

## UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

### DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

The NSHE Code, UNR bylaws, and college/school/department bylaws govern the process of reviewing faculty applications for promotion and/or tenure. Applications for promotion receive final approval from the President; applications for tenure go to the Board of Regents.

This document provides direction for faculty, department chairs, and deans regarding the preparation and submission of applications for promotion and/or tenure.

Applications must be submitted on the University of Nevada, Reno Application for Promotion and/or Tenure form. Faculty applying for both promotion and tenure submit only one form.

#### Directions for the Applicant

##### Application Form

The [application form](#) is available on the Office of the Provost website in Microsoft Word. Beginning spring 2015, there is an option in Digital Measures for creating a first rough draft of the application.

The application should be prepared so that information is complete, well-organized, clear, and concise. In general, each item should appear only once.

These directions identify the information to be provided in each section of the application and the manner in which it is to be presented.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| PRESENT TITLE                   | Full title—e.g., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Lecturer II).   |
| PRESENT RANK                    | Rank—e.g., II, III, 0(II)  |
| DATE OF PRESENT RANK            | Month and year current rank was awarded.   |
| DEGREES, DATES AND INSTITUTIONS | Year, major field of study, and degree obtained from each institution. Begin with the most recent information.                 |
| EMPLOYMENT HISTORY              | Year, location, and institution for each position held since the baccalaureate degree. Begin with the most recent information. |
| PRIMARY ASSIGNMENT              | Summarize the primary responsibilities and include role statement percentages for years in the period under review.            |



Office of the Provost  
Clark Administration, Room 110  
University of Nevada, Reno/0005  
Reno, Nevada 89557-0005 <http://www.unr.edu/provost/>

Updated 8/18

**TEACHING**

Include information on teaching since appointment at UNR, or since appointment to current rank.

Courses: List each course taught. For each, list semesters taught, purpose, audience, and enrollment. For each, provide up to 10 lines describing any course development, redesign, or innovation. Include a table such as the sample below that provides summary quantitative information from student evaluations and brief explanation of the scale used.

**Course Evaluation Scores**

*Scores use a 9-point scale.*

|                  | <b>COURSES TAUGHT</b> | Overall eval of teaching | Overall eval of course | Dept mean (if available) | Dept mean (if available) |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>SEMESTER</b>  |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 09</b>   | Course # and Name     | 8.1                      | 7.3                    | 7.2                      | 7.3                      |
| <b>Spring 10</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 10</b>   |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Spring 11</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 11</b>   |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Spring 12</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 12</b>   |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Spring 13</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 13</b>   |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Spring 14</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Fall 14</b>   |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
| <b>Spring 15</b> |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |
|                  |                       |                          |                        |                          |                          |

Undergraduate advising and mentoring: Describe undergraduate advising activities. If applicable, list number of formal undergraduate advisees, undergraduate researchers mentored, independent studies directed, and internships supervised. Also note presentations at professional meetings, publications, awards received, and other indications of scholarly accomplishments by students.

Graduate advising and mentoring: List graduate-student-advisory committees. For each, identify the faculty role (chair or committee member), the student's graduate program (master's/doctoral and department/program), and the dates of service. If applicable, list number of independent studies directed and internships supervised.

Postdoctoral fellows or research associates supervised: List any postdoctoral fellows or research associates supervised, with dates.

Assessment: If applicable, list assessment projects (completed and ongoing) and describe responsibilities in those projects.

Other: Provide additional information as appropriate regarding your contributions to teaching in your discipline, including curriculum development, writing of textbooks, participation in educational workshops, and other activities.

Honors, awards, and grants related to teaching: List, with brief identifying information.

## RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

For promotion applications, include information on research, scholarship, and creative activity since appointment to current rank. Tenure applications should also include research, scholarship, and creative activity that preceded appointment at UNR. List entries in reverse chronological order.

Publications: List publications under the appropriate headings (e.g. refereed journal articles, books, chapters of books, other). Provide full citations that list all authors in the order they appear in the publication, date of publication, volume, and pages. Use explanatory notes as needed should the order of authorship not adequately reflect overall contribution. Peer-reviewed publications should be listed separately from non-peer-reviewed publications.

