



College of Agricultural, Consumer and
Environmental Sciences

Department of Agricultural Economics and
Agricultural Business

DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES, GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

As approved and adopted by the Faculty of the
Department of Agricultural Economics and
Agricultural Business on August 9, 2018

1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF P&T PROCESS

These guidelines describe the departmental policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty promotion and tenure in New Mexico State University's Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business (AEAB).¹ Specifically, these guidelines are intended for use by all AEAB tenure-track (tenured) and non-tenure-track faculty (TTF and NTTF, respectively) with research, teaching, and/or extension appointments.

This document is supplemental and subordinate to both University and College policies and procedures. Each faculty member in AEAB is responsible for following the relevant criteria procedures presented herein and in each of the following documents:

1. Promotion and Tenure policy for New Mexico State University is governed by **NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures** Chapters 9.30 – 9.43 (available online at <https://arp.nmsu.edu/>) and hereafter referred to as NMSU P&T Policy.
2. College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES) “Criteria for Promotion and Tenure” (available online at <http://aces.nmsu.edu/employee/pt/>) and hereafter referred to as ACES P&T Policy.

1.1. Overview of P&T Evaluation Process.

Faculty candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to demonstrate and document professional stature, skills, and capabilities consistent with the rank or tenure status being sought. In addition, candidates should demonstrate effective abilities to communicate and work effectively with colleagues, administrators and staff, and clientele. For example, candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure are encouraged to document collaborative efforts in the areas of extension, research and teaching. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) is a performance-driven process involving several parties and elements. In addition to the faculty candidate, parties to the process include the Department Head, Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, ACES Promotion and Tenure Committee, and ACES Dean. Core elements to the P&T process include: (1) definition of duties, performance areas and effort levels; (2) evidence and documentation of performance, e.g., outcomes, impacts, and accomplishments activities, efforts, roles, and contributions accomplishments, outcomes, impacts, major efforts, roles, and contributions; and (3) review, evaluation, and reporting on candidate performance including that from the Departmental and College P&T Committees, Department Head, and external reviewers.

1.1.1. AEAB Faculty Mentoring

All junior faculty in AEAB are formally assigned to the mentorship of a senior faculty member as mutually agreed to by both faculty members and the department head. Senior faculty

¹ Changes to these guidelines must be approved by a majority of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business faculty at a meeting called either by the Department Head or the Chair of the Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business promotion and tenure committee with at least a two-week notice to all faculty. If the policy should change during a faculty member's pre-tenure or pre-promotion period, the faculty member may choose one of the policies for evaluation purposes. The faculty member must make that choice in writing to the Department Head and the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee prior to submitting their portfolio for annual review.

members should consider it part of their responsibilities to assist in this mentoring process. The mentor performs a key function in the orientation and guidance of the junior faculty member. Mentoring is an important and valued activity that assists in the growth and development of the junior faculty member and is instrumental in promoting activities that contribute to their success within the department, college, and university. Mentors are expected to develop on-going relationships with their protégés and to meet no less than once a semester to discuss progress and documentation efforts in support of the P&T process.

1.1.2. Faculty Performance Areas, Duties and Efforts

The Allocation-of-Effort (AE) statement reflects an individual’s goals and objectives as they relate to the University’s mission and Departmental expectations, and is a fundamental element of performance assessment within Departments and Principal Units at NMSU, and all faculty are expected to develop and record an AE statement annually in consultation with their Department Head (see NMSU ARP 6.61 Faculty Assignments - General). AE statements report for the coming year expected shares of effort and time across each of the Four Areas of Faculty Effort: **Scholarship, Teaching, Outreach, Service**, and other (allocations must total 100%). Each year, in consultation with the principal-unit administrator, faculty shall complete and sign an allocation-of-effort statement with mutually agreed-upon changes made during the year, as needed.

The AE statement then forms a basis for assessing performance, progress and achievement based on standards and guidelines described below. The AE can change from year to year, depending on evolving goals and changing circumstances facing the faculty member, Department, College, and University. The academic Curriculum Vita (sometimes referred to as a *portfolio* or *package* but hereafter simply as CV) shall contain a table summarizing annual AE statements. This form (shown below and in Appendix 2 of the ACES P&T Policy) shall be completed at the time of the faculty member’s annual performance evaluation and may be revised during the year. All levels of the promotion and/or tenure process will acknowledge and respect variations among individual allocation-of-effort statements. The promotion and tenure process at all stages will acknowledge and respect variations among individual allocation-of-effort statements in their respective assessments.

Allocation of Effort (%)							
Year	Scholarship			Teaching (Instruction) & Advising	Outreach	Service	Other
	<i>Extension</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Teaching</i>				
20xx							

Leadership. While a faculty member’s performance must be evaluated through their contributions to teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, extension and outreach, leadership is an important component. Leadership must not be considered as a separate area to be evaluated. Rather, when applicable, its value should be considered in how they affect

performance in one or more of the Four Areas of Faculty Effort.

1.1.3. Promotion and Tenure Documentation Development and Submission

It is the responsibility of each junior faculty member to maintain a current full academic CV that all assistant professors and untenured tenure-track associate professors should submit each spring (typically April 1) for review by the Departmental P&T Committee. The CV is specific with respect to content and format, as it documents performance and accomplishments including major activities, efforts, outcomes, roles, and functions, all with respect to the performance areas given by the AE statement. The format of the CV is found in Appendix 6 of the ACES P&T policy. Note that the CV outline shown in the appendix example is a generic form used by all college faculty regardless of their specialties. Therefore, candidates are advised to address and include only content applicable and relevant to their specific individual efforts and activities (i.e., skip all unneeded or inappropriate elements). The P&T Committee Chair and/or faculty mentor can assist in providing and preparing a CV template.

P&T Portfolio (formal P&T consideration). The application for promotion and tenure is formalized with the preparation of a P&T portfolio consisting of (1) Core Document and (2) Documentation File (see Appendix for portfolio preparation guidelines in accordance with NMSU P&T Policy 9.35), including external assessment letters to be solicited and inserted by the Department Head, for final consideration by the Departmental P&T Committee in the fall (typically Oct 1). Candidates are expected to prepare their portfolios following the guidelines and with *deliberate care and concern for content and readability* -- e.g., proof-read for typos and grammar. Upon request a sample P&T package will be provided to the candidate (and if sample is a copy of an actual portfolio then written permission is also to be provided). A hardcopy of the portfolio will be held in the Department Head's office; the chair will distribute a digital copy of the Core Document to each eligible committee member. The candidate may review, change, add, amend or delete any element only pertaining to the Core Document and Documentation File components of the P&T portfolio prior to the final vote of the Committee. Any tenured faculty member wishing to receive comments and suggestions regarding "progress toward promotion" to the next rank should submit their CV to the Committee in spring, generally by April 1.

