

Statement of Functions and Criteria

Department of Physics
College of Arts and Sciences
New Mexico State University

Approved by the Physics Faculty on January 19, 2021

1 General Remarks

This document provides the statement of Departmental Functions, Promotion and Tenure Process, and Annual Evaluation Procedures of the Department of Physics. The Department of Physics operates under the general criteria and procedures of the University as stated in the NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP) with regard to decisions involving promotion and tenure. University policies regarding promotion and tenure supersede department and college policies. Therefore this document includes by reference all corresponding statements made in Chapter 9 of the ARP. This document defines more clearly the Department's procedures for the assignment of teaching, research and service loads, evaluation of performance, and policies for promotion and tenure, in a way that is appropriate to the discipline of Physics.

Should the NMSU rules on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (ARP Sections 9.30-9.35) change during a faculty member's pre-tenure or pre-promotion period, the faculty member may elect whether to be evaluated by the former rule or the revised rule. This election shall be documented in writing. New faculty should be informed about these rules and choice of policy.

2 Statement of the Departmental Functions

2.1 Teaching and Advising

The teaching and advising functions of the Department are to provide 1) high quality education in Physics and Engineering Physics for all students, 2) specialized training for our

majors and students in some other disciplines, and 3) high quality graduate education at the Master and Ph.D. degree levels in Physics and Geophysics.

Proper advisement of undergraduate students in physics, engineering physics, and other disciplines to graduation supports NMSU's Goal #1, "Enhance student success and social mobility", as set out in the NMSU LEADS 2025 Strategic Planning Framework. All faculty members are expected to contribute to a departmental climate supportive of our undergraduate majors. Individual contributions will vary and will be documented in the annual Allocation of Effort Statement and in Digital Measures Reports.

2.2 Research

Faculty and student research at all levels is an equally important endeavor that is vigorously pursued to maintain the quality of the Department and University. The results of research performed in the Physics Department not only contribute to the knowledge base of the scientific community but ultimately to society at large.

While it is not required that every person in the Department participate in both research and teaching, it is important for the Department as a whole to have strong research and teaching programs. The Department recognizes the important symbiotic relation that exists between teaching and research. The value of teaching diminishes if it does not reflect the advances from current research. Conversely, the gain of knowledge obtained from research is of little value if it is not passed on to the next generation of physicists in a timely manner. The separation of these two endeavors is to be avoided. It is the responsibility of the Department and College to provide, to the best of their ability, the intellectual atmosphere and physical facilities and equipment to meet the functions stated.

2.3 Service

In order to achieve the goals stated above, organization and implementation are essential. This important activity is denoted as service. Service at the departmental, college and university level is crucial for the future well-being of the entire university and benefits both teaching and research, often treating problems common to the two activities at the same time. Service to the broader Physics community is also important for the visibility of the Department and the health of the field as a whole.

2.4 Outreach

Outreach activities benefit the larger educational community as well as recruiting efforts in the Department. Public presentations at local institutions (especially K-12 schools), and the Physics Olympics programs we have held, are good examples of outreach activities.

2.5 Allocation of Effort

The standard of evaluation for each faculty member shall be based on the allocation of effort outlined in the annual statement, which is agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Head each year.

The allocation of effort for standard tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments is 40% for teaching, 50% for research and 10% composed of service and outreach; the Department Head, in consultation with individual faculty members, can modify the allocations. For example, faculty members with major commitments to service and/or outreach can ask for reduced teaching or research loads, faculty members with reduced research activities may be asked to take on an increased teaching load, and faculty members with extensive research activities may opt to buy out some teaching duties.

College Faculty will be evaluated in the same manner. Their standard allocation of effort is 95% for teaching and 5% for service, although the Department Head, in consultation with individual faculty members and the Dean, can modify the allocations. The baseline for service allocation is the number of FTE for which college faculty are hired, with 1.0 FTE corresponding to 40 hrs/week. For example, a College-track faculty member with a 0.5 FTE appointment will normally have 50% of the service assignment of a College-track faculty member with a 1.0 FTE appointment.

College research faculty who are fully or partly supported by internal NMSU funds have the same reporting requirements as the college teaching faculty. College research faculty who are fully supported by external funds are encouraged to submit annual goal statements and progress reports to the department head. Such documents will be considered for potential promotion requests.

3 Basis for Evaluation

3.1 Teaching and Advising

Each faculty member, both tenure-track and college faculty, is responsible for providing information on his/her teaching activity and performance. In general, materials appropriate for evaluating teaching should include at least 3 out of the following 4 forms of evidence. Per current policy (see ARP 9.31 Part 3, C.2.a), evidence from students is always required.

