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The mission of the College of Education is to:

- Develop and strengthen the capacity of educators to serve an increasingly linguistically and ethnically diverse student population in ways so that each student is successful.
- Conduct research and disseminate the results in order to improve professional practice and contribute to the knowledge base in our fields of study.
- Engage in outreach activities aimed at improving educational practice and policy.
- Provide educational leadership to the state and nation.

The College of Education’s mission corresponds with the mission of the University of Nevada, Reno as a land grant institution. The mission of the College of Education is to use intellectual and creative energy to improve the condition of education and students as well as their families by developing outstanding education professionals and by producing good scholarship aimed at improving professional practice.

The faculty members of the College of Education strive to attain a substantial record of scholarship that contributes to the realization of its mission. All faculty members bring different strengths to the College of Education and its programs, but certain basic expectations apply to all faculty in the College of Education. All faculty must:

1. establish their credentials as scholars;
2. strive to be excellent teachers and mentors with concern for the professional development of their students;
3. keep abreast of developments in their fields and remain professionally active throughout their careers;
4. reflect the highest standard of professional integrity;
5. have their work assessed in a variety of meaningful ways; and
6. be committed to the improvement of professional practice.

The diversity of people and programs in the College of Education necessitates flexible and sensitive application of these ideals.

Who Are Faculty?

Please see section 2.3.2 Faculty within the University Bylaws for definitions of academic and administrative faculty. [http://www.unr.edu/facultysenate/bylaws/UNR%20Bylaws/unr-bylaws-11-18-09.pdf]

Organization of the Document

The initial portion of this document provides links to the NSHE Code and the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws that pertain to evaluation and merit. Subsequently, a discussion of the relationship of role statements to the evaluation process is included. This information is followed by introductory or philosophical statements related to (a) teaching, (b) research, scholarly, and creative work, (c) and professional service to the university, profession, and public. Each of these sections includes relevant information from the College of Education Bylaws and the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws. (Given the relationship between the evaluation process and the promotion and tenure process, the Personnel Committee used the philosophical statements previously developed for the promotion and tenure document). These philosophical statements lead to a discussion of priority and supporting activities for (a) teaching, (b) research, scholarly, and creative work, (c) and professional service to the university, profession, and public. Priority activities are specified for all faculty while supporting activities are delineated by academic rank. Given that actions might occur where faculty feel there is an adverse impact on employment conditions, the Personnel Committee thought it important to include information regarding grievance procedures (through links to the relevant documents / websites from the NSHE and/or
University Bylaws that specify the process to follow). Finally, the document concludes with Appendix A listing examples of supporting documentation that a faculty member could choose to attach to the annual evaluation document.

EVALUATION

The Nevada System of Higher Education Code

The NSHE Code http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Handbook/TITLE-2---/index.htm provides information regarding the evaluation process. Relevant sections are

Section 5.12 Evaluation

Section 5.13 Annual Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws

Chapters III and IV of the UNR Bylaws outline policies and procedures for evaluation, merit, and tenure. Please see detailed comments about these topics at the following link: http://www.unr.edu/facultysenate/bylaws/UNR%20Bylaws/unr-bylaws-11-18-09.pdf

Relevant sections of the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws include:

Section 3: Faculty Personnel Policies

3.3 Professional Responsibilities, Evaluation, and Personnel Recommendations

3.4 Tenure (there is also information relevant to the annual evaluation process)

Merit

Although the evaluation and merit processes are separate, they are related. According to the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws 3.3.2, an overall evaluation of excellent or commendable shall be considered “meritorious.” Section 3.3.3 goes on to state “The purpose of meritorious evaluations should be perceived by the faculty and administration alike not only as the rewarding of excellence, but as an opportunity for each faculty member to assess his or her performance within the academic community and to improve that performance with reference to specific and uniform written criteria applied by each department or appropriate unit in the evaluation process. Moreover, it is understood that a meritorious evaluation is a matter of academic record, a recognition of performance deserving of special note, regardless of the current availability of funds for direct merit award.”

Currently, “merit is a fixed-step system based on accurate performance evaluations which are based upon accurate goal/role statements” (Retrieved on February 10, 2011 from http://www.unr.edu/hr/documents/employeeperformance/FacultyMerit.pdf). Faculty can earn evaluation ratings of excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory; merit can be granted for ratings of commendable or excellent.

The current steps and merit levels are:

Step 1 Commendable
Step 2 Commendable
Step 3 Excellent
Step 4 Excellent
Step 6 Extraordinary Merit

The dollar amounts associated with each merit step are determined at the provost level.

The following eligibility requirements are in place within the university:
• All continuing annual renewable “A” or “B” contract faculty (.5 FTE or more) hired on or before September 1 of the current year are eligible to participate in the merit process.
• Continuing Rank “0” faculty are eligible to participate in the merit process.
• Faculty who have changed positions with no change in pay during the current year are eligible to participate in the merit process.

It is important to note that academic or administrative faculty who will advance in rank or range and receive a 10% increase to salary effective July 1 are not eligible for an additional merit award on July 1. Administrative faculty who have received an advance in range and an increase to salary between July 1 and June 30 of the current fiscal year are not eligible for an additional merit award on July 1 of the subsequent fiscal year. (Retrieved on February 10, 2011 from http://www.unr.edu/hr/documents/employeeperformance/FacultyMerit.pdf).

The College of Education Merit Process

The College of Education merit process conforms to the university merit and evaluation process as outlined in the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws. The level of merit recommended is based on the annual evaluation ratings, with recognition that there are steps within the merit system. That is, there are two steps for a rating of “excellent” and two steps for a rating of “commendable.” These steps can be reflected as follows: Two faculty members can both receive ratings of “excellent” in, as an example, research. However, one faculty member might have had a book published, five refereed journal articles, five refereed national presentations, and three refereed state conference presentations. The other faculty member might have earned an “excellent” with three refereed journal articles, four refereed national presentations, and one refereed state presentation. Clearly, the determining authority has the flexibility of awarding differing merit levels, even though the annual evaluation rating was the same. Similar incidents can occur in the areas of teaching and service.