1.1.4. Department P&T Committee Review, Evaluation, and Recommendation

All faculty members of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business are eligible to serve on the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, formed each fall semester. The Committee Chair is selected by majority vote from the Department's tenured full professors following a call for nominations and shall serve a two-year term (and can be re-elected). For any specific candidate consideration, deliberation, discussion and votes Committee composition can vary, however, in each case it must have no less than three members each of whom have attained at least the rank or tenure position to which the candidate is applying. For example, a committee member with rank of College Associate Professor is eligible to participate in the promotion deliberations for a candidate seeking the rank of Associate Professor; however, this member must abstain from discussions and votes pertaining to tenure. At their discretion, a faculty member may choose not to serve, and if so choosing must inform the Committee Chair in writing. Furthermore, in the event that three eligible members are not available, the Department

Head and the former Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (in consultation with the Dean) will select additional members as needed to serve on the AEAB committee from the ranks of NMSU tenured, full professors.

Because the purpose of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is to provide independent input, those individuals who make formal independent recommendations in the promotion and tenure process, such as the Department Head, the Dean of the College, and the Provost, are excluded from the committee even when they would otherwise qualify for membership. The final decisions on promotion and tenure rest with the Provost who will be given recommendations by the Dean.

The AEAB P&T Committee meets generally once during each spring and fall semester. During the fall meeting, the committee formally considers and votes on each finalized application for Promotion and Tenure. Each spring the committee is responsible for the following three separate and distinct review and recommendation processes:

- **Annual Contract Renewal (retention).** Each spring the P&T Committee reviews and evaluates the performance and progress of all untenured tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty holding academic (non-CES) positions, and reports to the Department Head whether or not a one-year contract renewal is recommended. The report includes: (1) the voting results from a secret ballot of eligible P&T Committee members present (i.e., members must be tenured to participate in this action and no proxy voting is allowed), (2) the retention recommendation based on simple majority, and (3) a description of candidate strengths and weaknesses as it pertains to retention. During the retention review process, the committee shall have access to a complete portfolio for all years including (1) the recommendations of the committee itself, (2) the Department Head's annual performance evaluation and recommendation on retention for the current year and all previous NMSU years, and (3) relevant conditions under which the candidate was employed, including all allocation of effort statements.
- **Tenure (and progress-toward-tenure).** Each spring the P&T Committee reviews and evaluates the performance and progress of **all tenure-track assistant and untenured associate professors**, and reports to the Department Head on whether or not tenure is recommended or if progress-toward-tenure is sufficient. The report includes: (1) the simple-majority voting results from a secret ballot of the eligible P&T Committee members present (i.e., members must be tenured to participate in this action and no proxy voting is allowed), (2) the tenure recommendation (based on simple majority), and (3) a description of candidate strengths and weaknesses as it pertains to tenure. The Committee also reports to the candidate feedback and guidance as to the state of progress and, as necessary, suggested actions and approaches to improve and strengthen progress. In accord with University policy, consideration for promotion and tenure of tenure-track assistant professors is concurrent and generally expected during the sixth year of appointment (see NMSU P&T Policy 9.35). The application for tenure may occur only one time.

The university provides candidates flexibility on the possibilities for extension of the probationary period for qualifying events, as contained in **ARP 9.35 Faculty Promotion and Tenure Reviews: Procedural Guidelines and Timeline.**

- Promotion (and progress-toward-promotion).** Each spring the P&T Committee reviews and evaluates the performance and progress of all assistant professors, and any other TTF or NTTF member preparing for promotion consideration during the present cycle, and reports to the Department Head on whether or not promotion is recommended or if progress-toward-promotion is sufficient. The report includes: (1) the simple-majority voting results from a secret ballot of the eligible P&T Committee members present (i.e., members must hold at least the rank to which the candidate is applying to participate in this action and no proxy voting is allowed), (2) the promotion recommendation (based on simple majority), and (3) a description of candidate strengths and weaknesses as it pertains to promotion. The Committee also reports to the candidate feedback and guidance as to the state of progress and, as necessary, suggested actions and approaches to improve and strengthen progress.

The annual review provides 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/or tenure and should take into account the allocation of work effort during the years reviewed and be based upon the principal unit's criteria. The outcome must not be used as a determinant for setting merit pay or for contract continuation decisions. These promotion and/or tenure reviews are independent of the annual performance evaluation and contract renewal reviews conducted by the Department Head.

Confidentiality of Records and Communications.

Committee meetings are closed to the general public and only members of the committee eligible to vote on a particular individual may be present during committee discussion and vote. To be considered an appropriate meeting for voting on any issue, a quorum must be present. A quorum shall be defined as a minimum of two-thirds of committee members eligible to vote on the issue. As per University guidelines, votes by proxy will not be allowed.

Without exception, all correspondence, votes and discussions related to a candidate's application for promotion and tenure will be held in strict confidence at all times. All votes taken by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee are to be by secret ballot and all discussions and outcomes related to committee matters are strictly confidential; however, confidentiality is not meant to inhibit mentoring between junior and senior faculty members. All vote counts must be recorded. The Department Head and the Dean may request a meeting with the Committee to discuss procedural matters at any time during the year.

Mid-probationary review. Tenure-track faculty members may request a formal Mid-Probationary Review. The Mid-Probationary Review is an opportunity for feedback on the Tenure-Track Faculty member/future candidate'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 (ARP 9.34, Part 3).

Portfolio Deficiencies. In cases where (1) a candidate has prepared and submitted a P&T portfolio for **formal departmental review and P&T consideration**, (2) the Committee observes errors, omissions, or otherwise substantive violations of Departmental guidelines and/or codes of conduct (e.g., integrity and honesty), and (3) corrective actions are reasonably available, the following actions are to be taken:

1. The Committee suspends determination and action on candidate's portfolio and within 2 working-days returns all portfolio documents to the candidate along with clear guidance on noted deficiencies and possible corrective actions
2. Within 5 working-days, the candidate will re-submit the corrected portfolio to the Committee for FINAL consideration
3. Committee members review the candidate's corrected portfolio and the Committee reconvenes and continues consideration and determination of the Candidate's P&T application.