- (a) Evidence from the instructor: For example, course materials (syllabus, lecture notes, sample homework and exams, lab manuals, etc.), instructor self-evaluations, evidence of course development and lecture innovation.
- (b) Evidence from other professionals: Peer evaluation from another instructor, for example.
- (c) Evidence from students: This is typically based on evaluation forms that the students in each course complete. In particular, for annual evaluation purposes, faculty will

compile a one-page summary of their student evaluations for each of their courses; in this context, cross-listed undergraduate/graduate courses, in which student evaluations are performed uniformly across the combined courses, require only one summary. The summary will typically include a display of the “most beneficial to your learning” and “could most use enhancement” histograms of the evaluations (or present the salient information in alternative fashion), as well as list representative student comments pertaining to the most relevant items in each of the two histograms.

- (d) Evidence of student learning: Standardized test questions embedded in classroom exams can be used to calibrate student learning, for example.

Faculty members are expected to keep class notebooks as required by accreditation agencies; these can be invaluable sources of evidence for teaching evaluation.

Undergraduate and graduate student research advising is an important advising activity; and results of these interactions should be reported in the annual performance report.

Some (but not all) faculty members in the department are assigned duties as undergraduate academic advisors; they serve to guide the individual major program for each student assigned to them. The assignment of these duties will be mentioned in the Allocation of Effort forms. The results of these interactions should be reported in the annual performance report.

3.2 Research

Research is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Evidence of research activity should be comprised of all of the following elements:

- (a) Publications: In proportion to their allocation of effort, faculty members should be engaged in research activities which result in high-quality publications. The quality of the publications is a decisive element in the evaluation of the publication record, not just the quantity of work produced. All parties involved in evaluation of research effectiveness (candidate, P&T committee, department head) are expected to comment on the quality of journals based on standards established for the discipline and the rigor of peer review for each publication.
- (b) Externally funded, peer-reviewed grants and contracts: All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to seek outside funding for their research and graduate program. The degree of success in obtaining grant funds is weighed against such factors as the variety of sources sponsoring a particular kind of research and the availability of funds.
- (c) Presentation of Research Results: Tenured and Tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the advancement of science through presentations at national and international meetings, and publication in proceedings.
- (d) Recognition: An important measure of research activity is the degree of external peer recognition that a faculty member receives. A summary of citations of published work

can be a indicator of the extent to which the research has impacted the field. Election to office of national and international scientific organizations, and awards and fellowships from external institutions, can be evidence of widespread recognition of the quality of work.

3.3 Service

Service to the Department, College and University is a part of the responsibility of faculty members (both tenure-track and college faculty) and is essential for the long-term prosperity of the Department, College and University. Evidence of service can be comprised of any of these elements:

- (a) Summary of Committee Work: Tenure and tenure-track faculty members are expected to serve on assigned Departmental committees as well as work on the accreditation of the department as needed. Service on College and University committees is also strongly encouraged.
- (b) Summary of Professional Service: Service to the profession includes refereeing papers, reviewing proposals, organizing meetings, and editing for journals as well as serving as officers and committee members of professional organizations.
- (c) Summary of Participation in Departmental Activities: Faculty members are expected to contribute to an academic atmosphere through participation in colloquia and other department functions and encourage their students to do the same. All need to contribute to departmental duties such as inventory, bookstore orders, commencement, supporting committees (by providing requested information), etc.

3.4 Outreach

Outreach to the local community is strongly encouraged. Evidence of outreach can be comprised of any of these elements:

- (a) Public presentations in classrooms or at local institutions (schools, organizations, businesses, etc.).
- (b) Organization of events where public participation is primary; the Physics Olympics is a good example of this kind of activity.
- (c) Participation in recruitment of students.
- (d) Organizing visits from local schools to the department.

This list is not intended to be exhaustive, and should be extended as we develop more outreach activities.

4 Procedure for Evaluation for Continuation and Tenure

4.1 The Promotion and Tenure Committee

Evaluations and recommendations regarding continuing contract, promotion, and tenure are made separately by the Department Head and by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all tenured faculty members in the department and an external member appointed by the Dean. Members of the committee have the right and obligation to read the files of the candidates under consideration and to be present for discussions and votes concerning the annual review of progress toward promotion and tenure, and for recommendation thereof.

In cases where there are college track candidates for promotion, then at least one college track faculty member of higher rank (perhaps from another department) will serve in those cases only.

In no case shall the Promotion and Tenure Committee be composed of less than three eligible members. If insufficient faculty members are available, then the Dean shall appoint additional Representatives to make up the balance.

4.2 Clarification of Procedures:

The Dean, Department Head, and comparable administrators may meet with the Promotion and Tenure committee to discuss procedural matters, if needed.

4.3 The Committee and External Review Files

Each tenure-track faculty member should maintain a file containing publications, information on teaching and mentoring, grants and contracts, annual reports, a current extended vitae and a summary of professional activities. The contents of this file should be guided by those criteria listed in Section 3. This file should be updated at the beginning of each calendar year, for use by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Head in forming their yearly evaluation.

The Department Head will maintain a separate file for sensitive material, in particular letters of evaluation.

