Fiscal Affairs Committee

Spring 2006 Report

Report on College/School Faculty/Academic Administrator Merit Award System at the University of Nevada Las Vegas

Prepared by
Faculty Senate Fiscal Affairs Committee
Paul Aizley
Lori Candela
Venicia Considine
Michael Dalbor
Anthony Ferri
Tod Fitzpatrick
Marnie Peppers
Steven Phelan
E. G. Phillips
Reeta Sinha
John Swetnam
Mimi Wolverton, Chair
Sarah Akhter (Graduate Student Representative)
Keeton Little (Undergraduate Representative)

Prepared for
Faculty Senate
University of Nevada Las Vegas

April 20, 2006

Report on College/School Faculty/Academic Administrator Merit Award System at the University of Nevada Las Vegas

Charge: Develop a campus-wide baseline of information about how merit is awarded to faculty and academic administrators who report to academic deans.

Participating Colleges/Schools: Separate reports for the following colleges/schools are included in this report. Comparisons and recommendations made take only these units into account.

> College of Business
> School of Dental Medicine
> College of Education
> College of Fine Arts
> School of Health and Human Sciences
> William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
> School of Nursing
> School of Public Health
> College of Liberal Arts
> Library
> College of Sciences
> Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
> University College

Process: Two templates (see Appendices A and B, pp. 10-11) were developed for reporting data—one for faculty and the other for academic administrators. (Note: Not all colleges have separate processes for faculty and administrators; therefore, in some cases only one template was used.)

The year 2004 served as the baseline year. All data reported in this report derive from 2004.

Each college/school specific committee member interviewed individuals (chairs of merit committees, department chairs), who recommend merit award levels to their college deans, to collect information about who can apply, the process used to determine award recommendations, percentages awarded, and problems with the system or process used. In addition, each college/school provided a copy of its merit application form. These reports and application forms are included in this report as appendices (see Appendices C through O).

Once information was collected, it was submitted to the committee chair and two professional staff members of the Fiscal Affairs Committee for compilation. Data were entered into a matrix (see Appendix P). Any information that was missing in initial reports was collected and added to the matrix. (The initial, individual college/school reports were not revised.) Comparisons across colleges were made in order to collapse and make sense of the data. Preliminary recommendations were developed by this subgroup and presented to the full committee.

The full committee reviewed the report and finalized the recommendations.

The following report includes the initial college/school reports (Appendices C through O, pp. 12-98), the cross-college/school comparison (pp. 3-8), and a set of recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate (pp. 8-9).

Cross College/School Comparison

The following comparison across colleges/schools is organized around eleven questions:

> Who can apply?
> What are the criteria used to determine merit awards?
> What is the weight given to each criterion?
> Does a separate process exist for academic administrators below the rank of dean?
> What percent of eligible faculty/administrators applied for merit?
> What percent of those who applied actually received merit?
> Is the dean bound by the recommendations made by the merit committee?
> How many appeals were filed?
> What percent of the money available for merit was actually awarded?
> What is the process?
> What are the perceived problem areas in the process?

Who Can Apply?
Across all colleges/schools, all faculty/academic administrators who were full-time employees for at least one-half of the academic year in question can apply for merit.

What are the Criteria Used to Determine Merit Awards?
The criteria taken into consideration in the determination of merit awards is the same across all units. These criteria are research or creative activity, teaching or job performance, and service. In some instances, a fourth criterion exists for academic administrators who report to a dean.

What Is the Weight Given to Each Criterion?
The weight attached to each of the criteria varies by college/school. In five cases, Dental, Fine Arts, Hotel, Nursing, and University, no specific weights are attached to individual criterion. In Business, the weights vary based on an individual's teaching load. In Education, Health and Human Sciences, Public Health, and Urban Affairs, all three criteria are weighted equally—one-third each. In Science, the weights are research 40%, teaching 40%, and service 20%. The Library has a set of minimum weights: job performance 60%, teaching 10%, and service 10%. In 2004, Liberal Arts weighted the categories in the following manner: research 80%, teaching 10%, and service 10%. (In 2005, the weighting system changed to research 50%, teaching 30%, and service 20%.) The following table provides a summary glance of merit weights across college/schools.

Table 1: Merit Weights by Category and College/School

College/School	Research	Teaching	Service
Business Dental Fine Arts Hotel Nursing University	Varies	Varies	Varies
Education Health and Human Services Public Health Urban Affairs	1/3	1/3	1/3
Liberal Arts	2004: 80% 2005: 50%	2004: 10% 2005: 30%	2004: 10% 2005: 20%
Library	60% minimum	10% minimum	10% minimum

Does a Separate Process Exist for Academic Administrators Below the Rank of Dean?
Seven colleges appear to use separate (or additional) processes to determine merit awards for academic administrators who report to the dean. In the Dental, Fine Arts, Liberal Arts, Urban Affairs, and Business colleges/schools, the dean makes merit decisions for academic administrators. In Science, the faculty merit committee evaluates research and teaching for academic administrators; the dean evaluates the service component. In Education, the faculty merit committee evaluates academic administrators as faculty members on the basis of research, teaching, and service; the dean conducts an additional evaluation to determine administrative merit, which is added to any merit recommended by the faculty merit committee.

Three units—Hotel, Library, and Nursing—have no separate process. University, Health and Human Sciences, and Public Health were unable to determine how academic administrators are evaluated for merit. Nursing indicated that the provost determines merit awards for its academic administrators.

What Percent of Eligible Faculty/Administrators Applied for Merit?
The percent of faculty/administrators within a college/school that applied for merit varied from 35% (Urban Affairs) to 100% in University and Dental.

What Percent of Those Who Applied Actually Received Merit?
The actual percent of faculty/administrators who applied and actually received merit varied from 69% (Fine Arts) to 100% in seven colleges/schools. (It appears from the reports that across units, if academic administrators applied for merit, they received it.)

Table 2 summarizes the percent of eligible faculty/administrators who applied for and received merit across colleges/schools.

Table 2: Percent Who Applied for and Percent Received Merit across Colleges/Schools

College/School	Applied	Received	% College Faculty Who Received Merit
Business	94%	71%	67%
Dental	100%	98%	98%
Education	71%	98%**	70%
Fine Arts	93%	69%	64%
Health & Human Sciences	54%	100%	54%
Hotel	83%	100%	83%
Liberal Arts	67%	93%	62%
Library	51%	100%	51%
Nursing	46%	100%	46%
Public Health	100%	100%	100%
Science	76%	100%	76%
University	100%	90%	90%
Urban Affairs	35%	100%	35%

**68% were recommended by the merit committee; dean increased the number who received merit.

Is the Dean Bound by the Recommendations Made by the Merit Committee?
Three colleges/schools (Dental, Public Health, and Urban Affairs) did not provide this information. In Liberal Arts , the dean cannot overturn merit committee recommendations. In all other cases (9), the dean is not bound by the merit committee's recommendations.

How Many Appeals Were Filed?
There were no appeals in five colleges/schools—Dental, Nursing, Education, Liberal Arts, and Library—although Education indicated that the merit pool was exceptionally large in 2004, so there were no appeals. Typically, there are, on average, two appeals each year in the college. Urban Affairs had five appeals. All other units did not provide this information.

What Percent of the Money Available for Merit Was Actually Awarded?
Based on the information provided, colleges/schools award anywhere from 55% to more than 100% of the allocated dollars. Five colleges did not provide this information. Table 3 delineates the allocation pattern.

Table 3: Award Percentages of Available Funds by College

College	Percentage Awarded
Business	89%
Dental	100%
Education	100%
Fine Arts	??
Health & Human Sciences	??
Hotel	??
Liberal Arts	100%
Library	74%
Nursing	55%
Public Health	>100%
Science	>100%
University	??
Urban Affairs	??

What Is the Process?

Most of the processes start at the department level and in some way involve faculty. A notable exception is the University College where recommendations are made by the dean. This situation may be due, in part, to the newness of the college. The library is another exception. The process here begins with faculty at the college level, who make recommendations to the dean. Unlike all other colleges, the Library allows faculty to apply for merit in one, two, or three categories. Other colleges/schools appear to require that individuals be considered for merit based on a comprehensive portfolio, which addresses all three areas of performance.

Of those colleges/schools with processes that start at the department level, only one (Hotel) begins with the department chair, who makes recommendations to a college committee. In this instance department chairs rank candidates by merit amount between $1,000 and $3,000. Chairs then forward their recommendations to a college merit committee. This committee can alter chair recommendations. These recommendations go to the dean.

The process in two other colleges begins with either a department chair making recommendations to a college committee or a department committee making recommendations to a college committee. In the case of Liberal Arts, the dean sits on the college committee. In Urban Affairs, the recommendations go directly from a department chair or committee to the dean. There does not appear to be a college-wide committee.

The process in the Division of Allied Health (Dental, Health and Human Science, Nursing, and Public Health) begins with separate faculty committees in each school, which forward recommendations to school deans, who in turn forward their recommendations to the division director.

The processes for all other colleges begin with a faculty committee at the department level, which makes recommendations to one or more college level committees, which, in turn, make recommendations to the dean.

In the Business College, departments convene peer committees of at least 3 members. These committees assign numeric score from 0 – 5 for each merit category. Each numeric score is weighted by faculty member's teaching load. The college merit committee (CMC) reviews departmental rankings, paying particular attention to research output. The CMC and department chairs make joint recommendations to the dean.

In Fine Arts, department recommendations (each department has its own process) are forwarded to a college merit committee (CMC). The CMC ranks applicants on a consensus basis, with input from relevant Chairs. Recommendations are forwarded to the dean.

In the College of Education, department committees of three faculty members (sometimes the department chair is one of the three) rank faculty and forward the rankings to a college committee, which determines college-wide rankings. The dean and department chairs are not present at this meeting. The committee's recommendations are forwarded to the dean, who shares them with the department chairs to determine whether the rankings are accurate or need to be adjusted.

In Science, department committees make recommendations to three college committees, one for research, one for teaching, and one for service. All college applications are ranked and awarded points. These rankings and the accompanying points are forwarded to an executive college merit committee, made up of the chairs of research, teaching, and service committees. This committee makes recommendations to the dean.

What Are the Perceived Problem Areas in the Process?
No problem areas were identified in five colleges/schools—University, Dental, Public Health, Nursing, and Library.

In Health and Human Sciences, a lack of specific guidelines about what to count and when to count it caused trouble. For instance, under research, at what stage are manuscripts counted—at submission, at acceptance, in press, or in print. In teaching, the committee does not see student evaluations, and the issue seems to be that some faculty teach to the evaluations. And in the area of service, the question of what is meritorious service arises.

Both Education and Urban Affairs identified the teaching component as troublesome. Urban Affairs requires teaching portfolios, which are cumbersome. In Education, administrative work and graduate level work with doctoral students done as part of a teaching reassignment is theoretically included in the teaching category, but is in most instances, discounted in the teaching category, and in the case of administrative work not counted in the service category.

Lack of consistency across departments in the weighting of articles and the ranking of journals proves problematic in the Business College, especially since the emphasis at the college level is on research productivity.

In the Colleges of Education and Liberal Arts, administrative merit is a concern—in the first instance, the awards are seen as arbitrary. In the second, productive chairs go under-rewarded.

In other cases, the problems are related more to process structure than to merit criteria. For instance, faculty-in-residence in Education must be ranked based on an even split across research, teaching, and service. Yet, their job descriptions preclude much, if any, activity in one or more of the categories. In Science, inconsistency across departments in the way they determine the initial rankings and the authority of the committee to change rankings (usually those developed by a department chair) lead to undeserved awards.

In Liberal Arts, although the presence of the dean at the merit committee meetings keeps him informed, it inhibits discussion among committee members. Finally, the Hotel College deems its system arbitrary and opaque (in need of transparency).

Recommendations

The Faculty Senate Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee makes the following recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. Make all merit processes across colleges transparent.