Dissenting Opinions. In the event that unresolvable disagreement or difference in opinion arises amongst the Committee's members in the course of considering a candidate's portfolio, the Committee's letter of report should adequately reflect the dissenting opinions (as indicated by unanimous Committee approval of the letter) else a 'letter of dissenting opinion' is to be prepared by dissenting members and submitted to the Department Head as an addendum to the Committee's letter. The dissent letter must describe specific commendations, concerns, and recommendations in relation to Departmental criteria. The candidate must be clearly apprised of results and dissenting opinions arising from the evaluation process. If warranted, a meeting may be convened comprising the candidate, Department Head, P&T Committee Chair, and additional committee members as needed. All Committee letters and letters of dissent become part of the candidate's Departmental record.

1.1.5. Department Head

The Department Head is instrumental in the promotion and tenure process. In addition to annual performance evaluations that included in the candidate P&T core document, the Department Head has specific actions that assist in the P&T evaluation process (see 9.35 part 5). During P&T consideration, the Department Head writes and includes in the portfolio an independent evaluation/recommendation concerning each candidate's case for promotion and/or tenure in relation to promotion and tenure criteria. This recommendation may be in support of or against either promotion or tenure, or both, and should address the candidate's strengths, weaknesses, and the level and nature of accomplishments.

1.1.6. External Letters of Review and Assessment

An important element included in the core document of the candidate portfolio is the external letters of review and assessment. The Department Head has a special responsibility concerning external letters required during the tenure/promotion process (see NMSU P&T Policy 9.35 - Part 5, B). Department-specific policies are as follows: (1) the Department Head will ask the

candidate to suggest a list of at least four external reviewers, four internal reviewers, and four former undergraduate and graduate students (for candidates with teaching appointments); (2) reviewers with professional academic positions should be at or above the rank for which the candidate is applying; (3) the Department Head and P&T Committee may add names to this list, final selection of persons requested to write letters are made jointly by the Department Head and the P&T Committee Chair no later than the end of Spring semester; (4) The final list will contain at least one reviewer from the candidate's initial list, but not all of the individuals suggested by the candidate; (5) the Department Head will also select one or more independent reviewers in departments of agricultural economics and / or agricultural business at peer institutions; (5) the Department Head shall contact the reviewers and arrange for the letters and will include criteria for serving as an external reviewer, a statement of the reviewers qualifications and relationship to the candidate, and Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure; (6) the Department Head must advise reviewers that the candidate will have the opportunity to review all letters, and in the event of an EEOC or other investigation, additional parties may also review; (7) all letters received must be included in the candidate's portfolio; (8) any unsolicited letters submitted to the Department Head will be transmitted to the P&T Committee Chair and to the candidate, and all three must agree unanimously that an unsolicited letter will be placed in the candidate's portfolio; (9) the Committee may request additional information from internal or external reviewers provided that a written notice of that request is transmitted to the candidate; (10) each candidate has the right to review the complete portfolio at any time and may choose to withdraw their application from further consideration at any time.

1.1.7. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The College P&T Committee (see ACES P&T Policy Section VII C) examines each candidate's portfolio, including the Department Head's letter, and *evaluates the candidate according to Department promotion and/or tenure standards*. In its evaluation the college committee considers the candidate's department assignment and role apportionment as specified in the candidate's position description and AE statements, and makes recommendation to the Dean concerning the candidate's application (see NMSU P&T Policy 9.35 - Part 5, D). When the Department has the opportunity to elect a representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will conduct an election; all tenured, full professors will be eligible to serve on the College Committee. The election, conducted by secret ballot, will occur at the spring committee meeting and the representative must receive a majority vote of all committee members present.

1.2. Additional Departmental Promotion and Tenure Policies

1.2.1. Mentoring of Junior Faculty

The Department Head in consultation with the Departmental P&T Chair and each junior faculty member will identify a suitable mentor that will guide and mentor the junior faculty member. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to, ensuring that the junior faculty member is familiar with NMSU, College, and Departmental policies, providing orientation as necessary to assist adaptation and integration within the Department, College, University, and community, and serving as a resource for faculty development.

1.2.2. Conflict of Interest Issues and Concerns

A conflict of interest is defined as any case in which an objective outsider would reasonably suspect a conflict of interest that would result in an inability to be objective and fair in the assessment of a candidate's record. It is the responsibility of all members of the Departmental P&T Committee to avoid actual conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest. Prior to deliberations, the Departmental P&T Chair will review with the committee the matter of conflict of interest. Any member of the committee who has a conflict of interest with respect to a case will request recusal for that particular case by submitting a written memo to the chair of the committee with a copy to the Department Head. A two-thirds majority of committee members may vote to recuse a committee member who has an actual or apparent conflict of interest but who does not request recusal. The chair of the committee will submit a memo indicating the recusal to the Department Head. Recusals will be noted in any reporting of the committee vote counts.

1.2.3. Appeals (NMSU P&T Policy 9.35 - Part 9)

Peer review is an inherent part of the promotion and / or tenure process. The advisory judgments of Departmental and College promotion and tenure committees, Department Head, Dean and Executive Vice President and Provost are not, in themselves, appealable. Under the terms of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, such judgments are reviewable insofar as they may be discriminatory; otherwise, appeals of promotion and/or tenure decisions may be based only on violations of procedure or due process that are provided in the NMSU ARP.

ARP 10.60 Part 6. "A faculty member who believes that the university, college or department's promotion and tenure policy or procedures have been violated, adversely affecting the faculty member's evaluation, promotion, or tenure may file a grievance pursuant to ARP 10.60 (Faculty Grievance Review and Resolution)."

In accordance with ARP 10.60 Part 6, such grievance shall be submitted in writing within 30 days of formal notification of the University's Promotion and Tenure decision.

ARP 10.60 provides an opportunity for mediation, and in the event mediation is not successful, review by a panel of faculty peers (i.e., Faculty Grievance Review Board or FGRB) which hears evidence presented and issues factual findings and recommendations on the issue of whether or not the rules governing evaluation, promotion or tenure were violated.