In order to facilitate external review by writers of letters of recommendation, the candidate should provide an extended vitae, statement of teaching philosophy, a list of courses taught at New Mexico State University, a list of the five most significant papers and a statement of their broader impact, a list of successful grants and contracts in which the candidate is the main PI or Co-PI, a list of successful grants and contracts in which the candidate has an essential role, and a description of service activities.

4.4 Confidentiality of Materials and Procedures:

The Department Head will maintain a file of sensitive material, as mentioned above, and this file may only be seen by members of the Promotion and Tenure committee for official business, and by the associated faculty member upon request. The meetings of the Promotion and Tenure committee are also confidential. The official output of these meetings should be the letters written to the Department Head concerning individual faculty members; NMSU policy requires that the candidate is provided copies of the Promotion and Tenure evaluation letters.

4.5 Procedures for Continuation

At the beginning of the spring semester all tenure-track faculty members will update their files as described in Section 4.3. The members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will study the files and make their professional assessments of the untenured faculty members, guided by those criteria listed in Section 3. The vote of the Committee will be conducted in person, in closed session only among Committee members, using a secret written ballot. The vote tally shall be recorded. Committee members must take part in the deliberations in order to vote (confidential electronic remote participation possible with approval of the committee chair).

The Committee will present to the Department Head, in writing, its assessments in teaching, research, service and outreach, the overall progress toward tenure, and their vote tally for continuation or termination of each tenure-track faculty member. The Department Head will make a separate written recommendation on continuation or termination for each tenure-track faculty member and inform him/her of the tally of the voting and the two written recommendations. Both letters of recommendation are transmitted to the Dean of the College.

4.6 Procedure for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty members will normally apply to be considered for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and for tenure in their sixth year.

Committee Discussion in Spring: In early February in the fifth year after the hiring of a tenure-track member, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will convene to consider his/her candidacy for tenure. The committee will individually examine the files and annual reports of the candidate and may request additional information, if necessary. In late March, after appropriate discussion, the committee will vote on progress toward tenure; this recommendation for or against will be passed to the Department Head, who will write his/her own recommendation. Both letters, from the Committee and the Department Head will be conveyed to the candidate by the Department Head. The candidate may request consideration for tenure at that point, submitting to the Department Head a list of at least six persons external to NMSU who are competent to evaluate their creative works and are not excluded by College or NMSU policy. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure will select at least

3 persons from the list given by the candidate and decide on an additional 3-6 names for outside letters. The Department Head and the P&T Committee have the right to strike names from the list of reviewers provided by the candidate. The candidate may also submit a list of potential reviewers to be excluded; the Head and Committee will take this list into consideration. Additional names may be requested from the candidate or from the P&T committee at any time, to ensure that a sufficient number of letters are received as needed for the review of the candidate.

Criteria for Selection of External Reviewers: Competent external reviewers are normally researchers with a strong record of peer-reviewed publications in the field of the candidate. Current or former close collaborators (co-authors or co-PIs), advisors, mentors, students, or others with a conflict of interest are excluded per College Promotion and Tenure Policy Section 8.2. To the greatest extent allowed by College and NMSU policy, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure will aim to achieve a balance of reviewers with very close connections and detailed knowledge of the candidate and unbiased reviewers who may know the candidate mostly through his/her publication record. In small research fields or for large collaborations, it may be difficult to find competent reviewers without connections to the candidate. The modern practice of both experimental and theoretical physics often involves collaborations comprising scientists from all over the world, in groups ranging in size from tens to hundreds and even thousands. These collaborative projects take years, sometimes decades, to complete. The proper evaluation of the participation of tenure-track faculty members in such projects requires some careful consideration, especially in the selection of external reviewers. To the extent permitted by College and NMSU policy, the Department Head and Committee Chair will take care to select reviewers both from within the relevant collaboration(s) [such persons will have some understanding of the actual contributions made by the candidate] and from outside the collaboration(s) [such persons will be able to take an outsider's view of the applicant's curriculum vita]. Reviewers will be asked to focus on the research and professional service accomplishments of the candidate and they may also write about his/her teaching, if they have such knowledge. In most cases, external reviewers will be faculty members in the candidate's field at another institution with a higher academic rank than the candidate or Ph.D. researchers at federal laboratories. There may, however, be exceptions. For example, a high school principal or the CEO of a company might be asked to provide a reference letter based on their position without regard to their educational credentials.

Collection of Letters in Summer: It is the responsibility of the Department Head to collect outside letters from at least 6 selected reviewers. The P&T committee may suggest reviewers. In the instructions to a potential reviewer, the following items need to be addressed:

- The reviewer should, within the letter, provide a statement of his/her qualifications to serve as reviewer.
- The reviewer should, within the letter, provide an indication of his/her relationship with the candidate.

