

Report of Faculty Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee for 2012-2013

May 19, 2013

Submitted by Chris Fritz, Chair

The other members of the Committee were:

Benson, Reed
Browde, Michael
Martin, Nathalie
Gauna, Eileen
Mathewson, Alfred
Sedillo Lopez, Antoinette
Suzuki, Carol

The Committee's charge: To review candidates for consideration for retention, promotion and tenure. Conduct annual reviews of tenure track professors. Coordinate with the Faculty Appointments Committee regarding lateral hires.

In November, 2012 this Committee gathered information to help Interim Dean Barbara Bergman draft an annual review of the progress of Camille Carey and Dave Sidhu toward tenure as per our Faculty Handbook. Those two reports are attached as files "Carey Annual Review Info" and "Sidhu Annual Review Info" respectively.

When the Committee began this work, there was no existing model of how to initiate the process of such a review and what information should be sought. As such, the Chair has prepared a template (see attached file "Request for Annual Review Data") that may prove helpful to future Committees and obviates the need to reinvent "the wheel."

One significant labor of the Committee this year entailed completing a tenure review of Professor Barbara Creel (see the Committee's report as attached file "Full Draft of Creel Report Feb 11"). It should be noted that this year the University instituted an electronic posting system instead of hard copies. While this system may well turn out to be a more efficient means of sharing information with the Main Campus, there were problems that next year's Committee should take into account and anticipate. Specifically, the posting of relevant documents from the Law School made them difficult if not impossible to locate from those accessing the site from the Main Campus, in part because of a glitch that reordered and renamed files as additional information was added. The consequence was that the Committee has been asked on several occasions since the Law School's recommendation has gone over to the Provost's Office for documents that had already been shared via the electronic system.

As noted, these glitches may well be resolved in the future, but next year's Committee may well consider sending one hard copy of the key tenure documents to the Provost directly just to avoid the confusion that ensued this year.

In addition, the Committee, in conjunction with the Faculty Appointment's Committee, was asked in April of this year to conduct a tenure review of Lu-in Wang, as a lateral hire to the Law School. That tenure review is attached as file "Wang Evaluation."

Finally, in anticipation of Professor Dave Sidhu coming up for tenure review next year (during which time Professor Sidhu will be on leave in Washington, D.C.), the Committee took steps to help facilitate that review. Two class visitations were conducted this Spring. Professor Michael Browde attended two of Professor Sidhu's classes in Introduction to Con Law and offered the following report (see attached file "Browde Classroom Review Con Law"). Moreover, Professor Fritz sat in on Professor Sidhu's National Security Law Seminar and also offered a report (see attached file, "Fritz Class Visitation of Dave Sidhu.")

In addition, as Chair of this Committee I held an open meeting for all interested law students who wished to comment on their experiences with Professor Sidhu, both inside and outside the classroom. The account of that meeting is attached file, "Open Student Meeting re Professor Sidhu."

Memorandum

To: [Tenure-Track Faculty Member]
From: [Chair], Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee
Re: Annual Review of Pre-Tenure Faculty
Date: September ____, 20__

Dear [Tenure-Track Faculty Member]:

I write as Chair of the Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee to advise you that our Committee has been asked by the Dean to assist him in making your annual review for this academic year. This review is called for by the tenure and promotion policies of the University. (See the UNM Faculty Handbook, <http://handbook.unm.edu/> [specifically § 4.2], and the UNM Law School Faculty Handbook, <https://lobolaw.unm.edu/faculty/handbook/promo-retention/promotion-tenure-policy.php> [specifically III:C])

These annual reviews are supposed to occur both *before* your mid-probationary report and *after* that report. They are designed and intended to assist the faculty member in his or her efforts to progress toward reappointment and tenure. Thus, these reviews should not be viewed as judgments on the merits of promotion or tenure, but more in the spirit of progress reports of a faculty member's work towards those objectives and a means of maximizing their success in attaining them.

Thus, for the purpose of gathering the relevant materials for the Dean to make his report, would you please supply this Committee the following:

- an up-dated *curriculum vitae*;
- a description of courses taught this year (including any new preparations);
- a description of your service this year to the Law School, the University and the many other communities we serve;
- an assessment of the status of your scholarly research agenda in this year--works in progress, in press, or in print; and finally,
- a statement setting forth your goals for the coming year and (assuming you received an annual review last year) a statement of self evaluation based upon goals set for the previous year.

Thank you in advance for supplying this information and participating in this process. If this information is received within a month of this request, we would endeavor to produce a report within 30 days. Once the Dean's review is completed, you will receive a copy of that review and will have an opportunity to respond.

If you have any question about this process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Committee Chair]