1.2.4. Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review follows the process of an annual review designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, service, extension, outreach and other assigned areas. The Performance Evaluation generally serves the above aim; however, if deemed necessary by the Department Head due to deficiencies, a more extensive review may be initiated. The Department Head may request a post-tenure review of faculty members by the P&T Committee in accordance with NMSU P&T Policy 9.36.

DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE AND DOCUMENTATION

1.3. General Criteria for Faculty Performance, Promotion and Tenure

In applying for promotion and/or tenure a faculty member takes responsibility for providing the basis for appraisal of their performances, professional maturity and likelihood of continued contributions and success. Application and evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure is among the most significant and vital processes undertaken by the University. During this process, careful and deliberate consideration is given to each of the principle mission-critical areas of University activity, specifically the areas of:

- Scholarship (research and extension)
- Teaching (instruction) and Advising
- Outreach and Extension Engagement
- Service
- Leadership

As individual effort varies across each of these areas, consideration is based on the cumulative record of allocation-of-effort statements. At all levels of evaluation, judgments must be made based on an individual's responsibilities and performance. These judgments should recognize that each faculty member has unique responsibilities. Likewise, the candidate must be aware that advancement through the academic ranks requires not only excellence in the candidate's discipline, but also evidence of developing the professional stature and maturity of view expected of those in the professorial ranks (see NMSU P&T Policy 9.33).

Underlying specific guidelines, standards, and benchmarks is the Department's commitment to the shared core values of integrity, respect, trust, professionalism, and excellence. The Department gives careful and deliberate consideration to performance in each area, and uses both internal and external peer-assessment and judgment as a basis for evaluation. In general, the Department's evaluation criteria consider the extent that specific activities, duties, and/or outcomes are:

- (1) Relevant.
University, College, Department and Profession goals and missions are reflected in the candidate's performance.
- (2) Well- and responsibly-executed.
Principles of honesty, integrity and objectivity are maintained in the process.
- (3) Effective.
Intended goals and objectives are achieved and intended audiences served, and potential exists for meaningful outcomes, impacts, and contributions.

The Department does not define nor quantify specific numerical targets that would insure promotion and/or tenure. Rather, the Departmental P&T Committee considers each candidate's academic performance with respect to cumulative AE statements. Success in the promotion and tenure process is achieved by demonstrating satisfactory performance in all major areas identified by the 'allocation of effort,' and outstanding performance in at least one

area. Outstanding performance can be demonstrated, for example, by publishing success, grants and external funding, teaching recognitions and outstanding evaluations, and recurring recognition of high quality extension/outreach performance.

1.4. Research and Extension Scholarship (NMSU P&T Policy 9.31 - Part 3, D)

In evaluating research and extension scholarship the Department considers a range of scholarly products and processes (i.e., those strongly correlated with furthering the development of knowledge and information) including: (1) discovery, (2) synthesis, (3) integration, (4) dissemination, (5) application, and (6) skill acquisition. The Department also recognizes many important and relevant activities and outcomes associated with research and extension programs, but which are better associated with other performance categories i.e., either extension engagement or service. Among valued efforts and activities that might be judged primarily as “non-scholarly,” include activities and outcomes such as stakeholder engagement, community awareness and education, event planning, expert-based services, program communications, county and regional support, and demonstration projects. Admittedly, there are often no clear boundaries between scholarship and outreach (or extension engagement) – and often many externally funded projects require aspects of both. However, in developing annual Allocation-of-Effort statements, faculty should carefully consider their planned research and extension activities and programs, and attempt to distinguish between those that are fundamentally scholarship (and to which the guidelines below best apply) and those that are principally outreach, extension engagement, or service (and performance assessed under their respective guidelines). Any significant uncertainties should be discussed with the Department Head to ensure broad consistency with the annual Allocation-of-Effort statements, annual performance reviews, and Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluation.

Scholarship Guidelines. The Department highly values scholarship in areas of both research and extension, and expects that candidates for promotion and tenure will demonstrate scholarly activities and outcomes that are relevant, well-executed, and effective. Examples of scholarly activities and outcomes that are important for candidates to demonstrate and reviewers to evaluate include published works, external funding efforts, and extension efforts, programs and outcomes. The following Scholarship Guidelines (following Diamond) provide insight and guidance for such demonstration:

Candidates are expected to document and/or exhibit scholarly activities and outcomes that, in general:

- a) Express purposes, goals, and objectives that are clear and meaningful
- b) Demonstrate a high level of expertise
- c) Use methods and procedures appropriate to the activity, and which are executed in accord with principles of honesty, integrity and objectivity
- d) Achieve goals and outcomes with potential for meaningful and significant impacts
- e) Communicate, show, or present materials effectively and appropriately for selected audiences
- f) Be judged meritorious and significant by one’s peers

- g) Find that the scholar has assessed the impact of the activity and outcomes on the greater community and reflects upon this assessment to improve, extend, revise and integrate subsequent work.

Published works and other scholarly products are hallmarks that elevate and extend knowledge, credibility, and visibility not only for the individual, but for the Department, College and University. These accomplishments can be (1) indicators of performance, success and excellence; (2) evidence of intellectual accomplishment and expertise; and (3) demonstrations for scholarship relevance, execution, effectiveness, and leadership. In addition to peer-reviewed articles, there are many additional publishing pathways and deliverables that are vital to University, College, and Departmental missions, including books, book chapters, research reports, research presentations, software development, pedagogical systems, peer-reviewed curricula, extension publications, web sites and web-based publications, general periodicals, and presentations.

Performance Metrics and Measures. With high regard for published works and scholarly products as a basis for establishing scholarly credentials, in particular works that are peer-reviewed such as journal articles, the Department has developed a general, unified framework to guide scholarly performance and evaluation for all AEAB research and extension faculty. This framework is useful for (1) providing comparable performance benchmarks for a wide variety of scholarly products and deliverables, and (2) scaling performance benchmarks to allocated efforts. Using the concept of a *Peer-Review Publication Equivalent (PRPE)* -- defined as “one first-authored publication in a recognized, peer-reviewed academic journal” -- the framework is shown in Exhibit 1. All published works must be valid and verifiable to the candidate, and the candidate’s CV must clearly and appropriately indicate the status of all yet-to-be-published works, e.g., works *in review*, *accepted*, *forthcoming*, or *in press*.

NMSU P&T Policy describes eight general components of extension scholarship that may be applied to extension faculty members. Principal units will provide specific criteria for evaluating CES faculty.