- The reviewer will be asked to speak to those aspects of the candidate’s career for which he/she is most qualified to speak. If the reviewer has a strong record of research in the same field, then he/she will be asked to review the candidate’s research. On the other hand, if the reviewer is a strong educator and is familiar with the candidate’s record of instruction, then the reviewer will be provided with appropriate evidence of teaching from the candidate’s portfolio. Similar comments apply to service contributions; an editor at a journal might speak to a candidate’s record of manuscript review, for example.
- The reviewer must be informed that the letter may be viewed by the candidate (“open letters policy”).
- The reviewer must be informed that third parties may see review letters in event of EEOC or other investigations.

These letters need to be received by the Department head by mid-August. Letters received after this deadline will be considered, if this is practical. Letters received after the first vote has been taken by the P&T committee will be discarded. Unsolicited letters received by the Committee or Department Head will be discarded and ignored; only those letters specifically requested will be placed in the file of the candidate and used for evaluation.

Portfolio Preparation in Summer: During the summer, the faculty members under consideration for tenure will prepare a portfolio following the guidelines in ARP 9.35 Part 6 and related College policies. The Department Head may provide samples of previously successful portfolios to candidates, after having removed any sensitive materials. Sample portfolios from actual persons require written permission from that person.

Committee Discussion in Fall: In the fall, the members of the tenured faculty will study the portfolio, including the outside evaluations and will meet in early September to vote (following the guidelines in ARP 9.34 part 3) on a recommendation for or against tenure, as well as for or against promotion. The Committee will transmit the tally of the votes, including the number for and against, to the Department Head, along with a written summary of the discussion leading up to the votes. The Chair and Department Head will assist the candidate for tenure in preparing documents to be presented to the College Faculty Affairs Committee.

Portfolio Contents: The Department Head will maintain and store the portfolio of information supplied by the candidate, letters gathered by the Department Head and Committee, annual performance evaluations, and all other documents required to be included in the portfolio as outlined in ARP 9.35, the College of Arts and Sciences Policies, and as described above. The candidate may review all items included in the portfolio.

Viewing/Modification of Portfolio Contents by the Candidate: After submitting the portfolio to the Committee, the candidate faculty member may only add missing or replace incorrect materials after a request to do so by the Committee or Department Head. No materials may be removed. The Department Head will make these materials available for review by the candidate in such a way that the contents of the portfolio may not be removed

or modified, only reviewed. The candidate will have a last opportunity to view the portfolio before it is submitted to the Dean's Office.

Recommendation of the Department Head: The Department Head will make a separate written recommendation on tenure and will inform the concerned faculty member(s) of the results of the voting and the two written recommendations to be made to the Dean. The candidate(s) may respond in writing to the recommendations of either the Committee or the Department Head (under Faculty Policies).

4.7 Procedure for Promotion

The procedure for promotion is the same as the procedure for tenure. For untenured faculty members, some elements (portfolio, letters, meetings, etc) may address both tenure and promotion, but both decisions are separate and must be addressed separately in the letters by reviewers, promotion and tenure committee, and Department Head.

4.8 Mid-probationary Review:

In accordance with ARP 9.34 Part 3: Tenure-track faculty members may request a formal mid-probationary review, in the spring of their third year of service. The mid-probationary review is an optional opportunity to obtain feedback on the tenure-track faculty member's performance and is used to identify specific activities to enhance the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure. The review is formative, intended to assist tenure-track faculty in achieving promotion and tenure and should take into account the allocation of work effort during the three years reviewed and be based upon this Functions and Criteria statement. The outcome must not be used as a determinant for setting merit pay or for contract continuation decisions. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will perform this review, if requested by the candidate, as a part of the spring semester meetings, possibly followed by additional reviews as specified by College and NMSU policy.

4.9 Suspension of the Promotion and Tenure Process

A candidate may temporarily suspend the promotion and tenure time process in accordance with ARP 9.35 Part 2. A candidate may withdraw from further consideration in accordance with ARP 9.35 Part 7.

5 Considerations for Promotion and Tenure

The University describes the overall criteria for promotion and tenure in ARP 9.35. This section for the Functions and Criteria statement seeks to elaborate on those criteria in a manner appropriate to the field of Physics.

5.1 Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

5.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Members of the tenure-track faculty in the Department of Physics recommended for Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will show evidence of successful activity in each of the following areas.

1. Conscientious and effective teaching in undergraduate and graduate courses, by presentation of at least 3 out of the following 4 forms of evidence:
 - (a) evidence from the instructor,
 - (b) evidence from other professionals,
 - (c) evidence from students, and
 - (d) evidence of student learning.

Evidence from students (gathered for each formal course taught during the review period) is always required.