It is important to note that the College of Education Bylaws state that “annual merit recognition usually indicates encouragement toward tenure and promotion, but does not necessarily mean that all the requirements for tenure and/or promotion are being met” (section 18).

EVALUATION AND MERIT TIMELINES

Evaluation and Merit Timelines

Each fall, the Dean sets a specific timeline for the evaluation and merit process and shares that information with the associate deans and directors.

If materials are submitted prior to December 31 for the year under review and a faculty member receives notification about additional research or scholarly activities (e.g., a grant funded, an article published) prior to December 31, the faculty member will have the option of (a) attaching an addendum to the evaluation document or (b) including that activity in the subsequent year’s evaluation.

The associate deans, unit directors, or supervisors will complete their portions of the evaluation document by February 1 and forward all evaluations to the personnel committee by that date. This committee will review all documents and submit their recommendations along with those of the associate dean(s) to the Dean. The Dean will review the evaluations and if necessary meet with associate deans, unit directors, supervisors, and/or the personnel committee before completing the final evaluation. Ultimately, the Dean has set a mid-March deadline for having final annual evaluation and merit recommendations to the Provost.
Digital Measures

Digital Measures is a database used by the university to generate a variety of reports. Most important to this document, Digital Measures is the database used to generate the annual evaluation form. In general Digital Measures is a database program that allows faculty to input their teaching, research, and service accomplishments over the course of the year into one place so that the administration does not have to ask for the same data multiple times and the faculty member can keep an ongoing record of what they have taught, written, and done at UNR (Retrieved on February 16, 2011 from https://www.cis.unr.edu/DigitalMeasures/FAQ.aspx). (At the time of this revision, Digital Measures is only used by academic faculty; however, this could change in the future.)

It is important to note that Digital Measures is NOT an on-line evaluation. Rather it is database that is used for faculty to generate their evaluation forms. Faculty input their accomplishments, generate an evaluation report, make any necessary revisions/additions, and sign the hard copy for submission.

Because the data entered into Digital Measures are used to complete various system reporting requirements, it is imperative that all faculty input their accomplishments into this database.

Academic Faculty: ROLE STATEMENTS

Faculty are required to submit to the associate dean(s), supervisors, or dean an annual role statement, specifying the faculty member’s responsibilities in the areas of (a) teaching, (b) research, scholarly, and creative work, and (c) professional service to the University, profession, and public.

Beginning in 1995, role statements became required for all University of Nevada, Reno faculty. According to documents posted on the Provost's website: (http://www.unr.edu/provost/Faculty%20Resources/RoleStatementsPolicy.pdf) “the purpose of the role statement is not to establish a new layer of red tape, but to cause a dialogue between the faculty member … in the context of the department’s action plan.” Role statements are intended to delineate how faculty activities will help to achieve the unit’s objectives. That is activities within the role statement must be linked to the unit’s strategic plan. At a minimum the role statement must be linked to the college / unit (e.g., center) strategic plan.

Guidelines for developing academic faculty role statements:
1. Role statements should be kept to a maximum of one page, if possible
2. Activities should be delineated for each of the following areas:
   a. Research, Scholarly, and Other Creative Activities
   b. Teaching
   c. Service and Other Professional Responsibilities
3. Each of the above areas should be linked to the strategic plans of the department and college
4. A percentage of effort devoted to each of the three areas above should be identified. The traditional and expected breakdown for a 3-2 teaching load is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Any divergence from this breakdown must be determined with and agreed upon by the associate dean(s), with final approval by the dean.
5. Faculty role statements should include a discussion of priority and supporting activities (See the College of Education "Policy and Procedures Manual for Evaluation and Merit for Academic and Administrative Faculty.")
6. Role statements should address the differential expectations based on the individual's rank (See the College of Education "Policy and Procedures Manual for Evaluation and Merit for Academic and Administrative Faculty.")

7. If a particular faculty member does not have responsibilities in a particular area, the role statement should be marked as “Not Applicable.” (As one example, faculty who are at Rank 0 in a lecturer position are not required to perform research and scholarly activities.)

8. If a faculty member is proposing a non-traditional role statement, information on how that area will be evaluated must be included.

9. Approved and signed (by faculty member and associate dean[s]) role statements should be attached to the annual evaluation form.

It is important to remember that role statements serve as a basis for discussion with the associate dean(s). Role statements for the current year and the upcoming year must be submitted with the annual evaluation materials. The initial role statement shared with the associate dean(s) should be viewed as a draft. The role statement becomes final after a discussion with the associate dean(s), and this discussion should take place during the annual evaluation meeting. Prior to the role statement being signed, it is the prerogative of the associate dean(s) to ask for revisions. The dean must approve the final draft of the role statement.

Any changes in the above percentages must be justified and must clearly show changes to the duties to be performed in each area. A faculty member cannot simply decide to increase the teaching percentage without explaining what extra duties are being performed in that area. Similarly, a faculty member cannot decide to decrease the research area, with a subsequent increase in the teaching area, due to decreased activity in the research area. Increases in percentages for any area should reflect increased duties within that area. Changes to the typical 40-40-20 role statement must be negotiated with the dean.

Typically, a traditional role statement would be more beneficial to junior faculty in a tenure-track position than would a non-traditional role statement. A role statement for a junior faculty in a tenure-track position should reflect appropriate attention to teaching, research, and service as per the expectations for promotion and tenure.