There are common elements that ACES principal units could include in their evaluation of evidence of professional maturity in extension programming such as:

- Expertise in subject matter
- Ability to relate subject matter to broader fields
- Leadership in program development
- Professional services to extension programming
- Reputation among current and former clientele
- Reputation among peers
- Insight into future needs of society and directions of discipline by developing programs based on locally identified needs, concerns, and/or issues, targeting specific audiences;
- setting goals and objectives for the program;
- reviewing current literature and/or research for the program;
- planning appropriate program delivery;
- documenting changes in clientele knowledge, behaviors, attitudes, and/or skills;
- conducting a reflective critique and/or evaluation of the program;

- validation of the program by peers and/or stakeholders; and
- communicating results to stakeholders and decision makers through texts, publications and other materials published or developed for Extension education

1.4.1.1. **External Funding**

All faculty are strongly encouraged and generally expected to participate in securing external funding. External funding not only is important to the research- and land-grant mission of the University and College but is a fundamental input to a successful research program and to provide essential research funding for graduate student recruitment and retention. A general guideline is for research and extension faculty to (1) demonstrate external funding activity through proposal submissions, and (2) generate (on average) annual external funding sufficient to supplement program activities and/or support graduate student assistantships consistent with their allocation-of-effort. For example, graduate student support of 0.15 graduate students (i.e., ~\$4,000) per 10% of research effort (or equivalently yearly support for 1.0 students – about \$24,000 for a 60% research effort) is a useful guideline. Extension faculty are expected to pursue external funding, as appropriate and at levels that will generate additional support for their activities and programs.

Exhibit 1. Peer-Reviewed Publication Equivalents (PRPE) for a Variety of Alternative Scholarly Activity Outcomes Assessed by the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business (AEAB)

Scholarly Activity Outcomes ¹	Default PRPE ²
Peer-Reviewed Journal Article	1.0
Book Chapter	0.5
Book	1.5 – 2.5
Reports: (Peer-reviewed Research and Extension Reports, Foundation reports, published ‘White Papers,’ etc.)	0.5
Extension Guides and Publications	0.33
Proposal Submissions: (must be PI or Co-PI)	
Select value as appropriate to effort and success from either:	
Unfunded	0.20 – 0.50
Funded	0.50 – 1.0
Research Presentation: (Professional Association, Client/member groups, etc)	0.33
Informational or Informal Presentation: (non-research, general audience, etc.)	0.10
Published Abstracts	0.10
Extension, Education and Outreach Models and Programs	
Web-Site Design and Development	0.5 – 1.0
Software Development (e.g., model, program to user)	0.5 – 1.0
Curriculum Development	0.20 – 1.0
Patents and/or significant intellectual property ³	1.0 – 2.0

Notes:

1. This list of outcomes is suggestive of the most common types of scholarly outcomes meritorious of evaluation. Candidates are encouraged to provide a narrative or an amendment that describes additional activities for consideration.
2. Default PRPE will be generally applicable. However, the candidate may provide additional supportive evidence for consideration by individual P&T committee members if an alternative weight might be considered meritorious.
3. Intellectual property are valued academic outcomes developed through creative pursuits and scholarship and which are conveyed to the University, e.g., U.S. Patent 7,703,671
US Patent Search: <http://patft.uspto.gov/netahtml/PTO/srchnum.htm>

1.4.1.2. Guidance on Effort and Expected Performance

To allow for scalability and comparability of differences in effort-allocations, the Department defines an Effort-Month (EM) of scholarly activity as the effort commensurate with that used to teach a regular 3 credit hour course. For each effort-month the benchmark standard of scholarship performance is demonstrated by exhibiting 0.33 PRPE. For example, one PRPE is expected for each 30% research effort (or 3 months). For an Assistant Professor with a 60% research effort this would equate to 12.0 PRPE (~ 2 PRPE/yr) over the six-year performance period. Section 2.9 describes general guidelines and benchmarks for effort scalability and comparability across all performance areas.

1.5. Teaching (Instruction) and Advising (NMSU P&T Policy 9.31 - Part 3, C)

Teaching is central to NMSU's mission. For those who teach, effectiveness in teaching and advising is an essential criterion for tenure and for advancement in rank. Categories on teaching and on advising includes all forms of university-level instructional activity, as well as advising undergraduate and graduate students, both within and outside the university community. Successful candidates for promotion and / or tenure will have exhibited a distinct ability to interact with the students on many levels that comprise the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Business.

1.5.1. Teaching (instruction)

The Department considers evidence of quality instruction and learning achievement as demonstrated by evaluated ratings of success and effectiveness based on (1) student evaluations (normally a 3.0 or higher overall instructor rating for each class taught); (2) peer assessments (faculty colleagues); and (3) external observation (e.g., Department Head, teaching experts from the Teaching Academy). Whereas teaching performance is outcome-based, in accounting for allocation-of-effort, teaching effort is based on University standards of expected time commitment. For example, a 12-hour teaching load (i.e., four 3-hr classes) is considered full-time (i.e., 100%) by the University. Taught over a 4 month semester, a time commitment of approximately one month per class is the norm (i.e., 1 effort-month per 3-hr class). Following this guideline, the Department generally credits 1 effort-month (i.e., 10% allocated effort) for each *previously* taught 3-hr course (or pro-rated equivalent). For newly developed courses or those undergoing substantial revision (i.e., those within the initial two semesters of delivery), additional effort consideration of 5% per new course is given. The Department expects each candidate to conduct a student evaluation for each course taught using a standard Department student evaluation form. As a general guideline, the Department expects a 3.0 student evaluation rating for acceptable teaching performance and at least a 3.5 for outstanding teaching performance. Additionally by the third year, the candidate is expected to request and obtain peer teaching evaluations, at least one from a Department colleague and one from an NMSU faculty member outside the Department.