2. Advising of graduate and/or undergraduate students in research activities, and/or towards completion of their academic program.
3. A creative, independent and productive program of research in an area of Physics, (including Geophysics, Engineering Physics, and Physics Education), leading to visibility in this field at a national and international level and the potential to sustain and improve this program, as usually evidenced by any or all of the following:
 - (a) A significant body of refereed publications in high impact primary journals in the field, and/or in general journals, reporting original research conducted at New Mexico State University that has substantially enriched his/her field of specialization. The quality of the journals will be demonstrated by the candidate, and evaluated by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - (b) Appropriate peer-reviewed grant support from one or more of the major funding agencies, with the candidate as a main PI or having an essential/significant role.
 - (c) Presentations at national and international meetings/conferences of the investigator's field and seminars at major university and research oriented facilities.
 - (d) Involvement and financial support of graduate students and/or postdoctoral researchers.
 - (e) Awards of United States patents, if appropriate.
4. Conscientious and effective performance in university and professional service and outreach assignments as detailed in Section 6.

5.1.2 College-track Faculty

College-track faculty members eligible for the position of College-track Associate Professor (College Assistant Professors, for example) shall be judged on assigned research, teaching, service, and outreach duties according to the criteria given above for tenure-track faculty, their allocation of effort and their FTE. It is not expected that college professors will teach graduate courses, although they may if they have relevant research activities.

5.2 Early Promotion to Associate Professor

5.2.1 Tenure-track Faculty

While tenure-track faculty members will normally be considered for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor in their sixth year, promotion at an earlier time may be considered in cases of unusually rapid development accompanied by an exceptional record of achievements as described in Section 5.1. Such early promotion may, or may not, be accompanied by the granting of tenure status; tenure and promotion are separate issues. Indicators of exceptional performance include:

1. An exceptional body of published work that clearly establishes international leadership in the chosen field.
2. Peer-reviewed funding at a level substantially above the average for the field.
3. Exceptional peer recognition exemplified by invitations to present prestigious lectures, plenary lectures, and lecture series at prestigious institutions.
4. Awards for excellence in research, teaching, service, and/or outreach.
5. Special recognition from national or international organizations for excellence in research, teaching, service, and/or outreach.

5.2.2 Non-tenure-track Faculty

Similar criteria as for tenure-track faculty, adjusted for allocation of effort, in the areas of research, teaching, service, and outreach, will apply when considering early promotion of non-tenure-track Assistant professors to non-tenure-track Associate status.

5.3 Promotion to Full Professor

5.3.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Tenured members of the faculty may be recommended for promotion to the rank of Full Professor by a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure committee consisting of Full Professors. A candidate for this promotion will show evidence of leadership and be well known

in the international science community. Leadership should embody initiative, perseverance, and originality. Indicators of these qualities include:

1. **Teaching:** Sustained effective teaching contributions in courses, as evidenced by the criteria noted in Section 5.1. Some service in lower division courses is normally expected. Additional evidence includes sustained and effective mentoring of many graduate students, leading to the Master and Ph.D. degrees, and successful careers beyond NMSU. Leadership in teaching can also be demonstrated through curriculum, course or laboratory development.
2. **Research:** Sustained recognition and impact, over the full term of service at NMSU, in one or more significant areas of research as usually evidenced by:
 - (a) A continuing series of refereed publications in high impact primary journals for the field, and/or in high impact general science journals, reporting original research that has significantly impacted the field. The impact on the field can be evidenced from citations by other leading publications and by letters of reference from leaders in the field of investigation.
 - (b) Continuing and sustained peer-reviewed grant support.
 - (c) Invited presentations at the important meetings and conferences of the investigator's field and at major research universities and government facilities.
 - (d) Service on scientific review boards and panels.
 - (e) Awards of United States patents.
3. **Service:** Provide leadership and effective service at the local (Department, College, and University) and professional levels.
4. **Outreach:** Outreach, as defined in ARP 9.31 Part 3, is not a normal component of Physics Department activities, and so we do not require outreach activities of our faculty members. However, if they elect to participate in outreach activities, they may receive credit for it.

5.3.2 Non-tenure-track Faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty members eligible for the position of non-tenure-track Full Professor (College Associate Professors, for example) shall be judged on assigned research, teaching, service, and outreach duties according to the criteria given above, their allocation of effort and their FTE.

5.4 Early Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of Full Professor is warranted when the criteria in Section 5.3 are met and is not based on either promise or longevity. The time required by different faculty members to attain the appropriate level of achievement will vary, with six years being the typical minimum period at the Associate Professor level (for tenure and tenure-track faculty). Earlier promotion to the rank of Full Professor will only be considered in cases of unusually rapid development accompanied by an exceptional record of achievements. Indicators of such exceptional performance include:

1. An exceptional body of published work that clearly establishes international leadership in the chosen field.
2. Peer-reviewed funding at a level substantially beyond the average for the field.
3. Exceptional peer recognition exemplified by invitations to present prestigious lectures, plenary lectures, etc.
4. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or research.
5. Special recognition from national and international organizations for excellence in research.
6. Election to fellow status in a prestigious professional society, such as the American Physical Society or the American Geophysical Union, among others.