2. Develop a documented procedural protocol across colleges and departments, which is published and delivered to all members of the college/school. For instance, where does the process start—with a department chair or with department/ unit faculty. In larger units, the process becomes quite daunting. In others, the necessity of providing a portfolio of evidence along with the merit application makes reviewing applications cumbersome. The College of Sciences narrows the process by establishing separate committees for research, teaching, and service at the college level and then having the chairs of these committees serve as an executive committee to finalize the overall rankings for the college. Some such system might bear consideration.

3. Every person who submits an application for merit must include a copy of his/her specific job description and a detailed list of his/her responsibilities for the subject year with the application. These documents can then serve as a baseline for distinguishing between doing one's job and doing it meritoriously.

4. Each college should establish weight systems that are flexible enough to reflect the individual's contract (i.e., if the primary responsibility of a faculty member is teaching, much of his/her merit evaluation should pertain to teaching). The same holds true for individuals whose primary responsibilities lie in research or service. These weights could include post-tenure adjustments.

5. Establish a documented set of parameters for each college that specifies when to count publications, grant, and service activities (i.e., for publications: at submission, at acceptance, in press, or in print).

6. Define meritorious in terms of the mission (vision) of the college/university for each category—research, teaching, and service. For instance, does meritorious service require that a faculty member is involved in certain types of service at the department, college, and university levels? Does it require some national presence? Defining meritorious research behavior will be discipline specific, but guidelines about what constitutes meritorious work could be similar across disciplines.

7. Develop a separate, transparent merit process for academic administrators who are not professional staff (i.e., associate deans, department chairs, associate department chairs, directors) with specific guidelines for defining academic administrative merit.

Questions Raised

1. When and how were the merit categories determined? And by whom? What is the process for changing them? (i.e., $4,500; $3,000, $2,500; and so on)

2. Does the provost distribute merit money to the colleges as a percent of salary or as a percent of FTEs (either faculty or student)? Does the provost distribute all of the merit money or does s/he hold back some? If so, how much?

3. Do the deans distribute all of their merit money to the departments? If YES, based on what method? If the dean holds back some money, how much? (i.e., do they use it all for faculty merit, reserve a pool for academic administrators, or other)?

4. If the dean changes the department ranking, is the dean required to give a n explanation to the committee involved or to the person affected or to both?

Appendix A: Faculty Merit Report Template

Faculty Merit Report Template 2005

Each report should contain the following information for 2004 under the following headings.

COLLEGE
WHO CAN APPLY
MERIT CATEGORIES
WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
PROBLEM AREAS
NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE
PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL
    $4,500
    $3,000
    $2,500
    $2,000
    $1,500
    $1,000

If your college has a college-wide merit committee, contact the chair of the 2004 committee for this information. The specific percentages will probably have to come from the dean's office. If your college does not have a college-wide merit committee, contact the department chair or merit committee chair for each department. Note: if you collect the data in terms of number of faculty, convert the information to percentages.

Appendix B: Academic Administrator Merit Report Template

Administrator Merit Report Template 2005

Each report should contain the following information for 2004 under the following headings.

COLLEGE
WHO CAN APPLY
MERIT CATEGORIES
WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
PROBLEM AREAS
NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS IN COLLEGE
PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
PERCENT OF MERITORIOUSADMINISTRATORS BY $$ LEVEL
    $4,500
    $3,000
    $2,500
    $2,000
    $1,500
    $1,000

This information will probably come from the dean's office. Note: if you collect the data in terms of number of faculty, convert the information to percentages.

Appendix C: College of Business Report

Appendix C: College of Business Report

College of Business Faculty Merit Report, December 2005[1]

College: Business

Who Can Apply: All full-time faculty. The faculty merit committee does not make recommendations on department chairs, assistant deans, or associate deans.

Merit Categories: Scholarship, Teaching, Service.

Weight per Merit Category: Depends on teaching load.

Table 1: Weighting Scheme

	Weights Applied to Categories		
Teaching Load	Scholarship	Teaching	Service
2-2 teaching load	.60	.30	.10
3-2 teaching load	.50	.40	.10
3-3 teaching load	.45	.45	.10
4-4 teaching load	.70	.0	.30

Description of the Merit Process:

Faculty members who do not wish to be considered for merit signify by signing a box on their annual evaluation worksheet. All others are considered for merit unless they are a candidate for promotion and/or tenure.

As part of the annual evaluation process faculty members complete an annual evaluation worksheet, which includes a list of accomplishments during the year. Supporting documentation such as published articles, letters of acceptance, working papers, course syllabi, tests and other course materials, etc, accompany the worksheet. The data are used to arrive at a single score that is used to rate faculty based on scholarship, teaching, and service.

Performance Scores

Each department convenes a peer committee of not fewer than three faculty members to rate teaching, scholarship, and service of each faculty member. Departments establish a procedure for determining how the peers' input is used to arrive at the scores attributable to the peer input.

Scores for teaching range from 0 to 5 and are determined by a combination of student evaluation (30 percent), peer evaluation (30 percent) and chair evaluation (40 percent).

---

[1] Primarily authored by Jeffrey Waddoups (Jeffrey.Waddoups@unlv.edu), Merit Committee Chair 2004, to whom comments or questions may be addressed

Scores for scholarship range from 0 to 5 and are determined by a combination of peer evaluation (60 percent) and chair evaluation (40 percent).

Scores for service range from 0 to 5 and are determined by a combination of peer evaluation (30 percent) and chair evaluation (70 percent).

Each faculty member thus has three scores, which are then weighted according to the scheme listed above. The result is a single score between 0 and 5.

Determining Merit

The College Merit Committee and department chairs each provide input to the dean, who ultimately determines the recommendations that are forwarded to the Provost. The College Merit Committee is composed of one faculty member from each department, who is elected by the department. The committee member serves for two years, such that each year three members of the committee are new and three are incumbents.

For approximately two weeks before the first meeting, the college committee has access to annual evaluation materials of all faculty members in the college. It is presumed that members of the committee will examine the materials before the first meeting. The college merit committee is also provided with all the performance scores in an Excel spreadsheet as discussed above.

The college merit committee arrives at its recommendation for merit awards according to performance in research, teaching, and service. However, research output is the primary determinant. The baseline criteria were as follows: if a faculty member published an article in a tier I journal during the year in question, it would generally warrant a recommendation of $4,500. If a faculty member published an article in a tier II journal, it would generally warrant a merit award of $3,000. Articles in tier III journals or other refereed publications generally warrant recommendations of either $1,000 or $1,500 depending on the committee's judgment.[2]

In order to provide additional incentives to publish in high quality journals, publications in tier I and tier II journals are given weight beyond the year of publication. A tier I publication in the year after it was accepted for publication is treated as a tier II publication, and in the second year after acceptance it is treated as a tier III publication. Thus in the second year a tier I publication would warrant a recommendation of $3,000, and in the third year it would warrant a recommendation of at least $1,000. A tier II journal is treated as a tier III publication the year after its acceptance.

In instances of multiple publications, merit recommendations are adjusted upward according to the committee's judgment.

---

[2] The college has ranked journals into tier I – high quality, very selective journals – tier II – also high quality but somewhat less prestigious – and tier III.

Merit awards are also recommended for faculty who distinguish themselves in teaching or research. For example faculty with high performance scores, but without research, were recommended for merit amounts according to the committee's judgment.

The Number of Faculty in College (Excluding Administrative Faculty): 70.

The Number and Percent of Faculty who Applied for Merit: 66 (94 percent).

The Number and Percent of Faculty who were Recommended for Merit by College Merit Committee: 43 (65 percent).

The Number and Percent of Faculty who Applied for and Received Merit: 47 (71 percent).

Percent of Meritorious Faculty by $ Level:

Summary of Merit Awards, College of Business, 2004

$ Level	Recomm.	Percent	Actual	Percent
$4,500	4	6%	5	8%
$3,000	8	12%	6	9%
$2,500	4	6%	10	15%
$2,000	6	9%	5	8%
$1,500	12	18%	6	9%
$1,000	9	14%	15	23%
$0	23	35%	19	29%
Total Applied and Receiving	66		66	

For additional data on the variations between the committee's recommendations and actual merit awards to faculty in the College of Business by department please see Table 4 at the end of the report.

Percent of Merit Pool Awarded in 2004: 88.9%

Problem Areas

Inconsistency in Performance Scores across Departments

Each department assigns performance scores according to their own procedure. The result is that scores may be biased upwards in some departments and downward in others. Such inconsistency makes it difficult to make interdepartmental comparisons. To illustrate, I have compiled median performance scores by department in the table 3 below.

Table 3: Median Performance Scores by Department

Department	Score
Accounting	3.00
Economics	2.70
Finance	2.89
Management	3.64
MIS	3.81
Marketing	3.94

One manifestation of the inconsistency is the differences in teaching evaluations. In one case, a department chair gave every individual in the department with one exception the same teaching score. In other cases, there were very large discrepancies between student evaluation scores and chair or peer scores, with no explanation provided. It was suggested that the merit committee ought to have some kind of explanation for cases in which there is a variation of more than one point between the scores given by department chairs, peers, or students.

Inconsistency in Journal Rankings Across Departments

For many faculty, merit is based largely on research and the primary measurement of research quality is journal ranking. The college merit committee expressed concerns about inter-departmental equity with respect to the types of journals that are placed in the tier I and tier II rankings. (see footnote 2 for a description of the journal rankings).

Another issue is the lack of tier III rankings in some departments. The policies in the various departments run from exclusive tier III lists, to expansive tier III lists, to no tier III lists at all, thus any refereed journal not included on the other two lists is automatically included on the tier III list. A uniform policy on journal lists would increase the equitability of the merit process across departments in the college.

The Weighting Scheme

The weighting scheme as presented in Table 1 arbitrarily penalizes some who do research while they are on carrying three-three teaching loads because it does not necessarily reflect the workload at the time that research was being done. Suppose a faculty member was on a reduced teaching load in year 1 to conduct research. In year 2 the faculty member was back to a full-teaching load, and the paper was accepted for publication. According to the weighting scheme, the paper accepted in year 2 would not be valued as highly because the faculty member was on a three-three schedule during the year of acceptance.

College of Business Administrator Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: Business

WHO CAN APPLY: Department chairs, associate deans, Director of MBA programs, Director of Lied Institute, Director of the Center for Business and Economic Research

MERIT CATEGORIES: Teaching, research, service.

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY: Department Chairs (50% on service), other administrators range from 50%-100% for service.

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS:

Administrators are the last ones to be evaluated after the Dean receives recommendations from the department chairs and college merit committee on teaching and research performance.

Currently, the Dean is the only one to provide an evaluation of administrative service. This is done by reference to the baseline expectations for each administrative position. Administrators do not have to be above average when compared with other administrators. For merit, an administrator's performance/actions must go beyond those expected of the position.

Administrators who apply for merit are required to provide a self-evaluation of their teaching, research, and service activities for the year. The top merit category of $4500 will never be awarded solely for administrative performance as this typically counts for only 50% of the evaluation.

PROBLEM AREAS:

There have been no appeals against the Dean's evaluation of administrative service during his tenure. However, there is an opportunity to obtain more robust input to the process, through the use of 360-degree feedback on administrative performance from peers and subordinates who are knowledgeable about the administrative performance as well as top down from the Dean. In fact, this enhanced input will be implemented for the 2005 calendar year.

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS IN COLLEGE: 11 (6 chairs, 2 associate deans, 3 directors)

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS ADMINISTRATORS BY $$ LEVEL:

$4500	1	9.1%
$3000	6	54.5%
$2500	3	27.2%
$2000	1	9.1%
$1500	0	0.0%
$1000	0	0.0%

Appendix D: School of Dental Medicine Report

Appendix D: School of Dental Medicine Report

FACULTY MERIT REPORT

COLLEGE
School of Dental Medicine

WHO CAN APPLY
Anyone eligible

MERIT CATEGORIES
N/A

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
N/A

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
Development
Early in January, Department Chairs will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss their proposed activities for the upcoming calendar year. A final plan of activity will be agreed upon during the meeting. The annual plan should be consistent with the long-term goals established during the initial appointment discussions.