If a faculty member does negotiate an alternative role statement with the dean, then it is essential that the faculty member be evaluated according to that role statement. As stated Section 35 of the University Bylaws specify that all personnel evaluations shall be made on the basis of written and specific professional responsibilities and performance expectations mutually agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the responsible agent in the unit or college. (Keeping in mind that professional responsibilities must be in accordance with the mission and priorities of that person’s unit or college.) As an example, a person who negotiate less emphasis on research with an increased teaching load should NOT be evaluated in the same way as a faculty member with a traditional emphasis in both areas. A faculty member should not be penalized in any way in the evaluation process for negotiating an alternate role statement. On the other hand, if a faculty member negotiates an alternate role statement and does not achieve it, then the annual evaluation should reflect that performance.

It is stated above that professional responsibilities must be in accordance with the mission and priorities of the person's unit or college. This comment is consistent with Section 3.31 of the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws. Section 3.3.1 states “Any deviations from the mission and priorities described in the department bylaws must be justified and approved in writing by the dean and the President. The agreement shall be subject to appropriate periodic review by the individual faculty member and the responsible agent within the department who shall make every effort to accommodate subsequent changes that may be desired by either party. If a member of the faculty and the responsible agent in the department are unable to reach an agreement about
specified professional responsibilities, the matter is subject to the grievance procedure outlined in these Bylaws. The agreed upon specification of professional responsibilities may be subject to review by the dean or other appropriate administrators."

Additionally, within the academic faculty toolkit posted on the Human Resources website (Retrieved February 16, 2011 http://www.unr.edu/hr/employeeperformance/toolkit1.html) a specific discussion about the relationship of outreach or service beyond the university is provided:

c. Outreach or Service beyond the university and the profession includes but is not limited to:
* Public scholarship involving in an ongoing relationship with professionals in a systematic exchange of practice and learning in a manner that exemplifies the land grant mission.

* Consulting and other service for groups and organizations outside the University where such service is intrinsically related to the professional expertise of the individual and is performed with University affiliation identified. (underline and bold added for emphasis)

Role Statements must be put into Digital Measures (https://www.cis.unr.edu/DigitalMeasures/). Digital Measures is a database adopted by the University of Nevada, Reno, and individually used by each faculty member to generate a variety of reports including the annual evaluation document, role statements, and curriculum vitae. With respect to the role statement, a proposed role statement for each year should be written using Digital Measures, printed, and signed by both the faculty member and the associate dean(s), unit director, or dean. The faculty member should retain a copy of the signed role statement.

It is also important to understand that role statements can be revisited, and subsequently revised, mid-year if necessary. For example, a faculty member might receive funding for grant activities which could substantially alter the role statement for the remainder of the year. Revisions to a role statement must also be discussed with the associate dean(s), with final approval by the dean.

Administrative Faculty: Goal Statements / Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs)

As stated on the Human Resources website (http://www.unr.edu/hr/employeeperformance/documents/ADFACGeneralGuidelines.pdf), each administrative “faculty member must have an annual goal statement clearly stating all areas of professional responsibility being undertaken by the faculty member for the coming year, including any cross-department or college responsibilities. It should include one's goals/objectives for the year, evaluation criteria, needed resources and timeline. Goal statements reflect agreement about how one’s efforts contribute to the mission of the department and how the performance will be measured.”

Other points made on the Human Resources website about goal statements include
- Goal statements are not a check list; e.g., a “laundry list” of activities.
- Connection between individual goals and unit/college and university goals is essential.
- Achieving listed goals on the goal statement does not guarantee one will achieve meritorious performance; goals provide a baseline for measurement of overall performance.
- Supervisors should know in advance what activities each faculty member will undertake to advance the mission of the department as well as other units in which the faculty member participates.
- Everyone in the unit or college should contribute to the established programmatic goals of the unit or college. The strategic plan is designed to move the unit ahead. Each faculty
member must contribute. If faculty members do not contribute to the unit or college goals, they should not be rewarded.

- Goal statements should be changed when a faculty member’s role changes (e.g. a major change in role due to a major change in assignments, leave). Goal statement changes need to be discussed early - as soon as a role change has occurred.
- Goal statements should provide flexibility in setting goals for each faculty member.
- New faculty must have goal statements developed within a reasonable time after they have been appointed (i.e. within three months, end of semester).
PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENTS AND
BYLAW REQUIREMENTS
Teaching

Teaching adults involves, at a minimum, making good decisions about how they learn. Students depend upon their professors to direct them to the best examples of current theory, research, and professional practice in their field, and to guide them in the interpretation of such ideas and materials. Teaching must be vigorously evaluated using criteria that are recognized within the academic community. Evidence to support teaching performance should be gathered from multiple sources: self-assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment (See the Table on pages 21-22).

All teachers should present an organized, intellectually appropriate course of study in a manner that can be understood by students. In addition, all teachers should be accessible to students outside of class hours, carry an appropriate number of advisees, and contribute to the shaping of curriculum in areas of expertise.

Effective teachers study, or reflect upon, their own teaching through documentation of goal setting for improvement of teaching, specific efforts to meet such goals, and analysis of changes made. Course syllabi should demonstrate the use of new/revised instructional strategies, materials, technologies, and updated readings and assignments. The improvement of teaching through attendance at professional development conferences, workshops, and seminars should also be documented.

Program and curriculum development can also be thought of as an aspect of teaching. Excellent teachers are expected to contribute to the development of education programs related to their expertise. For example, developing new courses and revising existing courses demonstrate professors’ knowledge of their field and commitment to providing the most effective professional preparation possible for students.

Teaching, of course, is not limited to the classroom, and classroom teaching is no substitute for the personal guidance of an experienced mentor in preparing students to become independent thinkers and scholars. Excellent teachers are committed to providing professional guidance for all students.

Academic advisement is a critical element for all professional programs. Effective advisors are knowledgeable about both graduate and undergraduate program requirements and communicate such information to students in a clear and consistent manner.