6 Annual Evaluation

6.1 General Procedures

Towards the end of each year, each faculty member will produce an annual self-evaluation using the Digital Measures system, following the guidelines in Section 3. The Department Head will set a deadline for completion of the annual evaluation, usually in December. In December, faculty members will also submit a detailed Allocation of Effort Statement for the following calendar year, to be included in their files. The review period consists of the calendar year.

The Physics Department Annual Evaluation Committee, consisting of the Department Head and two tenured faculty members, elected by the faculty, will rank each faculty member's performance in teaching, research, service and outreach during the current review period (calendar year), measured against the goals listed on their Allocation of Effort Statement from the previous review period. The possible rankings in each area are "Needs Improvement" (NI), "Meets Expectations" (ME), "Exceeds Expectations" (EE), and "Exemplary" (EX). The elected members of this committee cannot serve two years in succession. Each member will perform the evaluations independently using the general guidelines given in the

next section. The two members of the evaluation committee elected from the faculty will not evaluate themselves; each will be evaluated by the Department Head and the other elected faculty member.

To facilitate a two-step annual appraisal process of faculty (review committee, department head), the department head may set an earlier deadline for the submission of faculty annual reports than the university-wide deadline for departments which do not use a review committee.

In accordance with ARP 6.61 the department head has the discretion to adjust teaching allocations based on the result of this evaluation if faculty members repeatedly don't meet expectations in research. Conversely, faculty members who repeatedly excel in research and service can have their teaching loads reduced. Faculty members whose teaching exceeds expectations will be given priority in their choice of teaching assignments.

Once the Dean has confirmed these evaluations (in the course of the spring semester), the Department Head will schedule a conference with each faculty member during the spring semester. During the conference, the Department Head and the faculty member will discuss the evaluation, ways for improvement of performance, if appropriate, and come to a consensus on reasonable performance goals and approximate fractional time assigned to teaching, research and service for the coming year. The evaluation is not complete until signed by the department head and the faculty member.

Allocation of Effort: Only regular NMSU jobs in Banner will be considered for the allocation of effort percentages in the annual Allocation of Effort statements. Supplemental compensation for teaching or research, temporary appointments (summer teaching or research), or non-NMSU jobs will not be considered.

The Allocation of Effort Statement is of primary importance in the evaluation of each faculty member. ARP 9.31 Part 3 states: "Serious attention must be given to performance in the Four Areas of Faculty Effort: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, and extension and outreach. The relative importance of each of these areas varies according to the cumulative Allocation of Effort statements. Each area is vital to the university's ability to achieve its mission, and the performance of a faculty member will be viewed as an indication of future contributions."

For allocation of effort, teaching consists of instruction through formal courses, independent study courses, advising graduate or undergraduate students in their course selection and progress to graduation, advising undergraduate research, and advising graduate student research of master degree or doctoral candidates. For full-time, tenure-system faculty, each formal course accounts for 12.5% annual effort. For faculty with a normal course load of three courses per year, the allocation for teaching will usually be between 40% and 45%, depending on the extent of teaching through activities other than formal courses.

Most tenured faculty will have a service load of about 10%. Tenured faculty with a course reduction for increased service will have a higher service load (about 20%). Tenure-track faculty will usually have a lower service load near 5%.

The remaining effort will be allocated to research, usually about 45 to 50% for tenured faculty and slightly more for tenure-track faculty.

College-track faculty have a standard allocation of effort consisting of 95% teaching and 5% service.

Deviations from these allocations may be negotiated with the department head prior to the beginning of the calendar year and may require approval from the Dean.

Certification of Effort: Every six months, most faculty need to certify the distribution of their effort based on all NMSU jobs for each two-week pay period. For this certification, all NMSU jobs will be considered, including permanent appointments, temporary jobs for teaching and research, supplemental compensation, overloads, and portions of their permanent salary used as matching funds for research grants. Non-NMSU compensation (consulting or editor contracts) will not be considered for this certification of effort. As a result, the percentages in the allocation of effort form may have only a weak relationship to the percentages in the certification of effort reports.

Annual Performance Reports: Towards the end of each year, faculty enter their annual performance reports in Digital Measures. All accomplishments consistent with the Functions of the Department should be entered, regardless of the source of compensation. For example, journal editing duties paid by a third party or research publications produced during the summer (paid or unpaid) should be entered in the annual performance report. Also, research results obtained during the summer achieved without summer compensation should be reported. Patents granted or publications/presentations paid through third-party employment should also be reported. On the other hand, proprietary consulting or private-sector employment not resulting in any activities described in the Functions and Criteria Statement should not be reported. Specifically, the student evaluation summaries described in section 3.1 will be either attached to the Digital Measures record, or suitably transcribed into the Digital Measures system in the appropriate section. They will also be provided separately to the Physics Department Annual Evaluation Committee.

