



## Promotion and Tenure Action Team

### Meeting Review - Aug 7, 2007

Those in Attendance - Natalie Goldberg (Jul 10th & Aug 7<sup>th</sup>), Jon Boren, Brenda Bishop, Merrillyn Cummings, Karim Martinez, Marcel Montanez, Mark Andersen, Jim Libbin, Tim Ross, Steve Thomas, Champa Gopalan, Craig Runyan, Wendy Hamilton, Tracy Sterling, & Jeff Bader.

#### Individual Reports from Members

Overview of College online reporting proposal/committee work – To develop a unified on-line reporting system that will collect or mine data that can be used for the following purposes:

- Generate faculty annual performance evaluation documents
- Generate faculty Promotion and Tenure documents
- Supply supporting data for accreditation reviews
- Supply administration with data for graduate and undergraduate program reviews
- Assemble required accountability reports for federal and state agencies
- Assemble accountability reports for university stakeholders around the state.

The fields in the databases would be marked for formatting and inclusion in various reports. Benefits to faculty would be ease of preparing their required performance and promotion documents, plus making it easier for administration to get their story out to stakeholders; benefits to administration would be centralized databases of publications and programmatic progress and impacts.

What other states are doing: University of Arkansas and Oregon State University (peer institutions) were reviewed for ideas. OSU has some references on scholarship.

Handouts: AES P&T policy, Extension Agent and Specialist Expectations, Draft Charts 1, 2, & 3

Discussion of P & T charts – Drafts 1, 2, & 3.

Issues discussed when debating drafts included:

- Concern about not having enough capacity to build a representative P & T committee in each department – need procedure in the College policy
- P & T criteria in each department may not be uniform across the college – review by this committee could aid Dean in review process
- Definition of a principal unit (PU) unclear
- Definition of scholarship unclear
- Draft 3 preserves peer review process
- Draft 2 preserves mission of individual departments



## Promotion and Tenure Action Team

### Questions that Arose

Where are the checks/balances for departmental P & T criteria?

Which committee should review departmental P&T criteria every 3 yrs? The College P&T committee?

Does Dean see Assoc. Deans having collaborative role with Dean on reviewing all college P & T packets in the future?

Should College develop a combined, single P & T document for all faculty (instructional, teaching/research, CES college-rank, AES college-rank, CES agents, CES specialists)?

What is the definition of an Extension publication?

What is the college's definition of scholarship?

Is publishing part of the agent/faculty member's job?

### College Policy Prep - Committee Work [Prior to Aug 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting](#)

The University P & T policy is divided out below. Individuals are asked to study their assigned section in the University document either individually or as a group and identify CAHE P & T needs.

5.90.3 Guiding principles: Chris Allison, Jeff Bader, Mark Andersen, Priscilla Bloomquist, Jon Boren, Merrilyn Cummings

5.90.4 Criteria for P & T: Diana DelCampo, Natalie Golberg, Edmund Gomez, Champa Gopalan, Rex Kirksey, Jim Libbin, Karim Martinez, Marcel Montanez

5.90.5 Policies: Shelly Porter, Tim Ross, Craig Runyan, Linda Schultz, Brenda Seevers, Steve Thomas

Forum Planning – no date set

### Next Meetings:

[Meeting with the Dean – Thursday Aug 16<sup>th</sup>, 3-4pm, GT 364](#); Report on sub-committee work, 4-5pm

Monday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 3-5pm, GT 297, 253 & 220 (sub-committee work)

Wed., Sept 5<sup>th</sup>, 3-5pm

Wed., Sept 19<sup>th</sup>, 3-5pm

### Attachments:

Extension Excellence

Specialist Expectations

Agent Expectations

Journal of Extension article – “Defining Scholarship for Co.Extension Agents”

NMSU P & T Doc - Feb 15, 2007 (amended Apr 11, 2007)