

Promotion and Tenure Instructions

Promotion and/or Tenure applications should be submitted on the University of Nevada, Reno Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form. Promotions are now approved on campus and do not go to the regents for final approval. **NOTE: If faculty are applying for both promotion and tenure, only one form needs to be submitted.**

For your convenience, Microsoft Word (preferred) and pdf versions of the University of Nevada, Reno form may be downloaded from the Provost Office website at <http://www.unr.edu/provost/>.

UNR Promotion & Tenure Application

The application should be prepared so that relevant information is included in a clear and concise form. The information should be complete and well organized. All appropriate information should be listed on the form in a font size no smaller than 11 point and pages should be numbered. In general, each item of information should appear only once. All lists should begin with the most recent information. The committee will receive only the basic application and recommending letters. Therefore, supplementary materials provided should be clearly identified and summarized within the application pages.

All required information and signatures should be complete at the time of submission to the Provost's office. All pages submitted should be 8 1/2" x 11". The application packet should be arranged in the order shown on the Promotion & Tenure checklist, also available on the Provost Office website. To aid in electronic processing, the application and supporting letters should not be bound or stapled—binder or paper clips and labeled folders may be used to facilitate handling.

The following information may be helpful in completing the application.

PRESENT RANK	Give rank. Possible ranks include the following: II (Asst. Professor, tenure track) III (Assoc. Professor, tenure track) IV (Professor, tenure track) 0(I) (Lecturer or Asst. Professor, non-tenure track)* 0(II) (Lecturer or Asst. Professor, non-tenure track)* 0(III) (Lecturer or Assoc. Professor, non-tenure track)* 0(IV) (Lecturer or Professor, non-tenure track)* <i>*These rankings are also applicable to research faculty positions.</i>
PRESENT TITLE	Give full title as used in the department.
DATE OF PRESENT RANK	Give month and year when rank was awarded.
PROMOTION OR ASSIGNMENT	Give Rank and Title for promotion sought.
NUMBER OF YEARS GIVEN TOWARD TENURE WHEN HIRED	Give number of years granted toward tenure upon hire by the Department, including the current academic year.

100-WORD SUMMARY OF
BACKGROUND

For applications with tenure requests, provide a 100-word summary of the faculty member's background. The emphasis should be on providing the Board of Regents with a capsule understanding of who the candidate is. The following is a sample summary statement:

Professor John Doe has been employed at the University of Nevada, Reno since 1998 as an assistant professor of English. He came to UNR from Iowa State University. His major areas of interest are American Literature, particularly the works of Mark Twain and Ernest Hemingway, but he also teaches courses in English composition and Survey of World Literature. Dr. Doe serves on strategic planning committee and the commencement committee. Since coming to UNR, he has published a book on Mark Twain, 5 refereed journal articles, and has made 10 professional presentations.

DEGREES, DATES AND
INSTITUTIONS WHERE AWARDED

Give the year, major field of study, and degree obtained from each institution. (Awards at each institution should be listed as well.)

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Give the year, location, and institution for each position held since the baccalaureate degree.

DESCRIPTION OF PRIMARY
ASSIGNMENT

Provide a short paragraph summarizing primary assignment; include role statement percentages. A copy of the role statement should be included in the application package if the percentages differ substantially from the standard role of the department.

TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Present a chronological listing of courses taught over the evaluation period, with special attention to quality teaching, new course development, innovative teaching methods used, etc. (See also course evaluation information which must be submitted for these courses below.)

List honors, prizes, awards and recognition received for teaching. Grants supporting training or teaching effectiveness/innovation would be included in this section.

If supplemental materials regarding teaching activities are being provided, they should be identified and summarized here.

For extension faculty and other outreach faculty or programs, teaching includes, but is not limited to, all forms of extension outreach instructional activities, including assessment of needs, identification of the audience, designing and developing the program and teaching methodologies, and implementation of the program.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATION
OF TEACHING

Multiple indices should be included if possible. This can be done most effectively in a tabular format. An example of a format that might be used is attached to these instructions. There should also be evidence that the results of participant evaluations were collected and analyzed. In the context of numerical participant evaluation data, provide an explanation of the numerical scale used in determining rating and a brief description of the course or instructional program. For classroom resident instruction, provide information on course off-loads and unavailability of course evaluations at submission time. Other information could include the department or school mean, if available, and/or departmental expectations or standards for teaching.