All faculty are expected to direct thesis and dissertation research and/or serve on graduate advisory committees. This work must be characterized by excellence and by consistency with the professional practice of the relevant field of study.
## Teaching

| **COE Bylaws:** Instruction includes teaching courses, advisement, supervision of student teaching, practica and internships, course development and revision, supervision of fieldwork and independent study, direction of theses and dissertations, and service on graduate committees within and outside of the home department. In addition, faculty members may be assigned responsibility for the maintenance and development of academic programs and participation in departmental performance assessment activities. | **UNR Bylaws:** (1) **Standard One:** **Teaching/Performance of Assigned Duties**

Either of the following: ...as a teacher, including, but not limited to demonstrated teaching competence and efficiency in a classroom and/or laboratory, and/or clinical setting, the ability to communicate effectively with students, and demonstrated skill in handling classroom and other duties related to teaching. (Such a record may include, for example, a showing of the ability to impart knowledge, to excite students' interest in the subject matter, and to evoke response in students and to demonstrate competence in advising students.)

(B) ...a record of effectiveness, efficiency, and ability to perform assigned duties. |
Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work

Research, scholarly, and creative work includes activities such as research, publications, and the delivery of papers and other invited presentations in professional settings. Research includes the discovery, interpretation, and critical evaluation of new knowledge and practice; program evaluation; and curriculum and product development including software, multimedia forms, and testing and evaluation instruments. The scholar shares his or her research findings and ideas individually or collaboratively with professional peers and in so doing subjects them to peer evaluation. Thus, the scholar extends both his or her own knowledge and the knowledge of others. The extension of knowledge is further enhanced through obtaining funding from federal, state, local, and/or private sources to conduct a variety of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

**COE Bylaws:** Research, scholarly, and creative work includes creative and scholarly contributions appropriate to the faculty member’s position description and professional area, such as conducting research and publishing scholarly writing, acquiring and administering external funding, editing professional journals, and project reports, reviewing journal and book manuscripts and conference and grant proposals, and recognition by professional peers representing the discipline.

**UNR Bylaws:** (2) Standard Two: Scholarly and Creative Activity. Demonstrated continuing professional growth related to the academic faculty member’s discipline or program area as shown by a record of scholarly research or creative activity resulting in publication or comparable productivity.
Professional Service to the University, Profession, and Public

Service, although broadly viewed, has several aspects that can be delineated. Service includes participation in affairs relating specifically to the institution and extends beyond the institution to include the profession and society at large. All faculty members are expected to perform service, in balance with excellence in teaching or scholarship. Institutional service includes such activities as participation on department, college, and university committees and/or serving in administrative roles within the department or college.

Professional service is considered to be an application of scholarship to policy or practice which will impact the profession or enhance the welfare of schools and society. Such activities involving the member’s professional expertise should be connected with scholarly efforts and make a substantive contribution to the field. This application of the faculty member’s special field of knowledge aimed at improving the profession and society’s welfare extends to populations outside the institution (schools and other relevant agencies). “Outreach or service beyond the university and the profession includes but is not limited to: Public scholarship involving an ongoing relationship with professionals in a systematic exchange of practice and learning in a manner that exemplifies the land grant mission. Consulting and other service for groups and organizations outside the University where such service is intrinsically related to the professional expertise of the individual and is performed with University affiliation identified” (Academic Faculty Evaluation “Tool Kit”, August 2007, p. 14).

| COE Bylaws: | UNR Bylaws: (3) Standard Three: Service |
| University, professional, public service, and other professional activities includes Department, College, and University committees and assignments, service to public and private schools, consultative activities related to public and private agencies employing professional personnel prepared by programs similar to those offered by the College, leadership and other active roles in appropriate professional associations, membership on accreditation teams, professional relations outside the University, and community-University activities. | …which may include, but not be limited to: (A) Membership and participation in professional organizations; (B) Ability to work with faculty and students in the best interests of the academic community and the people it serves, and to the extent that the job performance of the academic faculty member's administrative unit may not be otherwise adversely affected; (C) Service on University or System committees; (D) Recognition among colleagues for possessing integrity and the capacity for further significant intellectual and professional achievement; and (E) Recognition and respect outside the System community for participation and service in community, state, or nationwide activity. |
EVALUATION GUIDELINES

It should be noted that the following activities delineated for (a) teaching; (b) research, scholarly, and creative work; and (c) professional service to the university, profession, and public are meant to be guidelines regarding the type of activities to be completed. The activities listed should not be viewed as an exhaustive list. That is, the faculty member might engage in other activities that he/she wishes to include in the annual evaluation.

The following are guiding assumptions or principles for the evaluation process:

- Accomplishments are reported honestly.
- The faculty member must provide supporting documentation and/or rationales (e.g., the acceptance rate of a particular journal, source and amount of external funding).
- It is incumbent upon the faculty member to help the reviewer to understand the importance of activities.
- The evaluation process is not a totally quantitative process.
- The Dean, associate deans, unit directors, and supervisors need some flexibility in the evaluation process. Professional judgment is an important part of the evaluation process.
- The evaluation process is based on mutual trust.
- There are times when the Dean, associate deans, unit director, and/or supervisor will ask for additional information.