Presentations: For professional meetings, symposia, and conferences, provide full information on the date, location, and role (e.g. invited speaker, paper presenter, panel discussant). Distinguish between invited and contributed presentations. Also distinguish presentations at professional meetings from presentations at other institutions. Do not include presentations given at UNR.

Performances, Broadcasts, and Multimedia Productions: For performances, broadcasts and multimedia productions, note the date, location, audience, and role. Use explanatory notes as needed to clarify the nature of the event.

Grant activity: List grant support for research, scholarship, and creative activity. Identify funding agency, project title, inclusive dates for period covered by the grant, and name of principal investigator. If there are multiple PIs, specify the applicant's percentage of responsibility.

Work under review: List articles or other work currently formally under review. For each, identify title; publication, organization, or agency where it is under review, and date submitted. Do *not* list work that is "in progress" or "in preparation."

Honors and awards related to research, scholarship, and creative activity: List, with brief identifying information. Differentiate between internal and external honors and awards.

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND OUTREACH

Department, college, university, and NSHE service. For each committee, activity, or administrative assignment, specify term of service and, as appropriate, role and responsibilities. Use explanatory notes as needed to make overall contribution clear.

Professional organizations. For each, identify any leadership roles held, with term of service.

Reviewing activities: List professional reviewing activities—e.g., service on national grant review panels, review of research and creative publications for refereed journals, manuscript reviews for university presses, program reviews at other universities, and external reviews for promotion and tenure. For each, identify date and role.

Editorial activities: List professional editorial activities—e.g., service on editorial boards for refereed journals.

Outreach and Engagement. List outreach and engagement activities that draw upon the faculty member's professional expertise and are relevant to the faculty member's assignment at the university. For each, specify dates, role, and responsibilities. Use explanatory notes as needed. Do not include non-professional involvement in community activities.

### Supplemental Materials

Applicants are expected to provide supplemental materials to document teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity; professional service and outreach. The materials may be reviewed at the department, college, and university levels.

Applicants should present supplemental materials in a clear, orderly manner and provide a table of contents.

Supplemental materials must include:

- Full C.V.
- Course syllabi
- Student teaching evaluations
- Published research (copies of all refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, etc.); signal which are most significant in the table of contents
- Recordings and multimedia productions produced (copies of all released CDs, DVDs, etc.); signal which are most significant in the table of contents

Supplemental materials may also include:

- Role statements that explain assignments that do not include a typical mix of teaching, research, and service/outreach—e.g., for librarians, clinicians with patient care responsibilities, and extension faculty.
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Peer reviews of published research
- Letters regarding professional service and/or outreach
- Additional documentation required by the department or college

## Directions for the Chair/Department level

### Evaluation from the department-level committee and department chair

If the department-level committee prepares its own written evaluation, this evaluation should accompany the chair's letter; if it does not, the chair's letter should explain the basis for the faculty votes at the department level.

The chair's letter should present a full analysis of the application for promotion and/or tenure. It should state the result of faculty votes held to evaluate performance in each required area and the result of subsequent votes regarding promotion and/or tenure. These evaluations must use the standard terms specified in the NSHE Code. For each vote, report the exact number of votes cast, including abstentions and proxy votes, even for unanimous votes.

The chair's letter should discuss the quality and quantity of teaching, explain numerical scales used in evaluation, and explain the multiple indices by which the department evaluates teaching (e.g., course evaluations, peer observation). It is the chair's responsibility to explain the significance of research, scholarship, and creative activity in the context of the discipline and the stature of publication and performance venues. In so doing, the chair should make explicit the role of the external reviews in the evaluation of the faculty member's research, scholarship, and creative activity. It is the responsibility of the chair to address any points raised in external reviews with which the department disagrees.

The chair's letter should state the chair's evaluation of performance and recommendation for or decision against promotion and/or tenure.

The department chair should complete the [Evaluation by Chair and Dean](#) form by indicating the evaluation rating (excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) in each required area. No additional comments should be made on the form. Finally, the department chair shall also complete the Chair's Report of External Reviewers form indicating key information regarding the external reviewers who wrote letters regarding the candidate's application.

### Application packet

The department should arrange application packets in the following manner. All letters must be originals with signatures unless otherwise specified.