1.5.2. Student Advising

The Department and ACES College encourages and promotes one-on-one, faculty-member-to-

student advising at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Student advising is a vital activity and role for faculty in academic positions, and participation and quality delivery is expected. Evidence of advising quality is demonstrated by student letters of support, reports of advising value in student exit-interviews, and by peer-observation. In addition to account for variation in faculty effort and numbers of students advised, and the differences in efforts required to advise graduate students (e.g., where faculty are advisors and committee chairs and where faculty are committee members in a supporting role), advising effort is assessed based on committed time as reported on the annual allocation-of-effort. The Department uses the following guidelines:

- (1) Undergraduate (UG): 4 hr/year/student = 0.25% per UG student
 - (2) Graduate Non-Chair/advisor (GR-NC): 20 hr/year/student = 1.25% per GR-NC student
 - (3) Graduate Chair/advisor (GR-C): 40 hr/year/student = 2.5% per GR-C
- e.g., typical advising load (10 UG, 2 GR-NC, 2 GR-C): 2.5% + 2.5% + 5% = 10%

1.6. Outreach and Extension Engagement (NMSU P&T Policy 9.31 - Part 3, E, and ACES P&T Policy VI, D)

Outreach and extension engagement are essential to the University and ACES mission, establishing important linkages, relationships, and information pathways to the public, and promoting economic development through the dissemination of new technologies and best practices; and serving as a basis for sustainable, community-oriented, informal education that addresses local needs. Outreach and extension engagement activities may benefit affiliated professional service organizations as well as help build long- term relationships between NMSU and its stakeholders. Faculty who conduct outreach programs generate and apply knowledge to address community needs without necessarily engaging community input.

Outreach and Extension Engagement Examples. Faculty activities, efforts and contributions can include technology transfer, presentations at grower meetings or field days, advice to industry, local and state government, publications and presentations, and educational programs for K-12 audiences or student recruitment. In addition, input from clientele is always a part of outreach and extension engagement activities.

Evaluation of Outreach and Extension Engagement. The weight given to outreach and extension engagement activities during evaluation may vary considerably based on committed time and efforts of the faculty member and the significance of the activity. In accounting for allocation-of-effort, outreach and extension engagement are based primarily on committed time. For example, time commitments vary with type of outreach and extension engagement provided and time commitments should be estimated and included in discussions with the Department Head. Evaluation should focus on the activity’s importance relative to the candidate’s professional expertise, the work’s creative and intellectual merits and the potential impact on stakeholders. Evidence of quality extension engagement and outreach programs is demonstrated by peer and stakeholder assessments, the number and types of publications, external funding

activities, events and activities, and external observation or verification.

1.7. Service (NMSU P&T Policy 9.31 - Part 3, F)

Service is an essential component of the University's mission and requires that faculty members contribute to the organization and development of the University, as well as provide service to any local, state, national, or international agency, organization, or institution needing the faculty member's professional knowledge and skills. Satisfactory service is expected of all successful candidates for promotion and/or tenure.

Service Activity Examples. Service may be to students (prospective and enrolled), the institution (Department, College or University), government agencies (local, state, national or international), professional organizations, industry, stakeholders or the community. Professional service is involvement in state, regional, national, and international groups within the candidate's field and contributions to the University. Service activities are numerous and variable. College and university service also can include work in non-Departmental, College or University committees, graduate council and faculty senate. Examples of professional service include holding positions in professional associations, serving on editorial review boards or as editor of a professional journal, writing articles for newsletters and participating in media activities. Public service examples include volunteer assistance or appointment to government agencies or boards, involvement in public service organizations or community service activities, and collaboration with state, national and international agencies and organizations. Service to industry, stakeholders and the community may include assistance to producer and trade organizations, involvement in civic organizations and participation in community projects.

Evaluation of Service. Service is generally expected of all faculty members. Evaluation of time, effort and contribution vary with assigned duties and specific faculty interest and expertise. The focus of service evaluation should be on demonstrating the activity's importance relative to the candidate's professional expertise and the University's mission and the quality of contribution. In accounting for allocation-of-effort, service is based on committed time, and time commitments should be estimated and included in discussions with the Department Head. For example, time commitments vary with type and role of committee service, with leadership positions demanding higher levels. As a general guideline, a committee that meets once a month for two hours (i.e., 2 hr/month/committee) accrues a 1.25% time commitment (4 such committees = 5%). Leadership roles may command significantly more time and effort, e.g., Committee Chair may require eight hr/month/committee (5% per Chair). Letters of support from service activity leaders, colleagues, advisees, contractors, or committee members could be valuable tools for evaluation purposes.

1.8. Other

Other activities are non-routine functions that the faculty and the Department agree upon but are related to the expertise of the faculty member. Examples include short-term international assignments, expert testimony or administrative responsibilities. Other activities are not expected for a successful application for promotion and / or tenure; however, as they arise the allocation-of-effort statement should reflect activities and efforts in this area in consultation with the Department Head.

APPENDICES

APPENDEIX A: CV and P&T Portfolio Preparation

Candidates are responsible for preparing and submitting a copy of a promotion and tenure portfolio composed of a core document and documentation file. The principal unit also submits an electronic version of the core document to the college. Portfolios should not be unduly burdensome on either the candidate or other parties to the process. Adherence to format guidelines is helpful and generally expected, including the overall page limit.

In general, promotion consideration is given to performance over the period since the last promotion (i.e., ‘period under review’). Therefore, material not pertaining to the period under review should not be included. Also quality of the documentation and not the quantity of materials submitted is of primary importance. The candidate’s **portfolio** consists of two parts: (1) the “Core Document,” and (2) the “Documentation File.”

(1) Core Document

The following core document elements must be submitted in this order. The combination of items 4 through 6 **shall not exceed 50 pages**:

- 1) **Routing Form** with spaces for the required signatures (available from Dean’s office)
- 2) **Cover Sheet** indicating the candidate’s name, current rank, department and college, and rank to which the applicant is applying to be promoted or tenured.
- 3) Any written documentation generated throughout the promotion and tenure process, including annual recommendations from the principal-unit promotion and tenure committee and the numerical vote counts of the promotion and tenure committee(s); these materials will be provided by evaluators at each step of the process (See NMSU P&T Policy, 9.31)
- 4) **Table of Contents**
- 5) Candidate’s **Executive Summary** (well-reasoned summary interests, responsibilities, competence, contributions, ongoing activities and noteworthy circumstances.)
- 6) **Curriculum Vitae (CV)** - see below for format and structure
- 7) **Annual performance evaluations** by Department Head **for the period under review**, including all allocation-of-effort statements and written statements submitted by the faculty member as a part of, or in response to, the principal-unit administrator or supervisor’s comments. Numerical rankings, ratings or vote counts must be removed from annual performance evaluations.
- 8) **External Reviews**
- 9) Once the core document has been submitted to the College, any requested change, addition or deletion should be submitted to the PUA along with a letter of transmittal. The PUA and the P&T Committee Chair will present this information to the College Committee when it meets about this candidate.