Evaluation
In January, the Chair will meet with each faculty member to evaluate their previous activities based upon the finalized plan discussed above. The evaluation will be based upon the Chair's review of the faculty's activities in the areas of Instruction, Scholarly Research / Creative Activity, and Service.

Merit
Faculty will be ranked for merit based upon the final evaluation. The rank will be on a scale from 1-4, (1 = low and 4 = high). A faculty committee composed of one faculty from each department will review the ranking list. The individual names of faculty will not be identified, only the raw score. If the committee deems that the ranking list is appropriate, it will forward its approval to the Dean, who will then take the appropriate action.

PROBLEM AREAS
None

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE
49 FTE eligible for merit

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
100%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
98%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL

$4,500 – 20%

$3,000 – 40%

$2,500 – 20%

$2,000 – 10%

$1,500 – 10%

$1,000 – 0%

PERCENT OF AVAILABLE FUNDS AWARDED LAST YEAR
100%

NUMBER OF APPEALS
0

Appendix E: College of Education Report

Appendix E: College of Education Report

<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Annual Review Self Report / MERIT Application
(2004 Calendar Year)

</div>

Name:

Department:

_____   I wish to apply for MERIT for the 2004 calendar year.

_____   I do not wish to apply for or be considered for MERIT for the 2004 calendar year.

(Signature and date)

I.   PERSONAL DATA (to be completed by the faculty member)

Title:

     Rank (give date present rank was attained):

     Highest Degree Received (give date received):

     Employment Assignments for 2004 (please check as appropriate):

     <u>Spring 2004</u>   <u>Fall 2004</u>

           Regular faculty assignment

           Sabbatical leave

           Professional development leave

Other (explain)

Il.   SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE

A. TEACHING AND RELATED

1.. Formal Teaching

Spring Instructional Assignments (identify type of course, e.g., lecture, practica, internships, independent studies, continuing education, distance education) and Student Evaluation Ratings (mean ratings on the COE Evaluation Form using a 5-point scale):

Spring 2004 Instructional assignments:

Course #   Name   Enrollment   Student Ratings

Fall 2004 instructional assignments:

Course #   Name   Enrollment   Student Ratings

2. Other Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (e.g., efforts at revision of course content or refinement of field experiences, utilization of technology or personal research to enhance instruction):

3. Other assigned teaching related activities:

4. Reassignment to other duties in lieu of teaching (provide a brief description):

5. Advisement of Masters Students: (put number of students in blanks
    a. Served as Chair with student completing:

        Thesis _____   Prof. Paper _____   Comp
        Exams _____

b. Served as Member with student completing:

Thesis _____   Prof. Paper _____   Comp
Exams _____

c. Served as Grad College Representative with student completing:

Thesis _____   Prof. Paper _____   Comp
Exams _____

d. Serving as Chair in Progress _____

6. Advisement of Doctoral Students: (put number of students in blanks)

a. Served as Chair with student completing:

Comp. Exams _____   Proposal Defns. _____   Dissertation __
_

b. Served as Member with student completing:

Comp. Exams _____   Proposal Defns. _____   Dissertation __
_

c. Served as Grad College Representative with student completing:

Comp. Exams _____   Proposal Defns. _____   Dissertation __
_

d. Serving as Chair in Progress _____

e. Serving as Member in Progress _____

f. Serving as Grad College Representative in Progress _____

7. Other Non-assigned Advising Activities:

8. Special Honors or Awards for Teaching:

9. Professional Recognition of Student Research (e.g., awards, publications, presentations):

10. New Courses Developed (give prefix, number and brief catalog description)   and/or Other Significant Curriculum Contributions (give description):

11. Guest Lecturing/Team Teaching (other than assigned load):

12. Special Considerations/Additional Information (present justification(s) for any special considerations for credit in TEACHING that is not accounted for in this listing):

B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

1. Publications (list only those that were actually published during the calendar year, with full citation):

a. Books: (indicate new or revised):

b. Refereed journal articles:

National/lnternational

  Regional or State/Local

c. Chapters in refereed books or monographs:

 d. Nonrefereed journal articles or conference proceedings:

 e. Invited publications (columns, editorials, or similar items):

 f. Other circulated professional materials and creative activities (e.g., software, curriculum materials, media):

 g. Book reviews:

2. Presentations (give title; conference site and dates):

 a. National/lnternational

 b. Regional or State/Local

3. Grants and Contracts (give title and brief description, funding source, description of involvement in writing grant, whether initial grant or renewal, total amount, and whether funded or not funded):

4. Special Honors or Awards for Scholarly Activities Received in 2004:

5. Special considerations/Additional Information (present justification(s) for any special considerations for credit in SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES that is not accounted for in this listing, e.g., work in progress):

C. SERVICE

1. Institutional or System Committees (describe whether chair or member, and activities involved:

 a. UCCSN

 b. University

 c. College

 d. Department

2. Field Service Involvements (name organization, e.g., State Department of Education, Clark County School District, and describe activities):

3. Service to Professional Organizations (identify level -- national/international, regional/state/local and describe activities):

 a. Offices (identify elected or appointed)

 b. Committees (chair or member)

 c. Chairing conference programs:

 d. Other

4. Editing and Reviewing (describe activities involved):

     a.   Editorships:

     b.   Editorial board memberships

     c.   Guest Reviewing

     d.   Proposal reviewing (conferences, grants)

     e.   External reviewing for promotion/tenure (list candidate name and institution):

5.   Special Honors or Awards for Service Activities:

6.   Special Considerations/Additional Information (present justification(s) for any special considerations for credit in SERVICE that is not accounted for in this listing.

Appendix F: College of Fine Arts Report

Appendix F: College of Fine Arts Report

University of Nevada, Las Vegas - College of Fine Arts

Faculty & Administrative Merit Descriptions

2004 Calendar Year

College:

College of Fine and Performing Arts

Who Can Apply:

Professional Staff and Faculty

Merit Categories:

Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, Service

Weight Per Merit Category:

Not weighted by set percentages. Excellence required in at least one area
for minimum merit level. (See attached Example 2 "Merit Application Guidelines for more
information.")

Description of Merit Process:

Merit awards are first given a ranking at the departmental level. Each
department handles this differently:

MUSIC: Initial ranking determined by Music Department Chair. The Merit
Application is linked to the Annual Evaluation.

THEATER:

ARCHITECTURE: The Architecture Department forms a committee which
ranks the applicants. The committee then forwards this information to the Chair, after review,
submits it to the College Merit Committee.

ART: A merit committee reports their findings to the
Chair, who then reviews the information. If the chair is in agreement it is forwarded to the Dean
of the CFA. If not in agreement, the Chair will confer with the committee for a resolution, before
forwarding the recommendations. They tend to measure teaching first, professional development
second, and service third, but that is not absolute, there is some flexibility. A strong merit
recommendation would be a positive consideration in an individual's annual evaluation.

FILM:

DANCE: The Dance Department forms a committee which ranks the
applicants. The committee then forwards this information to the
Chair, after review, submits it to the College Merit Committee.
See Example 1 below.

GEREONTOLOGY: The Gerontology Program consists of faculty from about
fourteen departments. They do no award merit. Faculty members are awarded merit from their
respective departments.

ADVISING CENTER:

PERFORMING ARTS CENTER:

After the initial rankings at the departmental level, merit is then determined by a committee in
the College of Fine Arts. Each committee member reads every merit application and assigns a
rank. The committee then meets and begins to create a ranking by consensus. During the
deliberation, each department chair is consulted.
Awards begin at the top level and then move down. This type of ranking
ensures that the most deserving applicants will be awarded.

Problem Areas:

Some members of the committee may want to award themselves the top
award without really deserving it.

Faculty Numbers

Number of Faculty in College:

80 faculty
13 pro-staff

Percent of Faculty who Applied for Merit:

74% of the faculty and pro-staff applied for merit.

Percent of Faculty Who Applied For and Received Merit:

93% applied for merit.
69% of total faculty received merit.

Percent of Meritorious Faculty by $$ Level:

$4,500 – 20%
$3,000 – 30%
$2,500 – 17%
$2.000 – 11%
$1,500 – 9%
$1,000 – 13%

Administrative Numbers

1) Number of administrators in College?

9 administrators

2) Percent of administrators who applied for merit?

89% applied for merit.

3) Percent of administrators who applied for and received merit?

88% applied for and received merit.

4) Percent of meritorious administrators by $$$ level:

$4,500 - 57%
$3,000 - 43%
$2,500
$2,000
$1,500
$1,000

EXAMPLE 1

Department of Dance Merit Guidelines and Procedures
Department of Dance Merit Guidelines and Procedures
The Department of Dance will follow the merit procedures and guidelines of the College of Fine Arts. Departmental procedures are as follows:
<u>**Procedure**</u>
• In January of each year, the full-time faculty in the Department of Dance will initiate

application for Merit in the College of Fine Arts.
• All full-time, permanent faculty within the department wishing to apply for Merit, can submit a merit form outlining the activities (Teaching Assignments and Teaching duties, Scholarly and Creative Research, and Service) they feel are Meritorious and deserving of Merit.
• The merit form can include activities which have occurred since the faculty members last merit award.
• This period will end with the previous calendar year.
• Completed Merit Forms will be submitted to the Department of Dance chairperson, by the first week of instruction in the Spring semester.
• The Department of Dance chairperson, will then initiate the Merit evaluation process.
<u>**Process**</u>
• The governing body of the Department of Dance (which consists of Dance faculty members under full-time professional contract holding professorial rank), will review all merit files. This body will submit to the chairperson, evaluations of the files include items deemed meritorious, as well as a monetary merit amount the file deserves.
• The Department of Dance chairperson will evaluate merit forms and the comments of the Department of Dance governing body. The chair will then write remarks and summaries, rank the files, and submit these ranking to the Dean of the College of Fine Arts and the College of Fine Arts Merit committee.
• The Department of Dance chairperson will then distribute a copy of the rankings and summaries to the faculty members applying for merit.

EXAMPLE 2

MERIT APPLICATION GUIDELINES

$4,500
Ranked Excellent in at least 2, perhaps 3 areas
Ranked Commendable in other areas
Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:
Research published by prestigious, high impact, and internationally recognized journals/publishers
Creative work performed/shown in or by prestigious, high impact, and internationally recognized venues
Research/creative work recognized by national/international awards
Extensive effort/work involved
Outstanding benefit to UNLV
Demonstrated leader in respective field
Peer recognition of excellence in teaching (such as College, UNLV, Regents', or professional association awards)
Extensive service to department, college, university, and/or profession

$3,000
Ranked Excellent in 2 areas, or 1 area if accomplishments are Exceptionally important or represent a major contribution to the discipline
Ranked Commendable in all other area(s)
Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:
Research presented in or published by prestigious, high impact, and nationally recognized conferences/journals/publishers, perhaps some internationally
Research/creative work recognized by national awards
Known profile in field; well-recognized by peers
Substantial work/effort involved
Benefit to UNLV
Emerging leader in respective field
Potential to advance in field
Demonstrated superiority in teaching (such as published scholarship on teaching, record of students earning College, University, or national awards)
Substantial service to department, college, university, and/or Profession.

$2,500

☐Ranked Excellent in 1 or 2 areas

☐Ranked Satisfactory in no more than one area

Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:

☐Research presented in or published by nationally recognized conferences/ journals/publishers

☐Creative work performed/shown in nationally recognized venues

☐Reasonably strong profile

☐Recognition in field and by peers

☐Fairly substantial work/effort involved

☐Benefit to UNLV

☐Exceptional student recognition of excellence in teaching (student organization recognitions, student-nominated Alumni association awards, high mean score on student teaching evaluations, etc.)