- UNR Application for Promotion & Tenure Application (original)
- UNR Application for Promotion & Tenure—Department Chair Evaluation
- Letter from Department Personnel Committee (if applicable)
- Letter from Department Chair
- Chair's Report of External Reviewers
- External peer review letters. (Letters may have been submitted electronically or on paper but must be signed. A digital signature is acceptable.)
- Copy of Chair's letter to outside reviewers

Packets for tenure applications must also include copies of the following, provided by the department:

- Progress toward tenure letters from the third-year review (from both chair and dean), fourth, and fifth (from chair) years.
- Annual evaluations for the full probationary period

Supplemental Materials: the full file should be sent forward when/as directed by the college.

## **Directions for the Dean/College level**

### Evaluation from the college-level committee and dean

The college-level personnel committee reviews each case and notes whether the department followed the appropriate process. The committee prepares its own written evaluation, which should present a full analysis of the application for promotion and/or tenure in the context of the discipline and the expectations established in the college bylaws. It should also identify points of agreement and/or disagreement with the evaluation sent forward by the department chair.

The dean's letter should present a cogent analysis of the application for promotion and/or tenure that places it in the context of the discipline and college expectations. It should state the dean's evaluation of performance and recommendation for or decision against promotion and/or tenure.

If the dean concurs with the evaluation terms used in each area by the department chair, the dean should sign the evaluation form. If the dean does not concur but does support promotion and/or tenure, the dean should write the amended rating on the form and initial it before signing.

### Application packet

Application packets should be arranged in the following order before submission to the Office of the Provost. All letters must be originals with signatures unless otherwise specified.

- UNR Application for Promotion & Tenure Application
- UNR Application for Promotion & Tenure—Department Chair Evaluation
- Letter from Department Personnel Committee
- Letter from Department Chair
- Letter from College Personnel Committee
- Letter from Dean
- Chair's Report of External Reviewers
- External peer review letters (Letters may have been submitted electronically or on paper but must be signed. A digital signature is acceptable.)
- Copy of Chair's letter to outside reviewers
- Table of contents and/or summary overview of supplemental materials

Packets for tenure applications must also include copies of the following:

- Progress toward tenure letters from the third-year review (from both chair and dean), fourth, and fifth (from chair) years.
- Annual evaluations for the full probationary period

All packets must be complete at the time of submission to the Office of the Provost. To aid in electronic processing, application packets should not be bound or stapled but should be held together with binder

clips or placed in folders. Packets that are incomplete and/or disorganized will be returned to the dean/college.

Do *not* send the full file of supplemental materials to the Office of the Provost with the application packet. These materials should be retained at the college or department level until a final decision on the promotion and/or tenure application has been made.

The deadline for submission of applications to the Office of the Provost is ***November 1***. Please contact Audrey Casey, Director, Academic Affairs, with any questions.

### **External Peer Review Letters**

The intent of these guidelines for reviewer selection is to preserve the integrity of the process and to minimize the chance that individuals reviewing the application might question the appropriateness of one or more reviewers. Information regarding the external reviewers who provided letters should be included in the application packet on the *Chair's Report of External Reviewers* form.

A minimum of four and maximum of eight external peer-review letters are required for all applications for tenure and for promotion to associate professor (Rank III) or full professor (Rank IV). For promotions within Rank 0, requirements vary depending on the nature of the appointment. For Rank 0 research faculty, no fewer than three external letters are required. For Rank 0 instructional faculty and Rank 0 faculty whose assignment is clinical, external letters may be required by the college but are not required by the university.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to obtain external peer-review letters. These letters should be solicited under the following guidelines. The initial contact may be made via email or phone, but each reviewer should then receive a formal letter (which may be sent electronically) following the template on the next page.

- Reviewers for tenure applications should be selected by the department chair in consultation with the tenured faculty of the department; reviewers for promotion to full professor, in consultation with the department's full professors. The chair should allow and encourage the applicant to suggest potential reviewers. It is recommended that the candidate submit a list of 5 or 6 potential reviewers. The candidate should bear in mind that half or more of the reviews will come from individuals *not* on the candidate's list. The reason for this is to avoid selecting a set of reviewers that are strongly biased in favor of the candidate. Therefore, the candidate should think carefully about how many reviewers to put on the list, and who to include. For example, if the candidate lists the top 20 people in the field, the committee may have relatively few additional qualified reviewers to call upon. The candidate may also submit names of potential reviewers that the candidate feels should not be used.
- Reviewers should be experts in the applicant's area of research and should *not* be closely associated with the candidate for promotion. Avoid reviewers that have or could reasonably be perceived to have a conflict of interest. For example, they should not be a current or former research collaborator, a former graduate mentor or thesis advisor, co-authors, or a former contemporary at another institution. Avoid reviewers who hold a position at an institution where the candidate has earned a degree, performed postdoctoral research, or had any other official appointment, regardless of whether the reviewer's appointment at the institution overlapped with that of the candidate.