(2) Documentation File

The Documentation File contains supplementary materials provided by the candidate related to

the areas of activity. This material is not routed beyond the College P&T Committee but is available for review. The Documentation File is an important element of the candidate’s portfolio submission. At a minimum the documentation file **MUST** include copies (either hardcopy or digital as prescribed by the Departmental P&T Chair) of all cited journal publications and other published works (e.g., book chapters, technical reports) – do not include proposals or presentations. Each item should be matched with a corresponding **complete and correct** citations in the candidate’s CV. Any discrepancy between the CV citation and the Documentation File must be addressed and explanation inserted at the citation point in the CV.

In the case of an application for tenure, the candidate is to include evidence of contributions since starting at NMSU. If this is an application for promotion, then the candidate is to include evidence of contributions since the last promotion or tenure review.

Curriculum Vitae (CV) Outline and Format

I) General

- A) Name
- B) Current rank/present position
- C) Principal unit
- D) College
- E) Educational background
- F) Previous professional experience

II) Allocation of Effort

Annual percent teaching, research, extension, outreach, service, leadership and other assigned responsibilities for each year (present your annual allocation of effort in tabulated form using your annual allocation of effort forms)

Allocation of Effort (%)								
Year	Scholarship			Teaching (instruction)	Advising	Out- reach	Service	Other
	Extension	Research	Teach- ing					
2014								

III) Scholarship and Creative Activities for the period under review

- A) Extension scholarship and creative activities
 - 1) Candidate should provide a narrative that describes the candidate’s extension philosophy and program goals and demonstrates the ability to generate, transmit and apply research-based knowledge with the intent of improving others’ quality of life. Extension scholarship and creative activity is demonstrated by developing educational programs that meet needs identified by the community and that maintain mutually beneficial collaborations between NMSU and its partners, stakeholders and the general public.
 - 2) Evidence of extension scholarship and creative activity for the review period should focus on significant accomplishments within the candidate’s documented plan(s) of work as follows: (Refer to **Appendix 3** – Extension Program Excellence and Scholarship.)
 - (a) Major programming efforts
 - (i) Situation statements of programming needs as identified by advisory groups and clientele

- (ii) Description of target audiences
- (iii) Description of candidate's role in programming
- (iv) Clear, concise documentation of program efforts related to identified goals and objectives in areas such as:
 - Educational programs, workshops and trainings
 - County agent or specialist interactions
 - Curriculum development
 - Development of public relations tools, including print, radio and television media
 - Grants secured and maintained
 - Partnerships developed and agency or community collaborations
 - Teaching resources, curriculum and tools
 - Web site development and electronic resources
- (v) Evaluation (process, outcomes and/or impacts)
- (b) Publications
 - (i) Publications developed individually or in collaboration with others. Organize by type beginning with the most recent year. Consult a standard bibliographic reference for a citation style that is complete and accurate. Copies of publications may be included in the candidate's documentation file.
 - (ii) A state-level extension publication that has gone through a peer review process and has been assigned an appropriate extension number for identification is considered a publication. The publication must be cited as an original or adapted work.
 - (iii) At the county level, a publication that has been developed, produced and reviewed by colleagues in support of an educational program and required a high degree of original work by the extension faculty member may qualify as a publication. The publication must be cited as an original or adapted work.
 - (iv) Publications may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Conference papers
 - Educational popular or trade publications
 - Educational program materials
 - Electronic media and educational tools (PowerPoint presentations requiring major effort, Web site development, eXtension curricula, conference proceedings via the Internet)
 - Extension bulletins, circulars and guides
 - 4-H curricula, project books and green tops
 - Graduate thesis
 - Newsletter articles
 - Peer-reviewed publications
 - Refereed journal articles and abstracts
- (c) Professional presentations and activities: (Note: Candidate's role should be indicated, such as invited speaker, moderator, panel member, paper or poster presenter, review team, task force member or other role.)
 - (i) CES in-service trainings
 - (ii) Civic groups
 - (iii) Annual CES conferences
 - (iv) Judging venues
 - (v) Professional societies and organizations
 - (vi) Trade organizations
- (d) Special honors, awards or other recognition of excellence in extension
- B) Research scholarship and creative activities**
 - 1) Candidate should provide a narrative describing research scholarship and creative activities as evidenced by research philosophy and program goals, professional merit and expertise, as

- well as the impact that the scholarship and creative activities are making in New Mexico and the candidate's discipline. The results of this activity will normally find expression through accepted channels or media in the candidate's respective area(s) of expertise.
- 2) Evidence of research scholarship and creative activities:
 - (a) List of research areas, titles and sources of funding
 - (b) Nature and scope of research areas including responsibility in the above projects
 - (i) Scientific leadership roles (Explain nature of responsibilities.)
 - (ii) Administrative leadership roles (Explain nature of responsibilities.)
 - (iii) Other
 - (c) List of research products and creative achievements
 - (i) List of publications grouped by type. Citation style may follow any form used in the candidate's discipline; all citations must be complete and accurate. Candidate should have a copy of each publication in the documentation file:
 - Books
 - Book chapters
 - Experiment Station publications
 - Extension circulars
 - Juried exhibitions
 - Proceedings
 - Popular or trade publications
 - Refereed journal articles
 - Review articles
 - Technical reports
 - Other publications such as published abstracts
 - (d) Papers and/or posters presented before professional societies (Indicate if "invited.")
 - (e) Speeches and talks, other than those listed above, related to research activities
 - (f) Invited grant-review panels, task forces, etc.
 - (g) Special honors, awards or other recognition of excellence in research
- C) Teaching scholarship and creative activities**
- 1) Candidate should provide a narrative that demonstrates the ability to develop, test and evaluate new teaching ideas and products. The results or outcomes from such activities will be presented as products (See 2 below.).
 - 2) Evidence of teaching scholarship
 - (a) Books and manuals
 - (b) Educational magazines
 - (c) Handbooks or workbooks
 - (d) Invited panels, review teams or task forces
 - (e) Presentations (e.g., local, regional, national)
 - (f) Refereed journal articles
 - (g) Refereed Web-based educational materials
 - (h) Other publications such as abstracts
 - 3) Possible areas of teaching scholarship
 - (a) Comparing and contrasting various modalities for delivery of instruction
 - (b) Creating, revising and/or testing assessment tools
 - (c) Developing new educational strategies
 - (d) Developing and testing educational materials
 - (e) Educational consulting
 - (f) Empirically testing a pedagogical model

IV) Teaching And Advising For The Period Under Review

- A) Candidate should provide a narrative covering the candidate's teaching and advising responsibilities, teaching and advising philosophy, and the impacts of these activities. This

statement should describe the candidate's expertise in the discipline; skill in arousing interest and evoking responses in students; and skill in stimulating students to think critically, to understand the interrelationship of fields of knowledge and application of the knowledge to real-life problems.