☐Above average service to department, college, university, and/or profession

$2,000

☐Ranked Excellent in 1 area, perhaps 2

Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:

☐Research presented in or published regionally recognized conferences/ journals/publishers

☐Creative work performed/shown in regional venues

☐Moderate profile

☐Moderate work/effort involved

☐Some benefit to UNLV

☐Serious potential to advance in the field

☐Student recognition of excellence in teaching (student teaching evaluation average score of 3.0 or better)

☐Above average service to department, college, university, and/or profession

$1,500

☐Ranked Excellent in 1 area

Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:

☐Research/Creative work: regional venues

☐Lower profile

☐Some benefit to UNLV

☐Satisfactory service to department, college, university, and/or profession

$1,000

☐Ranked Excellent in 1 area

Generally merit at this level is based on meeting a combination of the following criteria:

Research/Creative work: primarily local venues

Low profile

Minor, but not entirely insignificant benefits to UNLV

Adequate record of teaching competence

Adequate service to department, college, and/or university

Appendix G: School of Health and Human Sciences Report

Appendix G: School of Health and Human Sciences Report

FACULTY MERIT REPORT

COLLEGE
School of Health and Human Sciences

WHO CAN APPLY
All tenure track and non-tenure track full time faculty and professional staff

MERIT CATEGORIES
Teaching, Scholarship, Service

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
1/3, 1/3, 1/3

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
The applicant must provide all documentation to support their application for merit. Department Chair is first review, Chair then supplies a supporting letter for the application (non supported applications do not go forward) which is then reviewed by the SHHS Faculty Affairs Committee. Faculty Affairs Committee reviews applicants and provides a rank ordered list to the Director of SHHS who reviews the list, makes changes when appropriate, then assigns monetary awards. Director reviews the rank ordered list with monetary awards with the Executive Committee and then forwards a final list to the Provost.

PROBLEM AREAS
Uncertainty about when an article is counted towards merit. E.G. – when the article is accepted or when it is actually in print. Teaching evaluations are not equally weighted when the committee reviews them. E.G. – A faculty member who teaches a graduate class with 6 students finds it easier to get a higher evaluation score than a faculty member who teaches a 100 level course with 50 students. Typically, the 100 level course with 50 students is going to receive a lower overall score than the graduate class. Service, what is considered meritorious service? We all do service, what is the cut off between what is expected and what is meritorious?

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE
35

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
54%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
100%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL

$4,500 – 10.5%

$3,000 – 36.8%

$2,500 – 31.6%

$2,000 – 10.5%

$1,500 – 5.3%

$1,000 – 5.3%

PERCENT OF AVAILABLE FUNDS AWARDED LAST YEAR
Not known; we just provide a rank order and the Director applies the funding amounts.

NUMBER OF APPEALS
Not known at this time.

Appendix H: Hotel College Report

Appendix H: Hotel College Report

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration Faculty Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: Hotel Administration

WHO CAN APPLY: All full-time faculty including tenure-track, faculty in residence, department assistant chairs, department chairs, associate deans

MERIT CATEGORIES: Research, Teaching, Service

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY: Weights per category are not specified.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MERIT PROCESS:
The merit process in the College of Hotel Administration begins at the **department** level. Persons who are applying for merit must state that they wish to be considered for merit. Candidates for merit fill out an annual report (see attached) and these are presented to the department chairs.

At this point, the department chairs rank candidates by cluster, or merit award. There are five clusters ranging from $1,000 to $3,000. Theoretically, no more than 20% of those applying will be in any one cluster. There is no formal point scoring done at this or any other level. The clustering is then sent to the College Merit committee, which is comprised of one representative from each department—food and beverage, hotel administration and tourism and convention.

The committee takes into consideration the following categories, although the weighting is not formally stated:

Research:	Refereed articles of any authorship
	Books
	Grants
	Refereed paper presentations
	Invited articles
	Invited presentations

Teaching:	Student evaluations
	New course development
	Program administration

Service:	Editorships
	National offices held
	Department, College, University Committees
	Advising
	Other service to the profession
	Consulting

The College Merit committee examines the clustering list. Any "reclustering" of candidates must be accompanied by written rationale for such changes. The candidate does not receive any information about this if he or she is reclustered. The reclustering is not tracked.

The revised merit cluster list is then presented to the Dean. The Dean has the authority to increase any one in any cluster. Any reclustering must be accompanied by written rationale for the Provost. The only way to tell if people have been reclustered is for the College Committee to compare their report to the final report submitted to the Provost.

Finally, only the Dean can make the decision to give someone top merit, or $4,500. In addition, the Dean issued a statement a few years ago that he will only consider awarding top merit to someone who is going for merit in research if they are actively involved in the grant writing process (not necessarily receiving grants).

PROBLEM AREAS
Overall, there is a sense of a "black box" effect with the merit process. While the requirements for tenure are relatively straightforward in an absolute sense, the merit process is more relative. Two years ago a large number of faculty members appealed their merit awards. Faculty members and department chairs are largely unaware of how candidates end up being clustered.

There is extreme competition for the top merit award. Additionally, while it is stated that people will be rewarded for being excellent in any of the three areas, the Dean is trying to encourage people to help pay for their research through grant writing. It seems this tends to favor those who are heavily involved in research as opposed to service or teaching.

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN THE COLLEGE: 53

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 44 or 83%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: All faculty that applied for merit received some award. Of the 9 faculty that did not receive merit, 2 were ineligible due to promotion, 3 were new hires and didn't apply, 3 declined to apply and 1 did not fill out the annual report.

PERCENT OF FACULTY BY AWARD LEVEL

Award	Number	Percentage
$4,500	3	5.7%
$3,000	10	18.9%
$2,500	9	16.9%
$2,000	7	13.2%
$1,500	7	13.2%
$1,000	8	15.1%
$0	9	16.9%

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
Administrator Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: Hotel Administration

WHO CAN APPLY: Department chairs and associate chairs, assistant and associate deans

MERIT CATEGORIES: Teaching, research and service

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY: Weights per category are not specified.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MERIT PROCESS:
In the College of Hotel Administration all merit monies come from the same pool of funds with the exception of that awarded to the dean. The dean is awarded from a pool controlled by the provost.

Administrators are rated as faculty members and the reporting procedure is the same as faculty. The Dean may consider performance that is above and beyond their regular duties as administrators. However, there are no specific activities that would necessarily be considered.

PROBLEM AREAS
Similar to the faculty merit process, there is a sense of a "black box" effect. Additionally, the administrators really do not receive any "extra" merit from their administrative duties.

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS IN THE COLLEGE: 6 (2 associate deans, 1 director, 3 chairs).

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF FACULTY BY AWARD LEVEL

Award	Number	Percentage
$4,500	1	16.7%
$3,000	3	50.0%
$2,500	2	33.3%

Appendix I: College of Liberal Arts Report

Appendix I: College of Liberal Arts Report

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: Liberal Arts

WHO CAN APPLY: All full-time faculty including tenure track, faculty-in-residence, directors, academic advisors

MERIT CATEGORIES: Research, Teaching, Service

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY:

Given the merit process described in the attached guidelines, no fixed percentage can be determined. Based on the criteria outlined in the merit guidelines, teaching is estimated to be rewarded at a rate that can be no greater than 34% of the total merit pool. This calculation is based on the assumption that every recipient received 1000 dollars in recognition of teaching excellence. The dean estimates that approximately half of faculty who received merit had their award increased in consideration of teaching excellence. He further estimated that an increment of 500 dollars was more likely than the assumed 1000. Based on these figures, the percentage of the merit pool would total slightly less than 9% of the total. The dean estimates that number of merit awards increased in recognition of service would total about half of that for teaching. Using that estimate, over eighty per cent of the merit pool was granted in recognition of excellence in research and publication.

It is important to note that the merit system has been substantially revised for the coming year. Under the revised system, merit will be awarded based on the following percentages: Research and Publication: 50% Teaching:30% and Service 20%.

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS:

The merit process begins at the departmental level with a process determined by each department's by-laws. Some departments employ a personnel committee to rank department members, others function as a committee of the whole, in some the chairman does the ranking. The outcome of this process is a set of recommendations with the level appropriate to each recommended faculty member. These departmental lists are forwarded to the college personnel committee. This committee meets with the dean present to discuss all applicants and determine an appropriate level for each applicant. In 2005, 93 of the 100 individuals forwarded to the committee received merit. Most decisions reached after discussion of individuals cases are unanimous so no formal vote was taken. In some instances, a secret ballot was used. Recommendations of the committee are made to the Dean who has the right to alter the amount awarded. In the year under consideration, the dean made no changes to the committee's

recommendations. A "small number, single digits, possibly about 5" of appeals were made of the committee's awards. Two of these appeals resulted in an upward revision of merit awards.

PROBLEM AREAS:

The participation of the dean in the deliberations of the personnel committee serves to enrich the information available to him in making merit decisions, and the dean expresses the opinion that the discussion of the cases enables him to interpret the written record in the light of faculty opinion. At the same time, the presence of the dean in committee deliberations may have the unintended consequence of influencing and inhibiting discussion by the committee, even among tenured faculty elected by the college.

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE: 157

NUMBER OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 100 (67%)

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: 93%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY LEVEL

4500   18%
3000   36%
2500   18%
2000   21%
1500   4%
1000   3%

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

MERIT EVALUATION FORM
Period Ending December 31, 2005

Name_____ Date of last merit award_____

Department_____

Rank_____ Date of last promotion_____

    CRITERIA:

Persons shall be recommended for merit only if they have demonstrated satisfactory performance in all three of the following areas: teaching, research and impact, and service. Satisfactory performance in each area must be demonstrated on the application form. Exemplary performance in one, two, or all three of those areas is the primary criterion for consideration for merit. In all cases, documentation must be available to support the application for merit.

Note (1):   Considerations of inequity should be excluded from the merit process.

Note (2):   Exemplary accomplishments resulting from a sabbatical leave are eligible as considerations for merit.

Note (3):   Except as indicated below in consideration of meritorious research and impact, Items submitted in support of previously funded merit applications may not be resubmitted in this merit application.

Except for the Research and Impact Category, Only accomplishments during the last calendar year should be included in this form. For Research and Impact, the period is the last three years: January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2005. Documentary evidence for each item included should be held in the appropriate departmental office for possible use by the Personnel Committee. Such evidence would include teaching evaluations, books, monographs, offprints, manuscripts, letters of acceptance, acknowledgement of submission, committee reports, grant proposals, letters of commendation, citations, etc.

The applicant should complete all applicable sections, except those sections requiring the chairperson's evaluation. Use addenda where necessary. Please submit the application typed.

1.   TEACHING

    1.1   Narrative description of teaching accomplishments. Please indicate method of student evaluation used, and method of peer evaluation, if used. Indicate also the number of courses evaluated, and size and level of courses taught. Other information, such as GPA on student evaluations, synopses of evaluations, etc. is optional.   Include significant activity in student advisement.

    1.2   Chairperson's assessment of general value of faculty member's teaching and teaching-related duties. Please indicate the criteria used for establishing this assessment: student evaluations, peer evaluation, chair's review of classroom materials such as syllabi, etc.

2.   RESEARCH AND IMPACT

    2.1   Publications/Creative achievement: books or monographs published or accepted for publication; comparable accomplishments for arts areas.

    2.2   Publication/Creative achievement: Refereed articles or similar refereed publications (include titles, dates, publishers, journals, page numbers, and any other relevant bibliographical information); comparable relevant information for arts areas.

    2.3   Invited publications (e.g., book review, invited review article in a refereed journal, invited chapter in a book, encyclopedia entry). Include titles, dated publishers, series, or any other relevant bibliographical information; comparable for arts areas.

    2.4   Non-refereed publications (e.g., in non-refereed journal, non-refereed proceedings volume, popular media). Include titles, dates, publishers, series, or any other relevant bibliographical information for arts areas.

    2.5   Papers presented at professional meetings.   Include titles, names of professional meetings, dates presented; comparable achievement in arts areas. Indicate whether paper was invited, or refereed, or neither.

2.6 Grants and contracts funded. Include name, granting or contracting agency, amounts, dates, purpose.

2.7 Other: awards, editing of a journal, refereeing, reviewing for publishers, award citations, published reviews of applicant's work, etc.

