Recommendation for language changes in NMT document “Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure”

Issue 1: Based on feedback from pre-tenure faculty and tenure committee chairs, the time between completion and return of the probationary faculty appraisal form is too long, impacting the candidate’s ability to adjust activities if suggested by the administration review of the form. Currently this form is submitted with committee comments to the department chair and administration by the February 15 deadline. However, the completed forms containing feedback from department chair and administrators are not returned to the committee chair and candidate until late in the year (mid-Fall in recent cases). It would be beneficial to the candidate to have this feedback earlier in the year in order to make any necessary changes prior to submitting the following year’s package.

We request addition of language in the “Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure” document.

1) In Section II-C. Annual Tenure Review

End of first paragraph: “Before March 1, the tenure committee chair will meet with the candidate and discuss that individual’s prospects for future and permanent appointment at the Institute, and promote constructive activities which that individual should consider pursuing.” The Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form will be returned to the committee chair and candidate by May 1 in order to provide the candidate with complete feedback in time to adjust plans for the remainder of the year.

2) Appendix (Important Dates and Processes in Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure)

Procedures for annual tenure review: add line at end of this section  
May 1 or before, the Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form is returned to the committee chair and candidate

3) Typical (5-year) Tenure Track at New Mexico Tech

Add line in spreadsheet under “1st Review”  
Probationary Faculty Appraisal Form returned to committee chair and candidate  May 1
Issue 2: We recommend that the entire tenure committee meet in person each year with the pre-tenure faculty member rather than just in the first year in order to provide the pre-tenure faculty additional opportunity to discuss any issues with the full committee. Current language in the document (Section II-C. Annual Tenure Review):

For the first year review, the tenure committee will describe their expectations for the candidate regarding research, teaching, and service. It is desirable that the tenure committee meet with the candidate in person in the first year to review the expectations for progress. Permission may be granted for an additional probationary year, provided the candidate is clearly making good progress toward tenure. The additional year should not be used to prolong probation for a candidate making insufficient progress.

Our recommendation is to change the yellow text to the following: 

It is desirable that the tenure committee will meet with the candidate in person in the first each year to review the expectations for progress.