B) Evidence of teaching and advising

- 1) Teaching responsibility
 - (a) General instruction area
 - (b) Nature of courses taught (e.g., service type vs. for majors)
 - (c) Special instructional aids and facilities used (e.g., technology, case studies, help sessions, field trips)
 - (d) Nature of subject matter (e.g., stable, changing, affecting preparation effort required)
- 2) Teaching load (Items a through e should be in a table format.)
 - (a) Percentage of allocation of effort for teaching
 - (b) Undergraduate courses taught (regular semesters and summer)
 - (c) Graduate courses taught
 - (d) Number of students per course
 - (e) Number of course credits and student credit hours produced
- 3) Teaching performance
 - (a) Peer evaluations
 - (b) Student course evaluations (Summarize in table format; original student evaluations should not appear in the core document.)
 - (c) Letters from former students
 - (d) Self-improvement activities related to teaching
 - (e) Other evidence
- 4) Professional service to teaching
 - (a) Development of instructional resources for others
 - (b) Assistance to other teachers, researchers and courses (guest lectures, etc.)
 - (c) Committee memberships related to teaching at the departmental, college, university, regional or national levels
 - (d) Relevant consulting activities
- 5) Special honors, awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching
- 6) Academic advising
 - (a) Methods used
 - (b) Number of undergraduate advisees
 - (c) Number of graduate advisees
 - (d) Number of international-student advisees
 - (e) Special advising activities
 - (f) Effectiveness (student and peer evaluations/input)
- 7) Other advising services to students
 - (a) Greek organizations
 - (b) Honor societies
 - (c) Judging teams
 - (d) Research projects
 - (e) Student clubs
 - (f) Other

V) Outreach for the period under review

- A)** Candidate should provide a narrative that demonstrates the ability to generate, transmit, apply and preserve knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with NMSU's mission. This narrative will describe the candidate's work with advisory groups,

volunteers, stakeholders, agencies, K-12 students and educators, and organizations in developing collaborations and implementing program objectives. By its very nature, the impact of outreach contributions is difficult to assess. Because impact analysis may not be possible, evidence of activity is important. Supporting letters and other assessments are encouraged.

B) Evidence of outreach (The following is not an exhaustive list.)

- 1) Technology transfer
- 2) Presentations to stakeholders
 - (a) Grower-group field days
 - (b) K-12
- 3) Recruitment and mentoring activities
 - (a) Types and numbers of recruitment activities
 - (b) Mentoring of students (e.g., hosting interns)

VI) Service For The Period Under Review

A) Candidate should provide a narrative that demonstrates the ability to serve the principal unit, college, university and the broader clientele community. Service generally includes contributions to the organization and development of the principal unit, college and university, and service to any local, state, national or international agency or institution needing the specific benefits to be derived from the candidate's professional knowledge and skills (e.g., committee memberships, task forces, mentoring other faculty and meetings attended). By its very nature, the impact of service contributions is difficult, if not impossible, to assess. Because impact analysis may not be possible, evidence of activity is critical. Supporting letters and other assessments are encouraged.

B) Evidence of service:

- 1) Principal unit
- 2) College
- 3) University
- 4) Community
- 5) State
- 6) Nation
- 7) International
- 8) Profession
- 9) Special honors, awards or other recognition of excellence in service

VII) Other for the period under review

C) Candidate should provide a narrative that describes involvement in leadership and other professional activities that are useful to the university, contribute to the growth and development of the faculty member, and/or produce benefits in areas not encompassed or reported in previous sections of the curriculum vitae. Types of activities that are appropriate for inclusion in this section could include administrative assignments (e.g., task force chair with separate appointment line or release time, chair of the faculty senate, or acting department head for a limited time period); international activities; professional development; or anything that does not clearly fit in one of the previous sections of the curriculum vitae.)

D) Evidence of activity in this area must not have been reported in previous sections of the curriculum vitae and should focus on the following:

- 1) Type of activity, including duration and level of involvement
- 2) Measures of utility, contribution or benefit expressed in a format that is comparable to other forms of evidence that are acceptable for other sections of the curriculum vitae.

APPENDIX B: Extension Program Excellence and Scholarship

New Mexico State University Extension Faculty achieve scholarly excellence by generating and applying knowledge addressing community needs through mutually beneficial collaborations between NMSU and its partners, stakeholders and publics. The following are extension's benchmarks of scholastic excellence:

Definition of Extension Program Excellence

1. Developing educational programs based on locally identified benchmarks (needs, concerns and/or issues)
2. Targeting audiences
3. Setting goals and objectives
4. Reviewing current literature and/or research
5. Planning appropriate program delivery
6. Documenting clientele knowledge, behaviors, attitudes and/or skill changes (transformational education)
7. Conducting a reflective critique of program(s)
8. Validating programs by peers
9. Communicating results broadly

Core Competencies of Extension Faculty

1. Subject-matter expertise
2. Networking and communication skills
3. Program development, delivery and evaluation skills

Collaborative Nature of Extension Program Excellence

1. Extension faculty network with university research and teaching faculty in identified areas of program discovery, development and delivery.
2. Extension faculty collaborate with others to identify local needs, garner resources, discover and adapt new knowledge, design and deliver programs, assess clientele knowledge, behaviors, attitudes and/or skill changes and communicate program results.

Benchmarks for Validating Extension Program Excellence

1. Address clientele needs, concerns and/or issues
2. Provide clientele with useful breadth and/or depth of knowledge
3. Produce planned changes in:
 - o Social, economic and/or environmental conditions
 - o Learning or behavior
4. Create insights regarding target audiences

Documenting Extension Program Excellence

1. Document process of identifying local needs and situation
2. Document program objectives
3. Document impacts related to program objectives
4. Cite the research base for educational program methods
5. Document feedback to the research community
6. Document program results measured against benchmarks
7. Communicate through peer-reviewed means and audience-oriented media