2.8 Other evidence of impact of work, such as mention in literature, at conferences, citations or other evidence that the work is noticed and highly regarded in the field.

2.9 Chairperson's evaluation of overall quality and significance of scholarship or creative activity since last merit award. Please evaluate each publication in terms of the competitiveness, prestige, circulation, and general quality of the press, journal, or medium; please evaluate each presentation in terms of competitiveness, prestige, size of membership, etc., of the sponsoring organization.

3. SERVICE

3.1 Professional service: office held in national or regional professional associations, service on editorial boards, professional association committees, consultancies. Include name, title, function, and dates of service.

3.2 System committees: include name, title, function, and dates of service.

3.3 University committees: include name, title, function, and dates of service.

3.4 College committees: include name, title, function, and dates of service.

3.5 Department committees: Include name, title, function, and dates of service.

3.6   Special assignments: Include name, title, function and dates of service.

3.7   Community Service: Include only those activities which provide the faculty member an opportunity to serve the community because of his/her professional education or training. Describe activity, with dates of service.

3.8   Chairperson's evaluation of scope and importance of service activities.

Recommend the appropriate level of award by circling one of the following numbers:

Level 0 (no merit) Level 4

Level 1   Level 5

Level 2   Level 6

Level 3

4.0 Chairperson's justification for recommended level of merit.

Evaluator_____

Signature_____

Date_____

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS ADMINISTRATIVE MERIT REPORT

COLLEGE: Liberal Arts

WHO CAN APPLY: Associate Deans and Department Chairs

MERIT CATEGORIES: Same as faculty

WEIGHT BY MERIT CATEGORY: not clear

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS:

Administrators are evaluated by the dean using the categories in the attached guidelines. The dean then adds to any amount already justified based on his assessment of the individual's performance as chair or dean.

PROBLEM AREAS:

The dean expressed the opinion that academically productive department chairs may be under rewarded by the system of merit steps, since they may have earned the maximum merit step prior to consideration of their administrative service. He asserts that the relatively higher percentage of administrators who receive merit is the logical consequence of picking able individuals to chair departments. The substantially higher rates of remuneration may also reflect the fact that the dean, working closely with department chairs, is more likely to recognize and appreciate their contributions to the university than the contributions of other faculty members.

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS: 10 (9 Chairs 1 Associate Dean)

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 90%

**PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR AND
 RECEIVED MERIT**: 100%

PERCENT OF MEITORIOUS ADMINISTRATORS BY AMOUNT:

4500 22%
3000 67%
2500 11%

Appendix J: Library Report

Appendix J: Library Report

UNLV Libraries Faculty Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: UNLV Libraries

WHO CAN APPLY:
- Faculty must be at least satisfactory in the three areas of job performance, scholarly/creative activities, and service and meritorious in at least one of those areas to be considered.
- Faculty must have served at least 50% of the year to which the merit award applies.
- Although a person may be employed for less than the full year, the person's total performance for the period under consideration would have to be deemed equally meritorious with that of other persons recommended for a merit award who have served a full year. It is rare that merit is awarded under such circumstances.

MERIT CATEGORIES:
- Job Performance
- Scholarly/Creative activities
- Service

NUMBER OF FACULTY: 34

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WHOAPPLIED FOR MERIT:
- 51.4%

PERCENTAGEOF FACULTY WHO APPLIED AND RECEIVED MERIT:
- 51.4%

PERCENTAGE WHO RECEIVED MERIT BY $$ LEVEL:
- 4,500 - 27.8%
- $3,000 - 61.1%
- $2,500 - 11.1%
- $1,500 - 0
- $1,000 - 0

TOTAL DOLLARS AVAILABLE FOR MERIT FOR FACULTY:
- $82, 156 (includes $$s available 8 Professional staff + 34 faculty)

TOTAL DOLLARS AWARDED FOR MERIT TO FACULTY:
- $60,500

NUMBER OF APPEALS:
- 0

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY:
- The applicant will assign a weight to the three areas of job performance, creative/scholarly activities, and service, even if he/she is not applying for merit in a particular category. If one does not apply for merit in a category, one will want to assign the lowest possible percentage to that category. The weightings will be used by the Merit Advisory Committee in ranking applicants.
- Minimum weight to be assigned to each category:
Job performance = 60%
Creative/scholarly = 10%
Service = 10%.

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS:
- Allocation of Awards
Generally, the Provost will establish guidelines and timetables for merit and will allocate a set amount of funds to each college.
- Application Process
A. Application: the faculty member who wishes to be considered for merit is responsible for nominating herself/himself by completing an application in accordance with the process indicated in C below. A person may apply for merit in one area, in two of these areas, or in all three areas.
B. When to apply: Merit, in most instances, is based upon the calendar year (January - December). Usually annual evaluations will take place by the end of January and applications for merit should be submitted to the Merit Advisory Committee by the prescribed deadline.
C. Format: The application for merit must include the following:
    1. Merit Application Form (see attached)
    2. A maximum two-page summary which highlights meritorious activities in the area(s) for which merit is requested, e.g. contributions to committees or full citations for publications (or letter of acceptance)
    3. Supervisor(s) annual evaluation(s) for the merit time period
    4. Official job description
    5. Copies of articles, presentations, or other publications that you are basing merit on

    The Merit Advisory Committee may request additional documentation from applicants or supervisors if deemed necessary to determine meritorious activities.
- Merit Advisory Committee
Composition: Specified in the UNLV Library Faculty Bylaws

"The Merit Advisory Committee shall be composed of six members, with at least one member from each of the following four areas: public services, knowledge access management, collection development and other branches/units. Members must be employed at least 12 continuous months at the UNLV Libraries. Cabinet members are not eligible to serve on the Merit Advisory Committee. Provision shall be made for staggered terms of two years each to provide continuity."

Procedures: The Merit Advisory Committee serves only as an advisory body in ranking applicants and forwarding recommendations to the Dean of Libraries, The Merit Advisory Committee does not determine allocation of merit monies.

1. Merit Advisory Committee determines application deadlines if necessary and selects a Chair of the committee.
2. The Chair of the Merit Advisory Committee will receive applications for merit and will compile appropriate paperwork for the Merit Advisory Committee to review.
3. The Committee meets to determine:

   A. if the applicant is satisfactory in all categories (if not the application is eliminated before ranking),

   B. if the areas for which merit is requested are possibly meritorious (if not, then the applicant is not considered for merit in that category).
4. Merit Advisory Committee members may not be involved in assessing his/her own case, nor that of anyone he/she directly supervises. Thus applications will be evaluated by four randomly selected members of the six-member Committee.
5. Individual Merit Advisory Committee members rank the applicants based upon the weightings determined by the applicant and ratings determined by the individual Merit Advisory Committee member. Merit Advisory Committee members rate individuals only in the areas for which merit is requested, An individual should be able to obtain a score of 75% or better to be rated meritoriously. If a score of 75% or better can not be justified, the score must be zero. The Merit Committee will meet to discuss and cumulate each applicant's four ratings to attain a total score used in ranking. Three of the four members rating an applicant must rate them 75% or better for the person to be recommended by the Committee for merit in a particular category.

To arrive at a numerical score the weighting is multiplied by the rating and totaled.

Example 1 of merit being requested in all three areas:

Job	70 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 63
Scholarly	20 (weight) x .80 (rating) = 16
Service	10 (weight) x .85 (rating) = 8.5
Total	= 87.5

Example 2 of merit being requested in all three areas but for which the evaluator feels merit is not justified in the area of job performance:

Job	70 (weight) x 0 (rating) = 0
Scholarly	20 (weight) x .80 (rating) = 16
Service	10 (weight) x .85 (rating) = 8.5
Total	= 24.5

Example 3 of merit being requested in two areas:

Job	80 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 72
Service	10 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 9

Total   = 81

Example 4 of merit being requested in job performance only:
    Job   80 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 72
    Total   = 72

Example 5 of merit being requested in scholarly and service:
    Scholarly   20 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 18
    Service   10 (weight) x .90 (rating) =   9
    Total   = 27

Example 6 of merit being requested in service only:
    Service   20 (weight) x .90 (rating) = 18
    Total   = 18

Thus a chart of the above examples shows the following breakdown:

Job	Scholarly	Service	Score
X	X	X	87.5
	X	X	24.5
X		X	81
X			72
	X	X	27
		X	18

6. All merit applications, and rankings assigned by the merit Advisory Committee, will be on file for the library faculty to review after the Committee has made its recommendations.
7. The Merit Advisory Committee will forward the list of ranked applicants along with a total score and summary paragraph of recommendations (positive and negative) for each applicant and a ranked list of applicants in each category for which the applicants applied to the Dean of Libraries by the prescribed deadline. The Merit Advisory Committee will also forward one complete set of application packets to the Dean of Libraries. At the same time, the merit Advisory Committee will notify Faculty members who have applied for Merit, but who have not been recommended for Merit, of their decision. Each applicant will be sent a copy of his/her summary paragraph (both positive and negative). After faculty members have been notified, an alphabetical list of those recommended for Merit will be sent to the entire faculty. This list will indicate in what categories an individual is being recommended for Merit. It is advisable for the Merit Advisory Committee to retain records and notes should an appeal be filed, but once the appeal deadline (15 calendar days after the Provost's written announcement to the campus faculty that merit awards have been allotted) has passed, the records should be destroyed.
8. The applications and workings of the Merit Advisory Committee are confidential and the privacy of applicants must be considered during deliberations.

- Decision Making and Reporting

The final decision for merit awards rests with the Dean of Libraries, however the recommendations of the Merit Advisory Committee should weigh heavily in the evaluation and the Merit Advisory Committee may be called upon for clarification of the recommendations.

The Dean makes recommendations for merit to the Provost by the beginning of April or the prescribed deadline. A list of the Dean's merit recommendations with justifications is sent to all faculty members of the library once provisional approval has been granted by the Provost's Office. The appeal deadline is 15 calendar days after the Provost makes his official announcement.

The committee is to keep in mind that financial considerations are not a factor in ranking for merit. That a faculty member may have received remuneration for a task is not an issue, only whether the task was meritorious.

The Dean is encouraged to provide feedback on recommendations to the Merit Advisory Committee.

- Appeals Process
The faculty member has the opportunity to appeal the decision. The appellants must first request from the Dean a written explanation of the denial. They must do so within 15 calendar days following notification of the merit awards. The Dean has 15 calendar days in which to respond to the request.

Following receipt of this explanation, the faculty member has 15 calendar days in which to ask for reconsideration, which moves up through the chain of command to the President for resolution within a "reasonable" period of time. These provisions are outlined in the University of Nevada System Code. In the library, the case is referred first to the Library Faculty Grievance Committee, who will meet with the faculty member and the Dean. The Library Faculty Grievance Committee should submit a recommendation within 15 calendar days of the case coming to their attention. If, following the reconsideration process, the faculty member has failed to secure a reversal of the original negative decision, he/she may continue the appeal through the UNLV Faculty Senate Appeals Committee, The committee's decision is advisory to the University President, who makes the final determination on the appeal. For successful appeals, either the Provost or the President recommends a specific merit award and allocates the funds previously set aside for appeals.

Approved by UNLV Library Faculty
February 23, 1995, amended February 12, 1997, March 11, 1998, February 9, 2000, and October 25, 2000.

APPLICATION FOR LIBRARY FACULTY MERIT
200X CALENDAR YEAR

Name   _____

Department   _____

Position   _____

Weights of categories:
    Fill in weights to be assigned -- must total 100%

       Job Performance   _____   60-80%
       Creative/Scholarly _____   10-30%
       Service   _____   10-30%

Check categories to be considered for merit:

       Job Performance   _____
       Creative/Scholarly_____
       Service   _____

Please also include the following documentation:

1. Maximum two-page summary which highlights meritorious activities and justification for merit in the categories requested (6 copies)

2. Annual evaluations for period being considered (6 copies)

3. Job description (6 copies)

4. Articles, presentations, etc. (1 copy)

Please refer to Procedures for Applying/Granting Merit [http://www.unlv.edu/Libraries/libstuff/fac/docs/merit.html] and Article 5, Faculty Welfare, UNLV Library Faculty Bylaws for additional guidelines.