Academic freedom is important and must be preserved.
TEACHING

The Board of Regents has stated, and the requirement has been incorporated into the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws, that students must evaluate courses:

“Every student in a University and Community College System of Nevada course shall have an opportunity to provide systematic feedback on the effectiveness of the teaching and the course.” (Board of Regents)

Evaluation of Teaching:

Key points regarding evaluation of teaching:
1. There should be multiple variables taken into consideration when evaluating effective teaching.
2. Annual evaluation reports are expected to include data regarding supporting activities (see the list of supporting activities on the next page).
3. It is expected that there will be some variation in the types of supporting activities included in the annual evaluation report based upon the rank of the faculty member (see the list of supporting activities on the next page).
4. Faculty must include student evaluation data for all courses (fall, spring, and summer). Student evaluation data (mean of medians and comments) will be an important factor in the rating of teaching.
5. The supporting activities detailed on the next page are taken into consideration.
6. Other factors such as new courses, course content, and implementation of innovative approaches can play a role in the rating. For example, a faculty member might implement new teaching approaches with which students are uncomfortable and receive a lower course evaluation in that course. The same faculty member might have another more traditionally taught class with a higher course evaluation rating. It might be appropriate to give more weight to the rating in the more traditional class.
7. A faculty member might choose to invite an associate dean or unit director and/or peers to observe the faculty member teaching, which might lead to valid reasons for assigning a higher rating than would be otherwise assigned if only examining course evaluation results.
8. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to report all information relevant to evaluating teaching.
9. It is obvious that the associate dean(s) and/or unit director have a variety of factors that should be considered when assigning a rating in “Teaching.” It is imperative that the totality of the faculty member’s teaching activities be considered in assigning an evaluation rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Evaluation Activity for ALL Who Teach</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student evaluations must be summarized by providing a list of courses taught each semester and summer with a statement of the Mean of Medians for each individual course</td>
<td>• Discussion of pedagogical innovations for each course that were introduced during the current year (question included within Digital Measures)</td>
<td>• Demonstrating a record of leadership in teaching (see activities in Column 2)</td>
<td>Faculty at the rank of Professor should show a continuing record that demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion of any new teaching material (e.g., cases, videotapes, audiotapes, course modules, instructor manuals, test banks, or simulations) that were developed and/or implemented (question included within Digital Measures)</td>
<td>• Demonstrating a record of leadership in mentoring  ✓ Evidence of acting as a teaching mentor* for junior/other faculty and doctoral students  ✓ Evidence of mentoring* field supervisors/providing leadership in progressive collaborative experiences in the field  ✓ Evidence of mentoring* junior faculty in their role as doctoral advisors  ✓ Evidence of mentoring* master’s / doctoral advisees</td>
<td>• Leadership in teaching (see activities in Column 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion of any activities in course that enhanced student learning and/or student contact with the business community (e.g., guest speaker, SBDC, SBI, or outside projects, field trips, field projects, etc.) (question included within Digital Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership in mentoring* (see activities in Column 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion of student evaluation data (question included within Digital Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* mentor / mentoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Evaluation Activity for ALL Who Teach</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Program development and curriculum redesign activities</td>
<td>• Completion of doctoral students</td>
<td>• Documenting attendance at professional development conferences, workshops, or seminars and including a statement of their effect on teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completion of master’s students, specifying type of culminating project (thesis, project, comps)</td>
<td>• Advising* master’s and doctoral students</td>
<td>• Documenting a systematic process and implementing action research (self-study) in classes and statement of effect on teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advising* master’s and doctoral students</td>
<td>• Teaching self-evaluations (may include teaching philosophy and approach as a way of providing a context)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Evaluation Activity for ALL Who Teach</td>
<td>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors</td>
<td>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</td>
<td>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing and teaching new courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducting independent studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receiving honors and awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer and/or administrator review of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring* undergraduate/graduate students and field supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervising interns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Advising refers to assisting students to develop academic programs, course sequences, etc.

*Mentoring activities can involve junior faculty, students, or practitioners (e.g., teachers, school administrators, counselors, early interventionists) and refers to providing professional career guidance and/or collaborating on research, teaching, or outreach activities.
RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE WORK

Academic faculty and administrative faculty for whom research and scholarly activities are required must demonstrate evidence of continuous and consistent scholarly productivity. In all evaluations of scholarship, excellence, application, and extension of knowledge are primary considerations. Numerous points are taken into consideration in assigning an evaluation rating:

1. The faculty member should note that some research, scholarly, and creative work will be more heavily weighted than other activities and are viewed as priority activities. As can be seen from the priority activities listed on the following table, a variety of peer-reviewed, published articles are viewed as scholarly works (e.g., data-based articles, reviews of research, research to practice articles, reflective essays).

2. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to help the reviewer to understand the importance of various types of scholarly writing.

3. It is understood that the quality of journals can vary a great deal. Good judgment will be used in reviewing the quality of the publications. However, it is important that the faculty member include information about the journal (i.e., importance of the journal, acceptance rates, and any other relevant variables) to assist the reviewer.

4. External funding awards are viewed as priority activities. It is important to note that the amount of an external award is not indicative of the degree of importance that should be placed on that award. That is, a small amount of external funding can be prestigious in an area in which it is difficult to obtain any external funding. Other variables that can influence evaluation of external funding include centrality to the research or teaching missions, competitiveness, numbers of students supported, research vs. other emphasis, F & A, etc.

5. One-year external funding awards that cross evaluation years will be counted towards evaluation only in one year, most likely year the funding was awarded.

6. A multi-year externally funded project that requires continuation reports will continue to be rated as a priority activity in subsequent years of funding.

7. The following table also details other supporting evidence of research, scholarly, and creative work that can be included in the annual evaluation document. It is expected that the faculty member will have a combination of priority activities and supporting activities.

8. The research, scholarly, and creative work area is reviewed and evaluated in TOTALITY. Given that there are a wide variety of priority and scholarly activities that faculty are encouraged to do, it would be inappropriate to evaluate a faculty member on only one aspect (e.g., publications) while ignoring other valued activities (e.g., conference presentations, submitting grants, mentoring activities).

9. Although it is expected that faculty will have a combination of priority and supporting activities, only in cases of unusual circumstances can a faculty member receive an “excellent” rating in research, scholarly, and creative works in the absence of any priority activities.