For extension faculty and other outreach faculty or programs, evaluation of outreach teaching includes both quantitative and qualitative evidence of the effectiveness of the design, implementation, and impact of the extension programs on individuals and/or communities.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY OR
CREATIVE EFFORT

List research, scholarly and creative activity under appropriate headings (e.g. refereed, books, book chapters, other, professional papers presented, grant related activities, in progress.) All authors should be given in the order they appear in the paper (not "with John Smith and Kathy Brown"). Use an explanatory note if the order of authorship does not adequately reflect overall scholarly contributions. Date of publication, volume, and page must be given.

Where not obvious, the department chair or dean should explain how the work was validated and communicated. The significance of the scholarship and creative activity and the stature of the sources in which they appear are also appropriate matters for discussion in letters of evaluation from the department or college promotion and tenure committee, the Department Chair, Director, or Dean.

For professional meetings, symposia, and conferences, note the dates, location, and role of the faculty member (e.g. organizer, chair, invited speaker, discussant, presenter).

For grant-related activities, list grant and contract support along with funding agency, dates and name of principal investigator.

Awards directly related to the program of research and which contain a research component should be listed in this section as well.

If supplemental materials regarding research, scholarly or creative effort are being provided, they should be identified and summarized here.

SUMMARY OF OTHER ASSIGNED INSTITUTIONAL DUTIES:	Include any temporary or permanent duties performed as part of the assignment and not included above, include responsibilities, dates, target audience, and results
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM OR INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES OR BOARDS:	Include system, University, college, and departmental committees or boards with role and dates.
SUMMARY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES	<p>Include service that is relevant to the faculty member's assignment and which draws upon professional expertise and contributes significantly to their profession or to university relations as well as community service not directly related to the faculty member's appointment but that contributes to the University.</p> <p>If supplemental materials regarding service are being provided, they should be identified and summarized here.</p>
DEPARTMENT CHAIR EVALUATION	Department chair should complete the evaluation by checking the appropriate box (excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory). Comments regarding performance should only be included in the chair's letter of recommendation.

Required Attachments (for campus use--not for submission to the Board of Regents):

- a. A clearly stated recommendation from each level of review (*i.e.*, department chair, department personnel committee if applicable, college/school personnel committee, dean). While these recommendations ordinarily will be held in confidence, please be aware that they may be accessed by the candidate upon request at certain stages of the review. Chairs should note that this recommendation is in addition to the completed evaluation which is part of the application form. The candidate's performance should be labeled using the standard categories specified by the Code. Where votes are taken, include the exact number of votes cast, even for unanimous votes.
- b. A minimum of four and a maximum of six external peer review letters. These letters should be solicited under the following guidelines:
 - Reviewers should be selected by each department's chair in consultation with others. The process of selecting potential reviewers may include input from the faculty candidate applying for promotion/tenure, but the actual selection of reviewers should not be made by the candidate.
 - Where possible, reviewers should be experts in the faculty member's area of research and should *not* be closely associated with the candidate for promotion. (For example, they should not be a research collaborator or a former peer in school.) In all cases, when the review is solicited, chairs should ask the reviewers to explain their association with the candidate, *i.e.*, known through their published work, *etc.*, and whether, in the reviewer's opinion, the candidate would be recommended for promotion/tenure at the reviewer's institution.
 - Ideally, reviewers should be affiliated with programs of equal or higher stature than the equivalent program at the University of Nevada. They should be of full professor rank, particularly in the case of an application for promotion to full professor. In certain cases, it

may be desirable to solicit reviews from individuals who are not affiliated with an academic institution—in these cases, the reviewer should be at a rank comparable to a full professor within his/her organization. In all instances, the chair should include in his/her supporting letter an explanation of all the reviewers' qualifications and why they are suitable to referee the promotion application. Optionally, the chair can also include a brief résumé for each reviewer.

- When requesting letters of review, the referee should be informed about whether or not their letter can be kept confidential. The language shown below in quotation marks is used by a number of universities and this statement, or one like it, should be included in the chair's letter requesting a reference. (A sample letter is available from this office upon request.)