Return application form along with documentation specified above by 5 pm on March 1, 200X, to Chair, Library Faculty Merit Advisory Committee.

Appendix K: School of Nursing Report

Appendix K: School of Nursing Report

FACULTY MERIT REPORT

COLLEGE
School of Nursing

WHO CAN APPLY
Full-time faculty members who are Tenured/Tenure Track or Non-tenured Clinical Faculty may be considered for merit.

MERIT CATEGORIES
Service: School of Nursing, University, and Professional and Community Service
Research: Publications, Grants, Presentations, Conducting Research
Teaching: Workload, Evaluation

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
N/A

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
The School of Nursing has adopted merit policies and procedures in accordance with the UCCSN Code and are described in the School of Nursing Merit Guidelines. The candidate seeking merit is responsible for preparing the required documentation. The merit documentation submitted by the candidate is made available for review by the School of Nursing Faculty Affairs Council. The Faculty Affairs Council determines merit allocations based upon the School of Nursing guidelines and sends forth their recommendations to the Dean of the School of Nursing. The Dean of the School provides a recommendation in support or non support of the merit requested. The Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Vice Provost for the Division of Health Sciences. The Vice Provost for the Division of Health Sciences makes recommendations regarding merit to the Provost. The Provost recommends to the President. The applicant for merit is notified by the Dean of the School of Nursing.

PROBLEM AREAS
None

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE
28

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
46%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
46%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL

$4,500 - 7.7%

$3,000 – 38.4%

$2,500 – 23.1%

$2,000 – 23.1%

$1,500 - 0

$1,000 – 7.7%

PERCENT OF AVAILABLE FUNDS AWARDED LAST YEAR
55%

NUMBER OF APPEALS
0

Appendix L: School of Public Health Report

Appendix L: School of Public Health Report

FACULTY MERIT REPORT

COLLEGE
School of Public Health

WHO CAN APPLY
All School of Public Health academic faculty (clinical, tenure-track, tenured, newly hired faculty and faculty on leave or sabbatical), who receive a satisfactory or better on their annual evaluation, are eligible to apply for merit. Faculty members who commenced employment at UNLV in the fall semester may count work done prior to their employment at UNLV, if that work was performed within the applicable merit calendar year. Faculty members who apply for merit must apply in all three areas (e.g., teaching, service and scholarship).

MERIT CATEGORIES
Merit in the School of Public Health (SPH) will be based on exceptional achievement in the three areas of academe (e.g., teaching, service, and scholarship).

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY
Equal weight in each area

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS
Unit administrators, including chairs, directors, and assistant and associate deans must file applications through the academic faculty process to receive merit awards for teaching, research and non administrative service. All academic faculty, including unit administrators, will use the adopted SPH merit application form and be reviewed using the adopted SPH merit process. Merit will be based on a calendar year. Merit can be awarded for outstanding performance over a longer period of time.

SPH faculty will submit their merit applications to the SPH Faculty Review Committee for review. After reviewing faculty applications, the Faculty Review Committee will make merit recommendations to the Dean of the SPH. The SPH committee will consist of a member from each SPH department/program. The Committee will elect a committee chair. The Committee will undertake the following tasks in the merit review process:

1. Based on their review of faculty merit applications, the Committee members will independently rate each applicant from 1-10 (1=lowest, 10=highest) on their teaching, scholarship and service.
    a. Members only rate those applicants whose merit application that they actually reviewed.
2. In Faculty Review Committee meetings (or via e-mail, if a member can't attend)
    a. Committee members' ratings are summed for each applicant for each of the 3 categories (teaching, scholarship and service).

        1).   Committee members will recuse themselves when their ratings are reported.

        2).   When members' ratings for an applicant are discordant, members will discuss their ratings, and member ratings may be changed to make them more concordant.

    b.   The summated rating scores are used to rank order each applicant in each of the 3 categories (the highest score for teaching is ranked 1st, the next highest score for teaching is ranked 2nd, etc.)

    c.   The ranks for teaching, scholarship and service are then added to attain an overall ranking score (the lowest scores indicate the highest overall rankings).

    d.   Based on these overall ranking scores, applicants are assigned to monetary awards (e.g., $500, $1000, $1500, $2000, $2500, $3000, $4500)

        1).   With the goal to award all of the merit monies allotted for SPH academic faculty, the Committee develops scenarios for assigning the faculty awards.(e.g., the equally uniform distribution scenario, the "natural breaks" in the total ranking scores scenario, the "Marxist" scenario (the fewest $4500 awards, and no one in the $500 category), etc.).

        2).   Members decide on which scenario, or combination of scenarios, to use to grant awards.

        3).   Based on the chosen scenario, the Committee recommends faculty awards.

3.   The Committee sends the teaching, scholarship, service and overall ranking scores and the recommended faculty awards to the Dean of the SPH.

The SPH Dean will make the final decision on merit awards for faculty at the SPH level by taking into consideration the Faculty Review Committees' final rankings in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the overall ranking, and the assigned merit awards. The Dean shall recommend the dollar amount of each award for teaching, scholarship and service in accordance with all policies and procedures mandated by the Provost or President. The President makes the final determination of the amount awarded to each faculty member, upon recommendation by the Provost.

Faculty have the right to grieve a merit decision. See the UNLV Bylaws for information pertaining to requests for merit reconsideration, including channels and procedures for grievance beyond the School. The official date of notification of merit awards for the purpose of grievance shall be the day that the merit list is released to campus. The merit list shall be made available to all faculty. When responding to a request from a faculty member for the reasons they received a particular award of merit, or no award, the Dean shall include in the letter the ranking of the faculty member by the SPH Committee and the reasons for that award, which must include any information provided to the Provost.

PROBLEM AREAS
None

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE
10

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT
100%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT
100%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL

$4,500 – 10%

$3,000 – 0%

$2,500 - 50%

$2,000 – 20%

$1,500 – 0%

$1,000 – 20%

PERCENT OF AVAILABLE FUNDS AWARDED LAST YEAR
100%

NUMBER OF APPEALS
Don't know

Appendix M: College of Sciences Report

Appendix M: College of Sciences Report

December 2, 2005   Report by
Faculty Merit Report for Calendar year 2004   Paul Aizley

<div align="center">

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

</div>

Number of faculty in college: 145

Who can apply: all may apply except those who were (a) promoted effective July 1, 2005 (b) on soft money but they may be eligible if provided for by the source of their money (c) hired starting Fall 2004 (d) on one year appointment.

  (a)   6 faculty were promoted
  (b)   25 were on soft money and 7 received merit
  (c)   And (d) 15 were new hires or on one year contracts
  (d)   98 were other wise eligible

Of the 98 eligible, 75 applied for merit.

Merit Categories: Teaching, Research, and Service

Weight per merit category: Teaching 40%, Research 40%, Service 20%

Description of merit process:

1.   Each teaching/research faculty member who wants to be considered for merit submits an application to his or her department's merit committee.

2.   The department merit committee creates a prioritized list of applicants.

3.   The department committee names three of its members to serve on one of the three college wide committees – teaching, research, service.

4.   Three college committees rank all applicants and then distribute points among the applicants. Teaching and research each have 400 points to distribute among the applicants. The service committee has 200 points to distribute among the applicants.

5.   The executive college merit committee is made up of the chairs of the college teaching, research and service merit committees. This committee creates the ranked college list by totaling points for each applicant.

6.   Recommendations regarding the award amounts for the list are provided by the committee to the dean of the college.

Problem areas: Only the math department has a point system so when the college wide committees meet to combine the departmental lists into a college list, the shifting of names is very subjective. Math is the only non-laboratory science in the college and does not always fit with the thinking in the other departments. The table below reinforces this perception, showing that only the math department, the largest department, did not have any one who received maximum merit. Fifty percent received second highest, $3,000.

Percent of faculty who applied for merit: Of the 98 eligible 76.5% (75) applied

Percent of faculty who applied and received merit: 100% of those who applied received merit

MERIT for 2004 in the College of Science

DEPT	Number	4500	3000	2500	2000	1500	1000	Check
BIOS	16	5	4	3	2	2	0	16
CHEM	14	3	1	6	0	4	0	14
GEOS	10	3	2	2	0	2	1	10
MATH	22	0	11	8	3	0	0	22
PHYS	12	3	4	2	3	0	0	12
ADV/Dean	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	75	14	22	21	9	8	1	
		18.67	29.33	28.00	12.00	10.67	1.33	100.00

Percent	MERIT $	4500	3000	2500	2000	1500	1000	Check
BIOS		31.3	25.0	18.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	100
CHEM		21.4	7.1	42.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	100
GEOS		30.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	100
MATH		0.0	50.0	36.4	13.6	0.0	0.0	100
PHYS		25.0	33.3	16.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	100
ADV/Dean		0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100

Total dollars in merit pool: The dean reported that he received $210,733.
The total of the merit awards was $211,150.
NOTE 1)   One faculty member received $3,000 but only $1,650 was from the COS merit pool.

NOTE 2)   One faculty member was awarded $2,500 from the merit pool but received only $1,250 because he is now on 50% retirement. The COS lost the other $1,250 to the provost's office.

Seven of the 25 people on soft money received merit totaling $14,432

Number of appeals   2

Appendix N: University College Report

Appendix N: University College Report

University College Faculty Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: University College

WHO CAN APPLY: Academic Faculty and Professional Staff members if they are: (a) hired after September 1 of the eligibility year; (b) temporary employees; and (c) part-time employees appointed at less than 50% FTE.

MERIT CATEGORIES:

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY:

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS: The University College merit award recognizes the person who has met the minimum standards for merit, one who has (a) performed at least satisfactorily in the areas for which the person is evaluated and (b) is considered meritorious (more than satisfactory) in at least one of those areas. Among the many legitimate reasons to award merit are the following:

• To encourage and reward exceptional performance in any of the areas for which a person is evaluated.

• To reward outstanding performance over a long period of time—performance that may not have resulted in merit for any particular year.

• To allow for other specific or general exceptions, which to the evaluators represent some outstanding reason for awarding merit.

Process
The award of merit shall require a specific application and an evaluation process separate from annual or other evaluations made.

Recommendations for merit from the College will be made by the Dean and submitted to the Provost. The recommendation of the Provost is submitted to the President for final approval.

For Academic Faculty, the Dean will examine the person's Annual Self-Report in juxtaposition to the person's workload assignment and make a recommendation for a merit award at one of the following award amounts: $4500, $3000, $2500, $2000, $1500, or $1000. This recommendation will be submitted to the Provost.

Reconsideration of decisions follows the NHSE Code and UNLV Bylaws, all Academic Faculty members have the right to request reconsideration of a merit award. A merit

award gained as a resolution of reconsideration (or grievance) will be awarded retroactively to the initial start date identified for merit salary increases.

If the merit award is not changed/reversed after reconsideration, the person may initiate the grievance process by contacting the Faculty Senate Office.

PROBLEM AREAS: This was the first year (half year) of University College's existence so no problems were brought up.

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE: In 2004 there were 10 'faculty' which consisted of 1 fulltime professor and 9 professional staff (who taught courses as well).

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: 90%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL:

$3000 -   11%
$2500 -   56%
$2000 -   22%
$1000 -   11%

University College Administrator Merit Report 2005

COLLEGE: University College

WHO CAN APPLY: The only Administrator during this time was Dean John Readence.

MERIT CATEGORIES: N/A

WEIGHT PER MERIT CATEGORY: N/A

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT PROCESS: The University College merit award recognizes the person who has met the minimum standards for merit, one who has (a) performed at least satisfactorily in the areas for which the person is evaluated and (b) is considered meritorious (more than satisfactory) in at least one of those areas. Among the many legitimate reasons to award merit are the following:

• To encourage and reward exceptional performance in any of the areas for which a person is evaluated.

• To reward outstanding performance over a long period of time—performance that may not have resulted in merit for any particular year.