In the College of Education the following guidelines can help in understanding the ratings of “Excellent,” “Commendable,” and “Satisfactory:”

**Excellent:** To earn an excellent the rule of thumb is that one must have three quality priority products, likely combined with other supporting activities. However, faculty are cautioned that it is NOT simply an issue of counting the number of publications. Factors that influence a review of priority products include quality of the product, type or product, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, and so forth. Also a combination of substantial supporting activities might boost an evaluation rating of a faculty member with fewer than three priority products. Alternatively, someone could have three refereed articles, but the nature of the articles and quality of journals do not warrant a rating of “excellent.” The totality and quality of all priority and supporting activities/products is considered.

**Commendable:** To earn a commendable the rule of thumb is that one must have two quality priority products, likely combined with other supporting activities. As is the case above for a rating of “excellent,” faculty are cautioned that it is NOT simply an issue of counting the number of
publications. Factors that influence a review of priority products include quality of the product, type or product, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, and so forth. Also a combination of substantial supporting activities might boost an evaluation rating of a faculty member with fewer than two priority products. The totality and quality of all priority and supporting activities/products is considered.

**Satisfactory:** To earn a satisfactory the rule of thumb is that one must have one quality priority product, likely combined with other supporting activities. As is the case for the above ratings, faculty are cautioned that it is NOT simply an issue of counting the number of publications. Factors that influence a review of priority products include quality of the product, type or product, acceptance/rejection rate of the journal, and so forth. Also substantial supporting activities might boost an evaluation rating of a faculty member without priority products. The totality and quality of all priority and supporting activities/products is considered.

**Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Certain Types of Scholarly Activities:**

1. **If a faculty member is the editor of a journal how should his or her publications within that journal be viewed?**

   A faculty member who publishes an article in a journal for which he or she is editor should explain whether or not the article went through the same refereed process as other articles.

2. **If a faculty member conducts a national presentation and has a publication in conference proceedings as a result, should both activities be counted towards annual evaluation?**

   The faculty member with a conference presentation and proceeding should provide a rationale for why the presentation and proceedings should be counted separately, being sure to specify whether or not the proceedings were refereed. (Although the presentation might have been refereed, the conference proceedings might not have been.)

3. **If an author has multiple chapters in a volume for which the faculty is an editor, how should the chapters and book count as publications?**

   Editing a book and authoring chapters are recognized as two different activities. When the chapters occur in a book for which the faculty member is an editor, he or she must provide a full explanation of the nature of the volume.

4. **How many years do I get to count a book?**

   A book counts for one year; unless the faculty member can make the case for a book to count more than one year.

5. **How is a revised book counted?**

   It depends upon the degree of revision. The faculty member must describe the extent of the revisions.

Anytime a faculty member thinks there could be questions about a particular activity, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to help the reviewers to understand the importance of the activity.
Please note that the activities within a category on the following table are **NOT** in order of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Activities</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publishing scholarly articles (e.g., data-based articles, reviews of research, research to practice articles, reflective essays) in international or national refereed journals</td>
<td>Presenting competitively accepted presentations at professionally recognized meetings of international or national scholarly or professional organizations</td>
<td>The <strong>priority</strong> and <strong>supporting activities</strong> listed in the first two columns are also relevant here. Additionally, <strong>leadership</strong> in scholarly activities or research may be demonstrated by, but are not limited, to the following activities:</td>
<td>Faculty at the rank of Professor should show a <strong>continuing</strong> record that demonstrates <strong>leadership</strong> in research, scholarly, and creative work (see activities in columns 1, 2, and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining funding for research, development, or training proposals from external sources</td>
<td>Presenting invited presentations at professionally recognized meetings of international or national scholarly or professional organizations</td>
<td>Co-authored publications with graduate students or colleagues (especially junior faculty)</td>
<td>Typically, these individuals will have established a <strong>national level of distinction and visibility</strong> in their particular field that is recognized by their peers in research institutions. They will have maintained a substantial research focus that has contributed to the education knowledge base, and there will be demonstrable evidence of a sustained level of productivity through publications, presentations, and other means. Evidence of scholarly productivity shall include a record of publications in major journals in a particular field, presentations at national conferences, involvement in writing proposals for funding, and administration of research projects. In addition, there is a demonstrated history of scholarly leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing books and monographs that were peer reviewed and accepted for publication</td>
<td>Publishing scholarly articles in regional refereed journals</td>
<td>Lead author on co-authored publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing chapters in scholarly books</td>
<td>Submitting proposals for grants / external funding</td>
<td>Presentations at conferences with graduate students or colleagues (especially junior faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A faculty member has the option of including other activities as priority activities, but in doing so must submit evidence and make the case that the activity is a priority activity</td>
<td>Developing scholarly or creative products such as non-refereed articles, conference proceedings, books, curriculum materials, computer software, multimedia forms, and testing or evaluation instruments</td>
<td>Pursuit of external funding that aids research activities of graduate students and/or colleagues, and/or provides moneys for graduate assistantships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing a book, test, or other reviews in books or international, national, or regional journals</td>
<td>Research activities in school settings or other applied settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please note that the activities within a category on the following table are **NOT** in order of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Activities</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serving as an editor or co-editor of a journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publishing articles in state or local journals or other media forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presenting papers at state, local, or regional conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtaining funding for research, development, or training from the University of Nevada, Reno (e.g., instructional enhancement grants, outreach grants, junior faculty research awards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, PROFESSION, AND PUBLIC AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

All faculty members are expected to perform service and outreach activities in balance with excellence in teaching or scholarship.

1. It is essential that service and outreach involves active participation and that the faculty member specify his or her involvement (e.g., committee chair, committee member, amount of time, expected outcome).

2. The faculty member is asked to classify service and outreach activities as MAJOR, INTERMEDIATE, or MINOR involvement and impact. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide the reviewer with a rationale for the classification of service and outreach activities as major, intermediate, or minor.