Annual Goals Definition: In the annual Allocation of Effort statements, faculty also describe goals for the coming year. This includes the specific courses they expect to teach (regular courses taught in load, low-enrollment courses taught without compensation, and additional courses taught for temporary or supplemental pay) and other expected teaching and service activities during the calendar year. They also describe research activities and expected outcomes (including the topic of publications, presentations, and proposals, funding agencies, and approximate dollar amounts). Faculty describe all goals they expect to meet during the year, regardless of whether the effort used to reach these goals is paid by a permanent NMSU job, a supplemental or temporary NMSU job, by third-party employment, or unpaid.

General expectations for faculty and standards for meeting or exceeding expectations are listed in the Functions and Criteria Statement, Sec. 6.2. The faculty annual Allocation of Effort statements are expected to be consistent with these standards.

If circumstances change significantly during the calendar year (for example changes in course assignments, research plans, etc), a revised annual Allocation of Effort statement must be submitted to the Department Head.

Annual Evaluation and Promotion and Tenure Considerations: The Allocation

of Effort Statement is of primary importance in the evaluation of each faculty member. ARP 9.31 Part 3 states: “Serious attention must be given to performance in the Four Areas of Faculty Effort: teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, and extension and outreach. The relative importance of each of these areas varies according to the cumulative Allocation of Effort statements.”

The annual evaluation by the Department Head is based on all accomplishments by the faculty member consistent with the functions of the department and the criteria described in the Functions and Criteria statement approved by the faculty. Faculty members are expected to meet the specific deliverables described in the annual Allocation of Effort statement, especially related to instructional and service responsibilities.

The totality of the research, teaching, service, and outreach accomplished by each member of the faculty, and their overall impact in achieving the Functions of the department will be considered.

Similar considerations apply to the criteria for promotion and tenure. All accomplishments by the faculty member consistent with the functions of the department and the criteria described in the Functions and Criteria statement will be considered for promotion and tenure.

6.2 Guidelines to be used by the Annual Evaluation Committee

The primary basis for the ranking of each faculty member is the achievement of the goals listed on the Allocation of Effort Statement from the previous year. These guidelines are intended to assist the Evaluation Committee in the determination of the rankings.

Exemplary (EX)

An “Exemplary” rating should always be supported by specific documentation. It is reserved for cases in which extraordinary and exceptional accomplishment is clearly and consistently demonstrated, or an exceptional or unique contribution is made. Others in similar roles rarely equal performance of this caliber; it goes beyond the very high level of performance subsumed under the “Exceeds Expectations” rating. It would not be considered unusual to have no “Exemplary” rating in an evaluation year. An “Exemplary” rating can be achieved in teaching, research or service, and can be attained by a faculty member meeting all criteria listed in the “Exceeds Expectations” sections, and accomplishing a singular achievement at the level of the following examples:

- Awards or recognitions from major national or international organizations.
- NMSU Regents Professorship or Westhafer Award.
- Election to fellow status in a prestigious professional society, such as the American Physical Society or the American Geophysical Union, among others.
- Multiple external peer-reviewed grants at an exceptional volume far exceeding the awards expected for successful research programs in the field.

- Transformative achievements such as the establishment and coordination of new scholarly programs at NMSU, introducing, e.g., new teaching methodologies across campus, or major new degree programs.

Exceeds Expectations (EE)

An “Exceeds Expectations” rating should be supported by specific documentation. The Department of Physics expects performance at a very high standard from all faculty members. It is expected that only a small number of faculty members will exceed expectations each year. To merit an “Exceeds Expectations” rating, a faculty member should exhibit high overall performance, routinely go beyond what is expected or essential requirements, and perform work of excellent quality. In particular, all criteria listed in the “Meets Expectations” sections must be met, as well as one or more of the following criteria. The performance of an individual faculty member is always measured relative to the other faculty members of the same or similar rank and/or track.

Teaching

A meritorious evaluation includes at least one of the following measures: consistently positive student comments in teaching evaluations that compare favorably to the comments typically received for this course and/or similar courses in the department, in classroom teaching assigned at the normal course load for that faculty member; involvement in new course development and teaching innovation; involvement of undergraduates in research experiences; successful mentoring of graduate students who perform publishable and/or patentable research and graduate in a timely fashion; exemplary use of outcomes assessment materials to improve courses; and successful mentoring of productive postdoctoral fellows.

Research

Evidence of meritorious performance may be based on the number and quality of publications and presentations, citations and reviews. A sustained level of peer-reviewed major funding is evidence of the quality and productivity of the research. For participants in multi-investigator projects, the level of individual contribution will be taken into account in assessing merit. Successful patent activity may also constitute evidence of meritorious research performance.

Service and/or Outreach

Evidence of meritorious service performance includes chairing an active Department, College, or University committee; active participation in more than one committee; professional service external to the university including the reviewing of proposals and papers; numerous public presentations, participation in numerous student recruiting or outreach activities, and/or organization of major public events associated with the university, college or department.