• To allow for other specific or general exceptions, which to the evaluators represent some outstanding reason for awarding merit.

Procedure
The award of merit shall require a specific application and an evaluation process separate from annual or other evaluations made.

Recommendations for merit from the College will be made by the Dean and submitted to the Provost. The recommendation of the Provost is submitted to the President for final approval.

PROBLEM AREAS: University College is growing and adding staff. In 2005 an Assistant Dean was added in 2005 so the procedure has not been tested yet.

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS IN COLLEGE: In 2004 the only Administrator was Dean John Readence.

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: N/A

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: N/A

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS ADMINISTRATORS BY $$ LEVEL: N/A

PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS THAT WERE AWARDED LAST YEAR: N/A

NUMBER OF APPEALS: 0

Appendix O: Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Report

Appendix O: Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Report

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
Faculty Merit Report 2005

Who Can Apply: The College includes faculty, administrators and professional contracted personnel. Three individuals (2 from UNLV TV and 1 from KUNV radio) are professionals are not included in this report since they are not full-time faculty. All full-time faculty including tenured, tenure track, affiliate faculty, professional contract, and administrators (chairs, etc.) can apply for merit.

Merit Categories: Research, Teaching Service

Weight Per Merit Category: equal values

Description of Merit Process:
The College has a Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Committee that evaluates all merit applications and sends their recommendations to the dean of the college. The dean uses these recommendations and those of the School/Department committees, chairs and directors to make a determination for merit.

Some units have personnel or merit committees while some do not. In those that do not have such committees, the chair or director ranks the merit applicants and forwards these to the dean. Those units with merit committees, the applicants are ranked and sent to the dean.

Number of Faculty in College: 100

Problem Areas:
Teaching portfolios are required in addition to the merit application. These require 1 inch binders and sections on "teaching philosophy," student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other areas. These portfolios are somewhat ponderous and somewhat confusing. For example, it is unclear how one's teaching philosophy can change from one semester to the next (see Merit Binder section, starting page 12 of this document).

NUMBER OF FACULTY IN COLLEGE: 100

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 35%

PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF MERITORIOUS FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL
 $1,000 awards   4 %
$1,500 awards   0
2,000 awards   35.7%
2,500 awards   14.3%
3.000 awards   32.1 %
4,500 awards   14.3 %

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
Administrators Merit Report 2005

Who Can Apply: All administrators can apply for merit.
Merit Categories: Research, Teaching Service

Weight Per Merit Category: equal values

Description of Merit Process:
Merit for administrators is determined by the dean.

Number of Administrators in College: 8
Problem Areas:

.

NUMBER OF Administrators IN COLLEGE: 8

PERCENT OF AdministratorsWHO APPLIED FOR MERIT: 100%

PERCENT OF Administrators WHO APPLIED FOR AND RECEIVED MERIT:
100%

PERCENT OF Administrators FACULTY BY $$ LEVEL
 $1,000 awards   0 %
$1,500 awards   0
2,000 awards   0%
2,500 awards   0%
3.000 awards   42.9 %
4,500 awards   57.1 %

ATTACHMENTS

Merit Form Greenspun College of Urban Affairs

This form is required for submission of your accomplishments for the recent calendar
      year. Forward this form to _____ by
      _____, 200_.

I WISH TO BE CONSIDERED FOR MERIT: YES   NO

NAME:

Present Rank and Title:

Date of Present Rank:

Department/School

Tenured: **YES   NO**

    Date of Tenure: _____

    If NO, on Tenure track?   YES   NO

Opening Statement:
Describe your professional and scholarly goals. Show how your past accomplishments,
future goals, and current activities relate to these goals.

I.   **Teaching/Job Ability and Effectiveness**

A.   Courses Taught Over Evaluation Period
Please submit the following information in the suggested order:
      Semester/Year taught
      Course Title
      Course no./section/credits
      Type of course
      Numbers of students enrolled
      Number of students responding to teaching evaluation surveys
      Individual course mean for evaluation
      Department course evaluation mean (if available)
      Department median (if available)

Use the following template to complete this section:
- ❋ *(Indicate with an * if the course was team taught and if so, the number of instructors)*
- ❋ *(Indicate with a double asterisk ** if a NEW PREP.*
- ❋ *(Dept. mean and median are ONLY applicable if they are available. If not available, leave blank)*
- ❋ *If teaching scores are not available, indicate how your department evaluates your teaching effectiveness. PLEASE INCLUDE THAT INFORMATION with a summary of your evaluation.*

Indiv.					**Course no./** **Dept.** **course**	**Dept.** **Mean**
Semester/Yr	*Section* *Median* *(credits)*	*Type of* *Course*	*Number* *Enrolled*	*Number* *Respond*	*Mean*	*(if* *available)*
Fall/1999	**HMD 376.2** (3)** **3.21/4.00**	**lecture** **3.30/4.00**	**60**	**48**		**3.46/4.00**
Spg/2000	**HMD 101.1*(3)** **3.25/4.00**	**lecture**	**120**	**109**	**3.22/4.00**	**3.18/4.00**

*HMD 101 team-taught with 3 instructors
**HMD 376.2—NEW PREP

_____

_____ **TEACHING PORTFOLIO:** If your College requires a teaching portfolio, check the line to the left. Make sure your portfolio and supporting documentation are complete and available on the date you submit your Annual Report.

_____ **PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING:** If your College requires peer review of teaching, check the line to the left. Make sure your portfolio and supporting documentation are complete and available on the date you submit your Peer Review.

B. <u>**List student advising (academic or career) responsibilities**</u>

C. <u>**Teaching Awards and Recognition**</u>
<u>**Teaching Grants**</u>
Please indicate which of the following category for each grant:
1.   External and Peer Reviewed Grant
2.   Contract

3.   White Paper

List the following for each grant category:
4.   Title
5.   Funding agency
6.   Is the grant part of a larger grant? If so, describe role.
7.   List specific aims or goals of the grant (one or two sentences)
8.   Principal Investigator, co-Principal Investigator, other
9.   Your % time contribution
10.   Term of grant (beginning and ending dates)
11.   Total of award

    Completed

    In progress

    Proposed/pending

    Unfunded

D.   Graduate Candidate Committees Chaired
List name of student, title of thesis, graduation date.

    1.   Doctoral Committees Chaired

    2.   Masters Committees Chaired

E.   Membership on Graduate Degree Candidates' Committees
    1.   Doctoral Committee Memberships

    2.   Masters Committees Memberships

F.   Undergraduate Student Supervision
List name of student and nature of the project, monograph, performance, production or exhibition. Indicate if this is an honors thesis project.

H.   Evidence of effective job performance

    1.   Other evidence of resident and/or outreach-based teaching and advising effectiveness (For example, performance of students in subsequent courses, tangible results and benefits)

       2.   <u>**Curriculum, Program, or Course Development**</u>

       3.   <u>**Evidence of attending conferences, classes, seminars, or programs to developing teaching skills (e.g. TLC), or major revision of existing courses (this may include web pages for classes)**</u>

       4.   <u>**Use of technology in the classroom**</u>

I.   <u>**Teaching Reassignment**</u>
Have you had a teaching reassignment during the last evaluation period? Please explain in one paragraph the goal and nature of the reassignment.

       II.   <u>**Research, Creative Accomplishments and Scholarship:**</u>

(II, Sect. 1)   Research and/or Scholarly Publications
List citations in standard bibliographic form accepted within your department and/or college (e.g. APA, MLA), ***WITH THE MOST RECENT DATE FIRST****. All citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate.*

The publications should be listed in the following order:

A.   <u>**Articles in refereed journals**</u>

B.   <u>**Books or monographs**</u>

C.   <u>**Book chapters or parts of books**</u>

D.   <u>**Books edited**</u>

E.   <u>**Book reviews and other published reviews**</u>

F.   <u>**Articles published in non-refereed journals**</u>

G.   <u>**Articles in refereed conference proceedings**</u>

H.   <u>**Presentations at professional meetings—Refereed**</u>

I.   <u>**Presentations at professional meetings—Invited**</u>

J.   <u>**Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, edited pieces, etc.**</u>

K.   <u>**Research reports to sponsor**</u>

L.   <u>**Translations**</u>

M.   <u>**Transliterations**</u>

N.   <u>**Abstracts**</u>

O.   <u>**Manuscripts accepted for publication (with attached letters of acceptance)**</u>
Journal Articles—Refereed
Journal Articles—Non-refereed
Conference Proceedings—Refereed
Conference Proceedings—Non-refereed
Proceedings—Non-refereed
Presentations—Refereed
Presentations—Non-Refereed

P.   <u>**Manuscripts submitted for publication, with an indication of where and when submitted (include copy of letter of receipt from publisher)**</u>
Submitted—Refereed
Submitted—Non-refereed

Q.   <u>**Manuscripts in progress**</u>

(II, Sect. 2)   Creative Accomplishments **(relates primarily to the Arts)**

*List citations in standard bibliographic form accepted within your department and/or college (e.g. APA, MLA), **WITH THE MOST RECENT DATE FIRST**. All citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate.*

The publications should be listed in the following order (items below do not imply a priority order):

A.   <u>**Novels and books**</u>

B.   <u>**Poems, Plays, Essays, Musical Scores, Screen Plays**</u>

C.   <u>**Performances, Creative Presentations, Choreography, Productions, Films, Videos and Exhibitions**</u>
List whether local, regional, national, international venue, invited or juried, dates, place, etc.

D.   <u>**Competitions and Commissions**</u>

(II, Sect. 3)   Other Scholarly or Creative Accomplishments

A.   <u>Research or Creative Awards and Recognitions</u>

B.   <u>List of honors or awards for scholarship, creative, or professional activity</u>

C.   <u>Significant innovations with respect to library collections, services, or methods</u>

D.   <u>Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms, new computer software developed, citation index analysis, etc.)</u>

E.   <u>Research Grants or Grants for Creative Purposes, Projects, Commissions, and Contracts</u>
Please indicate which of the following category for each grant:
1.   External and Peer Reviewed Grant
2.   Contract
3.   White Paper

List the following for each grant category:
1.   Title
2.   Funding agency
3.   Is the grant part of a larger grant? If so, describe role.
4.   List specific aims or goals of the grant (one or two sentences)
5.   Principal Investigator, co-Principal Investigator, other
6.   Your % time contribution
7.   Term of grant (beginning and ending dates)
8.   Total of award

Completed

In progress

Proposed/pending

Unfunded

F.   <u>Research Reassignment</u>
Have you had a research reassignment during the last evaluation period? Please explain in one paragraph the goal and nature of the reassignment.

III.   Service

Includes review of papers, student chapter mentoring & advising, officers of professional organizations, editorships, committee work, participation in governance and administration, and services to the profession, such as referee, session or program chair, discussant, reviewer of grant proposal, etc. If you received a service course release, indicate where and when.

A.   System

B.   University

C.   College

D.   School/Department

E.   Professional and learned societies

F.   Governmental agencies

G.   Business and industry

H.   Public and private organizations

I.   Service awards and recognition

J.   Service Grants
Please indicate which of the following category for each grant:
1.   External and Peer Reviewed Grant
2.   Contract
3.   White Paper

List the following for each grant category:
1.   Title
2.   Funding agency
3.   Is the grant part of a larger grant? If so, describe role.
4.   List specific aims or goals of the grant (one or two sentences)
5.   Principal Investigator, co-Principal Investigator, other
6.   Your % time contribution
7.   Term of grant (beginning and ending dates)
8.   Total of award

Completed

In progress

Proposed/pending

Unfunded

K. **Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of the candidate's expertise** (e.g. consulting, speaking engagements, services to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions, etc.)

L. **Service Reassignment**
Have you had a Service reassignment during the last evaluation period? Please explain in one paragraph the goal and nature of the reassignment.