3. Sometimes it is recommended that untenured faculty members have a reduced service expectation (i.e., serving on committees) while they are building their research and scholarly activity records. Upon receiving promotion and tenure, the service expectation would then increase for these individuals. However, it is important to note that university service activities can aid progress towards tenure and promotion by allowing faculty members to make themselves and their work familiar to colleagues in other colleges and programs. Junior faculty should be aware of both the advantages and disadvantages associated with university service. Care should be taken that junior faculty are not overburdened in the service area. Any junior faculty member with a reduced service load should have a signed role statement specifying responsibilities in the service area so that the individual is appropriately evaluated. The role statement should then be attached to the annual evaluation.

4. When faculty have other professional responsibilities, as is typically the case for administrative faculty, the activities related to these responsibilities would be delineated in this section of the evaluation document. Once again, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to assist the reviewer in understanding the importance of the activity as well as the faculty member’s involvement in the activity.

5. In order to receive an “excellent” in service a faculty member must have service activities that are MAJOR in terms of faculty involvement and impact. Moreover, in order to be eligible for an “excellent” in this category, faculty should provide quality service to the department, college, and university. That is, it would be unusual for faculty to earn an “excellent” rating in service if they are providing service only outside of UNR. In order to earn an “excellent” rating in such a case, the faculty member must make his/her case for such a rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Activities for All Faculty</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Service:** *Active* participation on program, departmental, college, and university committees or serving in administrative roles. | **Professional Service:** *Active* membership on editorial boards; reviewing manuscripts for refereed journals; reviewing prospectuses for manuscripts of books prior to publication; reviewing program proposals for international, national, or regional conferences of professional organizations; active membership on committees of local, state, regional, national, and international organizations; and a statewide emphasis in working in school settings and other relevant agencies. | The *priority* and *supporting activities* in the first two columns are also relevant here. **Leadership** in service to the institution may be demonstrated by, but are not limited, to such activities as:  
- Chairing university, college, and departmental committees  
- Serving in administrative roles within a college or department unit  
- Providing leadership as a member of university, college, and departmental committees | Faculty at the rank of Professor should show a *continuing* record that demonstrates *leadership* in service to the University, profession, and public (see activities in columns 1, 2, and 3). |
| **Institutional Service:** Program activities (e.g., development of performance assessment, strategic planning, special reports) | **Outreach Activities:** Activities reflecting the land grant mission of the University (e.g., consulting, workshops) | **Leadership** in service to the profession may be demonstrated by, but are not limited, to the following activities:  
- Membership on editorial boards  
- Leadership in national organizations (elected and appointed offices)  
- Membership on advisory boards for agencies and organizations | |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Activities for All Faculty</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Associate and Full Professors</th>
<th>Supporting Evaluation Activities for Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership role in organizing conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership in accreditation issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service on commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Serving in a significant role on a national committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing for funding agencies, competitive reviews, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Education Annual Evaluation Process

1. Each faculty member will complete and submit the annual evaluation form and attach role statements for the previous year and the upcoming year. Faculty will provide information about the impact of their teaching, research, and service so that an associate dean and the personnel committee will be able to further analyze and weigh the data provided in each category.

2. As an attachment to the faculty member’s annual evaluation report (i.e., a separate document of no more than one page), each faculty member will provide a self-evaluation of his or her work in teaching, research, and service (e.g., I believe that this year I should receive an Excellent in Teaching; a Commendable in Scholarship; and a Commendable in Service). Each self-evaluation should include bullets of the major achievements in each area (teaching, research, service). Faculty will provide a rationale for the quality and impact of the work, not just the numerical ratings and number of activities. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to provide detailed information so the various reviewers can assess their accomplishments. The summary form will be critical, with the details of the report (and submitted documentation) used to support the statements made.

3. The Associate Dean(s) will review these annual evaluation documents and determine whether the self-evaluation submitted by the faculty member should be accepted, changed, or if the faculty members needs to re-submit with more detailed information. If the Associate Dean(s) does not agree with a self-evaluation, he or she will provide a new rating for this faculty member.

4. The Associate Dean(s) will forward all of the annual evaluation documents including the evaluation form, role statements, self-evaluations, and the Associate Dean's ratings to the personnel committee comprised of faculty representing the various programs within the College of Education.

5. If the personnel committee disagrees with any of the Associate Dean's ratings, the Associate Dean(s) will be notified in writing by the chair of the personnel committee in writing. A meeting will be called at which the Associate Dean(s) and the personnel committee will discuss these disagreements and resolve them, if possible.

6. All faculty annual evaluations are recommendations to the dean who has final authority.

7. After the dean has approved the evaluations, the Associate Dean(s) will provide feedback to the faculty member regarding what they recommend that faculty member should (a) continue doing; (b) cut back on or stop doing; and (c) start doing more. This discussion is part of finalizing the faculty member’s role statement for the upcoming year.

8. Faculty wishing to request reconsideration or to grieve any aspect of their evaluation should follow the university policy outlined in the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws and NSHE Code.