Meets Expectations (ME)

“Meets Expectations” is a positive, not a negative rating, and the majority of faculty will fall into this category. This rating is warranted when the performance consistently met expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, and the quality of work overall was very good.

Teaching

A satisfactory level of teaching can be documented by student comments in teaching evaluations that are in line with the comments typically received for this course and/or similar courses in the department, at the minimum course load, and acceptable progress towards graduation of any graduate students mentored. Completion of outcomes assessment documentation in a timely manner is a must.

Research

A satisfactory ranking is evidenced by publication in a peer-reviewed journal (averaging one paper per year), minor funding from internal or external sources, or significant efforts to obtain funding by preparing and submitting research proposals.

Service and/or Outreach

Satisfactory service consists of assuming significant responsibility for organization and implementation of Departmental, College, or University activities during the evaluation period, participation in some recruiting or outreach activities, assisting in the organization of public events, and/or public presentations.

Needs Improvement (NI)

A “Needs Improvement” rating should be supported by specific documentation including a performance improvement plan, formulated by the department head and appraisal committee, that provides one possible path to resolving the issue that led to the NI rating. It is appropriate when the performance was substandard, with consistent, clearly evident deficiencies, repeatedly falling below the expected performance; when not all essential requirements are met, or when work requires a high degree of supervision and direction, frequent guidance and oversight. A failure to submit an annual performance report is cause for a “Needs Improvement” rating. In the specific areas of responsibility of faculty members in the department:

Teaching

A “Needs Improvement” rating would be appropriate in cases where persistently poor performance in teaching was documented. This rating would result, for example, from one or more of the following:

1. The consistent presence of adverse student comments that indicate a clear lack of communication and teaching effectiveness.

2. Failure to adequately monitor graduate advisee progress with the result that a graduate student continues to remain in the program for several semesters without any tangible progress towards degree.
3. Partial abandonment of assigned classes. When travel to fulfill professional responsibilities is unavoidable during the semester, another faculty member should normally cover a faculty member's class; a graduate teaching assistant should not teach classes unless prior approval of the Department Head is obtained. Repeated failure to obtain this approval would constitute unsatisfactory performance.
4. Persistent refusal to communicate with students in matters essential for them to be able to carry out their coursework, including failure to be adequately available to students outside of class hours. The Department Head will define the level of availability expected.
5. Failure to complete outcomes assessment documentation in a timely fashion.

Research

A "Needs Improvement" rating is appropriate when a faculty member makes little effort to pursue research, submit a paper or patent application, or seek funding at any level (from federal to internal university funds) by writing proposals, such that no substantive scientific output (documented, e.g., by a peer-reviewed journal publication, a patent application, grant funding, or a substantial new grant proposal submission) results in the evaluation period.

Service and/or Outreach

A "Needs Improvement" rating is warranted when a faculty member does not assume significant responsibility for the work of any committee to which the faculty member has been assigned. Refusal to serve on any committee is unsatisfactory, as is the documented failure to perform reasonable assigned duties on a committee.

7 Post-tenure Review

In order to promote accountability and continuing professional excellence among the faculty at New Mexico State University, all tenured faculty members are subject to post-tenure review according to policies set by the University (ARP 9.36) and the State of New Mexico.

8 Faculty Meetings

Attendance and Voting

All regular full-time or part-time tenured, tenure-track, and college-track Physics Department faculty members have the right and responsibility to attend departmental faculty meetings with voice and vote. Faculty members on phased retirement retain the right to

attend and vote in faculty meetings. Questions before the faculty may be decided by a voice vote, or by show of hands, or by a written ballot.

Consistent with the principle of collegiality defined in the College P&T policy, all regular tenure-track, tenured, and college-track faculty members are expected to attend all faculty meetings, unless they are on official travel or on leave. The Department Head will assign one faculty member to take the faculty meeting minutes, usually in alphabetical order. Meeting minutes should be circulated to all faculty members for comments and revisions within one week of the faculty meeting.

Attendance Without Vote

Other persons may be invited by the Department Head to attend relevant portions of departmental faculty meetings without the right to vote. In particular, the president of the Physics Graduate Student Organization (PGSO) will be invited to attend a designated portion of each faculty meeting that addresses selected topics relevant to graduate students. The PGSO president may designate a representative to attend the meeting.

9 Updates of The Functions and Criteria Statement

The Physics Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will review and update this policy document at least every three years. More frequent revisions may be needed to address serious discrepancies between University, College, and Department policy. If the policy should change during a faculty members pre-tenure or pre-promotion period, the faculty member may choose one of the policies for evaluation purposes. The chosen version of the policy will be placed in the faculty member's file, signed and dated by the faculty member and the department head.

Dean

Date

Stefan Zollner

Digitally signed by Stefan Zollner

Date: 2021.01.19 14:44:18 -07'00'

Department Head

Date