Do not solicit letters from more than one individual at a single institution.

Minimize the number of reviewers from non-U.S. universities. Researchers from non-U.S. universities often do not understand the U.S. tenure system and the importance of writing a detailed evaluation. Thus,

any non-U.S. reviewers should be selected with care, with the recommendation being to limit the number to 2 or less.

- For tenure candidates, reviewers from universities must be tenured faculty, preferably full professors, in programs at institutions with a research stature that is comparable or superior to that of the University of Nevada, Reno. At least half should come from institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as [R1](#). Reviewers from institutions that are classified below [R2](#) should be avoided.
- For application for promotion to full professor, reviewers from universities *must* be full professors.
- For application for promotion to associate professor, reviewers should preferably be full professors, with no more than one being an associate professor.
- In certain cases, it may be appropriate to solicit reviews from individuals who are not in programs of equal or higher stature or desirable to solicit reviews from individuals who are not affiliated with academic institutions. In such cases, the department chair should explain their stature and suitability in the brief summary of the reviewers' qualifications that is part of the application packet.

Deans are encouraged, but not required, to approve the list of potential reviewers before the reviewers are contacted. At a minimum, department chairs should submit the list of potential reviewers using the Chair's Report of External Reviewers form. Once the external letters are received, the report form should be finalized and accompany the final packet.

The chair makes the final selection of potential reviewers to be contacted. The names and institutions of potential reviewers contacted are not disclosed to the applicant. In order to obtain at least the minimum number of letters required, it nearly always will be necessary to contact more than the minimum number of potential reviewers.

The department chair should contact potential reviewers before the end of the spring semester and have a full slate of reviewers lined up by the end of May. The department chair should explain to reviewers that the package will be delivered no later than August 1 and obtain a verbal commitment that the review will be completed no later than September 1.

Half or more of the final slate of reviewers should be individuals recommended by the department and not on the candidate's list of suggested reviewers. The final slate of reviewers is not disclosed to the applicant.



**Template for letter to external reviewers. Revise as appropriate for gender and for letters that pertain only to promotion.**

Dear \*\*\*\*\*,

Thank you for agreeing to review Dr. Susan B. Anthony's research. We will consider Dr. Anthony's application for tenure and promotion to associate professor this fall.

Please indicate any personal or professional affiliation that you have with the candidate.

We ask that you objectively evaluate Dr. Anthony's scholarly accomplishments. We wish to apply national standards and ask that you evaluate Dr. Anthony within that context. To that end, please address Dr. Anthony's credentials as follows:

1. How widely and to what degree is Dr. Anthony's work recognized?
2. What is the scope and significance of Dr. Anthony's body of work?
3. What is Dr. Anthony's potential for future growth as a scholar?
4. How does Dr. Anthony compare with other scholars in her field who are at a comparable career stage?

We would also appreciate your assessment of Dr. Anthony's professional service. Comments on her accomplishments in other areas of faculty responsibility such as pedagogical innovations and/or professional outreach are not required but are welcome should that work be known to you. Any additional insights would be welcomed.

External peer-review letters will become part of the application file reviewed by department, college, and university promotion and tenure committees and by the dean and provost. Ordinarily, they will be held in confidence. However, in certain instances an applicant may request and be provided with access to such letters in redacted form, and letters may become fully discoverable in the unlikely event of a legal dispute.

Enclosed you will find copies of Dr. Anthony's CV and additional relevant materials. We need to receive your evaluation letter no later than \_\_\_\_\_.

Please contact me should you have any questions regarding this review. During the summer the quickest way to reach me is via e-mail: \*\*\*\*@unr.edu. My direct office phone number is 775-\*\*\*-\*\*\*\*.

Thank you again for your willingness to do this important professional service. I appreciate it very much.

Sincerely,