As was stated earlier, academic faculty accomplishments are entered through Digital Measures. Subsequently a faculty member generates the annual evaluation form. Digital Measures gives one the option of generating the form using Microsoft Word, html, or Adobe pdf. It would not be unusual that once the form is generated that faculty might need to make minor additions or revisions to the form. Once the annual evaluation form is finalized, the faculty member submits to the associate dean(s) or unit director the following:
2. Relevant supporting evidence related to teaching, research and scholarship, and service;
3. The current year’s dated and signed (by faculty member as well as all other required individuals) role statement, generated using the Digital Measures database, or goal statement if one is an administrative faculty member;
4. The following year’s proposed, signed (by faculty member), and dated role statement, generated using the Digital Measures database, or goal statement if one is an administrative faculty member;

It is important for faculty to remember that it is incumbent upon them to provide sufficient detail within the annual evaluation form so that all reviewers throughout the process (e.g., associate deans or unit director, Dean, COE personnel committee) understand the accomplishments being reported. For example, faculty should provide enough detail about publications and presentations (e.g., peer reviewed, role). Similarly, in the area of service faculty need to provide enough information that reviewers who are unfamiliar with the activity understand both the importance and impact of the activity as well as time involved. As one example, not everyone might be aware of the role of the University Faculty Senate Chair. It is also important that faculty who buy out due to grants, contracts, etc. specify clearly what activities are linked to that buyout. Grant buyout activities are obviously important to the mission of the unit and university and should be reported. However, clear information is needed for an accurate evaluation. Similarly, faculty with a course release to perform specific duties should clearly specify the duties related to that release.

If faculty do not report sufficient detail, it is incumbent upon the associate deans, unit director, or supervisor to ask for a revision to the document in which the faculty member adds the necessary detail. If the faculty member chooses NOT to add that detail, then the associate deans, unit director, or supervisor should conduct the evaluation based on the evidence provided rather than inserting information in the evaluation comments absent of the evidence.
Grievance Procedures

There may be times when a faculty member disagrees with an aspect of the evaluation and/or merit process. Therefore, the Personnel Committee thought it was important to include grievance procedures as specified by both the NSHE Code as well as the University Bylaws.

**Nevada System of Higher Education**

Please see the NSHE Code (Chapter 5, Section 5.7) for the current NSHE Code regarding grievance procedures (http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Handbook/TITLE-2---/T2-CH05---Personnel-Policy-for-Facul.pdf).

**University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws**

Please see section 3.2 of the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws for a complete overview of current grievance procedures. (http://www.unr.edu/facultysenate/bylaws/UNR%20Bylaws/unr-bylaws-11-18-09.pdf)
Appendix A
Examples of Supporting Documentation
To Be Attached to Annual Evaluation

Please note that in this section we include examples of documentation that is IN ADDITION to the information already included in the evaluation document. The faculty member will attach the supporting documentation for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work. Additionally, the associate deans, unit director, supervisor, or dean might ask for additional documentation to be attached.

Teaching

- Documenting attendance at professional development conferences, workshops, or seminars and statement of their effect on teaching
  - Attach conference or program agendas or any other supporting documentation

- Documenting a systematic process and implementing action research (self-study) in classes and statement of effect on teaching
  - Attach course syllabi showing changed assignments as well as provide an explanation why the assignments were changed
  - Survey students regarding particular aspects of a course and then do a summary or analysis of the information collected
  - Conduct interviews with students

- Teaching self-evaluations (may include teaching philosophy and approach as a way of providing a context)
  - Attach self-evaluations

- Developing and teaching new courses
  - Attach course syllabi and include an overview statement of time and effort involved

- Developing course syllabi that demonstrate the use of new/revised instructional strategies, materials, technologies, and updated readings and assignments
  - Attach course syllabi highlighting the new or revised areas (include old syllabi so change is evident)

- Documenting effective use of experimental teaching technology (e.g., on-line courses, distance education technology, experimental teaching methodologies)
  - Attach course syllabi highlighting the use of the new teaching technologies (include old syllabi so change is evident)

- Receiving honors and/or awards
  - Attach written acknowledgement of the honors and/or awards

- Peer and/or administrator review of teaching
  - Attach written feedback received
• Advising master’s and doctoral students
  ➢ Attach copies of committee approval forms for thesis or dissertation proposals
  ➢ Attach letters indicating approved human subject protocols
  ➢ Attach signed committee pages or notices of completion forms for completed thesis, dissertation, projects, papers (product determined by type of degree program)

• Mentoring undergraduate/graduate students and field supervisors
  ➢ Attach conference proposals and papers submitted
  ➢ Invitations to classrooms to provide feedback

• Other
  ➢ Include any other relevant information and supporting documentation not identified above

Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work

• Publications and Presentations
  ➢ Attach published materials (e.g., books, journal articles, chapters, newsletters)
  ➢ Articles accepted for publication or in press may be included but may be only counted for one year (i.e., if counted when in press, then they cannot be counted when actually published)

    When articles are counted when in press, attach supporting documentation (e.g., letter from editor).

  ➢ Supporting documentation for conference presentations can include letters of acceptance as well as conference agendas showing the presentation.

• Work in Progress:
  ➢ Include work submitted or under development
    (The rationale for including this work is that it provides the associate deans or supervisor with opportunities to provide mentoring as well as demonstrates that ongoing professional development is occurring. Showing “Work in Progress” can be particularly important for new faculty.)

• Current External and Internal Funding
  ➢ Attach letter or other documentation indicating grant, sub-grant, contract, external funding, etc. was received

• Editorships
  ➢ Include a brief description of the role and responsibility including an estimation of the number of articles processed only for the current year.
  ➢ If a faculty member is publishing in a journal for which the faculty member is the editor, please include a description of the process by which the manuscript was accepted for publication (e.g., blind, peer review; editor’s column that appears in each issue).

• Review Panels
  ➢ Attach copy of letter of invitation or acknowledgement of involvement

• Grant / External Funding Proposals Submitted
  ➢ Attach copies of transmittal form or letter and an abstract

• Awards and Recognition
- Attach letters or other documentation regarding the awards or recognition

- Other
  - Please include any other relevant information and supporting documentation not identified above

**Professional Service to the University, Profession, and Public and Other Professional Responsibilities**

- All service activities:
  - Attach letters or any other supporting documentation regarding the service activities

- Awards/Recognition
  - Attach letters or other documentation regarding the awards or recognition

- Other
  - Please include any other relevant information and supporting documentation not identified above