"The external peer review letters will become part of the candidate's application file and will be held in confidence. However, a candidate may, upon request and at certain stages of the promotion/tenure review process, be provided access to such letters in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation. The full text of the body of the letter would be provided to the candidate if so requested."

- Reviewers should be asked to comment primarily on the candidate's scholarly and/or creative activity, especially its significance to the field. For this reason, only material related to the candidate's scholarly output should be included in the packet that goes out for external review. Please note that the candidate's scholarly output may include contributions to pedagogical developments in their field. Reviewers may also be asked to comment on the candidate's service to the profession if it is known to them. Although evaluation of a candidate's teaching effectiveness or internal service record ordinarily should be performed only by internal reviewers, units can determine if such external evaluations are appropriate based on standards appropriate to the field.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to explain the role of the external letters in evaluating the application for promotion/tenure and to clarify any points raised in external reviews with which the department disagrees.

- c. A copy of the Chair's letter to outside reviewers.
- d. Role statements, when appropriate. This is most appropriate when a candidate has an assignment that is non-standard in terms of teaching, research, and service. In such cases, that assignment should be explained. For example, this situation sometimes applies to clinicians with patient care responsibilities and to extension faculty.

Supplementary Materials (for reference by the University Promotion & Tenure Committee, upon request.)

- a. Supporting documentation for teaching activities and effectiveness including teaching portfolios, syllabi, course materials, course evaluation comments, peer evaluations, self-analysis, and letters of evaluation concerning teaching.
- b. Supporting documentation for research/scholarly activity/creative activity effectiveness. Examples are copies of all published or completed works, including photocopies of articles, chapters

in books, and book reviews, reports of grant and contract activity, if relevant, peer review comments on publication, grants, shows, etc.

- c. Supporting documentation for effectiveness in service. Examples include letters acknowledging outstanding service on committees, etc. Be sure to point out participation in professional organizations, service on review groups, and so forth.

Application Submission

After review by appropriate groups at the various levels of review, forward one original and an electronic copy of the application to the Office of the Provost. In addition, please send the original external review letters, the recommendations from the department chair and department personnel committee, and the recommendations from the dean and the college personnel committee. While electronic copies of external letters may be necessary during the deliberation process at the college level, the letters sent to this office should bear the letterhead and signature of the reviewer.

Please do *not* send the additional supplemental information listed above when the application is forwarded to the Office of the Provost but do indicate on the application the nature of the materials available. These materials should be kept at the dean's office until a final recommendation on the promotion application has been made. Should the University Promotion and Tenure Committee need to review these materials, they will be requested from the dean. Since these materials are not routinely forwarded past the dean's office, it is important for the chair to fully outline the candidate's achievements in the areas of teaching and service in his/her letter of recommendation (required attachment a).

The deadline for submission of applications to the Office of the Provost is *the first business day of November each year*. Please contact this office (x-1740) if there are any questions.

Course Evaluation Scores

Scores are means of medians on a 9-point scale.

[NOTE: XX XXX has been substituted for course numbers.]

	XX XXX	XX XXX	XX XXX	XX XXX	XX XXX	XX XXX
Fall '97		7.00	7.21			
Spring '98		8.68	8.53			
Summer '98				8.71		8.50
Fall '98		7.35	8.80	8.20		
Spring '99			8.40	7.63		
Summer '99				8.60		
Fall '99		7.67	7.23	8.01		
Spring '00		8.58	8.55			
Summer '00				8.50		8.68
Fall '00		7.79	7.76		8.74	
Spring '01	8.16		9.00			
Summer '01				8.79		
Fall '01*			8.76			9.00
Spring '02#						

This chart was followed by:

- Explanatory notes for the footnote markers above (*, #), involving course off-loads and unavailability of course evaluations at submission time
 - Title and brief note for each course listed above (e.g., required course for _____ majors)
 - Representative positive student comments on course evaluations (course number and semester listed behind each) preceded by a summary (overriding themes) in bold
 - Representative negative student comments presented in same manner as the positive comments
- [About 15 representative comments were included in each comment category.]