Merit Application Process
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs

Merit Binder
All merit materials will be a one-inch binder. Do not use any plastic sleeves or enclosures in the binder. Use dividers to separate main headings (application, teaching, service, research) and sub-heads (e.g. teacher evaluations, peer observation).
Contents
Section I Merit Application Form
A fully completed annual report should be placed at the beginning of the binder.
Section II Research

• Research narrative: 1-3 pages. This should indicate the research agenda of the faculty member and how the publications and conference presentations fit into that agenda.
• Full citations (date, site, *acceptance rate*, etc.) of completed research output (conferences, journals, books). If possible, this should include information about the citation index for the journal.
• Copies of published articles, book chapters, books (accompanied with binder)

        • If applicable, copy of final letter of acceptance of journal article. Please notice that an article may be counted when accepted or when published, but NOT both times.

•

Section III Teaching
        • Teaching narrative: 1-3 pages. This should capture the teaching philosophy and highlight any significant accomplishments in this area.
        • Peer evaluations. Please note these are the summative conclusions of the peer evaluation process that reflect more than a classroom visitation checklist. Rather, these peer evaluations should include the conclusions of the personnel or advisory committee in re the syllabi,

Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The primary mission and central function of any University is the development, application, and dissemination of scholarly knowledge. This mission is accomplished through faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and professional service. Along that line, the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs has as an integral part of its mission the advancement of theoretical and applied knowledge, together with the commitment to use that knowledge to improve public policy, to improve professional practices, and to enhance the quality of urban life. Faculty in the College accomplish this mission through the scholarly activities of research, teaching, and professional service. Given the unique nature of the college, some faculty members will use traditional methods with findings disseminated in traditional formats, while others will focus their scholarly activities in applied ways with findings disseminated in alternative formats. Regardless of the method or format of scholarship, fulfillment of the College mission requires the recognition that we are all part of a community of scholars, all committed to advancing knowledge, all seeking to disseminate that knowledge.

To further the scholarly mission of the College, each member of the faculty is expected to be an active scholar, a good campus citizen, and an active participant in the profession beyond the campus. Tenure and promotion to both Associate and Full Professor require that the faculty member demonstrate the ability to produce quality scholarship of a type relevant to his/her particular field, suitable for the mission of the unit, appropriate to the goals at hand, and disseminated in a manner consistent with the nature of the work. Promotion and tenure also require a strong record of scholarly teaching and professional service to the campus, the community, and the profession. Merit is recognition, on a yearly basis, that a faculty member has excelled at the range of activities such as: teaching effectively, conducting significant research, and providing institutional and professional service.

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide the philosophical framework of promotion, tenure, and merit evaluations, working definitions and criteria that must be addressed, and to delineate the nature of the documentation necessary for the faculty member to

present the best case for successful tenure, promotion, and merit. The balance of this document has six major divisions. The first, Philosophical Foundations, details the five principle assumptions that form the basis of the document. The second, Criteria for Quality Scholarship, will outline the indices by which scholarship is judged in an academic setting. The indices are to be used in the evaluation and documentation of the types of scholarship. The third section, Assessment of Scholarship, outlines the areas to be judged in scholarship. The fourth section defines the criteria for promotion and tenure to both Associate and Full Professor in terms of the UCCSN <u>Code</u>. The fifth section outlines the information necessary for documentation of tenure and promotion. The final section details the criteria and documentation for Merit.

I. Philosophical Framework

This document is based upon five principles that are the foundation of the criteria,

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 2
documentation, process, and evaluative decisions surrounding promotion, tenure, and merit in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs.

1. The first assumption is that the criteria, documentation, and processes for tenure, promotion, and merit should be as specific as possible. Specificity means that both faculty and the institution are best served by tenure, promotion, and merit decisions that are based on documentation that is inclusive, complete, and specific to the decision at hand. This assumption would suggest that the documentation in portfolios should provide the clear and specific information such that peers, College committees, and administrators might make the most informed decisions possible. Thus, this document operationally defines the types of scholarship relevant for the College, criteria to be used as the basis of judgments about the quality of that work (section II), means by which research, teaching, and service will be assessed (section III), the criteria for tenure and promotion (section IV) and merit (section VI), and the documentation necessary to complete a portfolio for promotion, tenure, and merit (section V).

2. A second assumption of these guidelines is the notion that the quality of research, teaching, and service is more important than their quantity. Thus, enumeration of articles, courses taught, or committee assignments does not constitute evidence of the quality of those endeavors. Instead, the degree to which the products of these activities reflect clear goals, relevant methods, significant impact, that is disseminated in an appropriate manner is most important. A set of quality indices was developed based on the work of Boyer (19). Those criteria will form the base of quality decisions inherent in promotion, tenure, or merit. These criteria are delineated in section II (Criteria for Quality Scholarship).

3. The third principle is one that provides for broad definition of scholarship. The UCCSN Code defines faculty responsibilities as falling into three broad and largely undefined areas; research, teaching, and service. Given that the central feature of university life is one based upon scholarly pursuits, the faculty of this College view each of these activities as a scholarly endeavors operationally defined by the work of Boyer (19). The Boyer model is intended to embrace a new vision of traditional faculty responsibilities and to develop criteria to help us judge the full range of

faculty contributions more fairly and more fully. This document adopts the approach proposed by Boyer to describe the range of creative, recognizably diverse, yet equally important activities that comprise what Boyer calls scholarship. Boyer defines four types of scholarship, distinguished by the goals or purposes of the activity.

- ·*Discovery,* the most easily recognized style of scholarship, refers to the identification of new knowledge and is what is sometimes called "basic" research. It is commonly disseminated through scholarly journals, books, and conference presentations, particularly competitive programs. Other formats for this style of scholarship might include the development of software as well as the production of documentary films or **Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines** 3

  media programming. Regardless of the format, this style of scholarship develops and adds to the knowledge base of a discipline.
- ·*Integration* adds to our understanding of disciplinary knowledge by synthesizing and integrating discovery scholarship in ways that provide new insights, thus adding to the knowledge base of a discipline. While integrative scholarship may be disseminated through the same outlets as the scholarship of discovery, it might also take the form of textbooks, handbooks, or curricular development.
- ·*Application* takes the knowledge of a discipline to the wider community to solve problems and enhance professional practice. This type of scholarly research, which focuses on addressing an immediate need, is typically disseminated through evaluation reports, program development proposals, as well as those disseminated through traditional scholarly outlets. Faculty who pursue the scholarship of application may be engaged in providing technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, community development, public education, and a host of other such activities. The outcome of application scholarship is an identifiable product that contributes to knowledge within an organization or the candidates profession.
- ·*Teaching* is often a type of scholarly activity. In developing new courses, introducing new approaches to teaching, integrating technology into their teaching, or drawing on the cutting edge knowledge in their fields, faculty may demonstrate the qualities that denote good scholarship. Syllabi for new courses, broad curricular development, innovative student assignments, presentations on pedagogy at conferences, as well as handbook and/or textbook writing, when based on the most current literature of a field, are common formats for this type of scholarship.

Although sometimes distinct, the styles of scholarship are closely related. So, for example, in accomplishing the task of teaching, a faculty member may engage in the scholarship of integration and application. In a similar vein, a faculty member in assessing a community program may integrate existing research as well as educating students, colleagues, and citizens in the community. Thus, although Boyer draws distinctions among the forms of scholarship, a faculty member may, in a single activity, embrace more than one form of scholarly activity. Moreover, while scholarship in its various forms is crucial in the professional development and

advancement of a faculty member, service to the campus, the profession, and the community is also important.

4. The fourth principle is that of candidate responsibility. This document is based on the belief that the candidate for promotion, tenure, or merit should have the opportunity to present his/her best possible case in order to maximize the chances a successful outcome. Thus, the candidate for promotion, tenure, or merit has the responsibility to explain the

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 4 professional context into which his/her scholarship resides. In doing so, the candidate helps colleagues who may not be familiar with a particular area of scholarship better understand the goals, methods, and impact of the work. While such an approach might be seen as requiring additional effort, the assumption is that it is in the best interest of a candidate to have the opportunity to make his/her most complete and well documented case. A portfolio approach has been adopted in this document as the best means to provide the necessary quantitative and qualitative information that might be used by a candidate to demonstrate the degree to which the work has met the criteria outlined below. The specific guidelines to be used by a candidate in preparing and presenting materials for promotion, tenure, and/or merit are described in sections III (Assessment) and V (Documentation).

5. The fifth and final assumption of these guidelines places the inherently evaluative nature of decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit determination with the faculty. This principle of peer review suggests that in the final analysis, it is the collective faculty of individual units and the College that have the responsibility to decide if a colleague is tenurable, ready for promotion, or whether the accomplishments of a faculty in any given year are worthy of merit. Furthermore, the successful application of these guidelines also lies with the faculty. While application of such guidelines is never a easy or perfectly executed task, the unique nature of a university would suggest that the individual decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit evaluations must be based on common scholarly principles. The guidelines set forth in this document are intended to provide a common scholarly foundation in order to facilitate the most equitable, consistent, and reliable application of what are inherently individual and professional decisions. The assumption of peer review is evident throughout the sections in this document but most evident in section II (Assessment).

II. Criteria for Quality Scholarship

Quality scholarship (be it discovery, integration, application, or teaching) has four features: 1) clearly defined goals, 2) relevant, appropriate methods or approaches, 3) significance or influence in a particular context, and 4) dissemination in an appropriate format. The following features should be used in tenure, promotion, and merit decisions to demonstrate and evaluate the quality of scholarly activities.

> ·*Clearly defined goals.* Clearly defined goals lay out the objectives of the scholarly activity and show their importance to the field, identify the methods to be used, and describe the plan for dissemination of the results. This is done in a systematic way that ties the scholarship to the body of knowledge to which it is intended to contribute. The faculty member should be able to put the goals of the scholarship

into the context of the discipline, to show that the goals are realistic and achievable, and to show the potential for the scholarship to make a significant contribution to the knowledge base.

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 5

·*Relevant methods.* Different scholarly goals call for different methods of inquiry, but quality scholarship is distinguished by well-defined and documented methods. The faculty member should be able not only to select the appropriate methods but also to show their relevance to the goals of the scholarship. The faculty member should also show that the methods have been applied effectively, systematically, and with integrity. In the scholarship of application, the product should show evidence of significant professional expertise and, ideally, creativity and innovation in addressing problems.

·*Significance.* Clearly defined goals require that the faculty member show the importance of the scholarly objectives to the field. Quality will be represented in evidence that the scholarship has met those objectives, and has, thus, made a significant contribution to the body of knowledge. Significant scholarly research will survive rigorous peer review and may be disseminated in highly regarded outlets, cited and reviewed by experts, result in invitations to speak or write about the work, receive awards, and provoke thought and additional lines of inquiry.

·*Dissemination.* Faculty members should share their scholarship with both the academic community and the community at large, as appropriate to the subject. Regardless of the type, scholarship results in a product that is disseminated to the relevant audience. Just as different goals call for different methods of inquiry, so may they result in different formats for dissemination. The faculty member should be able not only to select the most effective formats for dissemination to its intended audiences, but also to be able to employ those formats so that the scholarship is presented effectively. The final product of quality scholarly research will evidence competence in use of the chosen format..

III. Assessment of Scholarly Activities

A. Scholarship of Discovery, Application, and Integration

The faculty member must describe and document the activities that constitute his/her scholarship and provide evidence of their quality. Materials for merit, promotion, and tenure will be presented in a **Scholarly Research Portfolio** that will provide three kinds of documentation: the faculty member's own assessment as described in a narrative summary that identifies the type of scholarship, and provides evidence of the quality indices noted above peer-related evaluation (that follow the guidelines for selecting peer reviewers, Appendix A), and the products of the scholarly activity. For tenure and promotion, the Scholarship Portfolio is intended to document the research career of the candidate.

1. Narrative summary. The faculty member's assessment of her/his own scholarship will be presented in the form of a well-articulated narrative summary that puts the scholarship into context so that it can be understood by a colleague who may be in a different field **Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines** 6 (not more than 5 pages). Each narrative should identify the type of scholarship for each of the works under consideration and provide evidence for each of the quality indices (as noted in the section II). For example, the narrative will include a description of the nature of the work, its place in the field, the connection between the methods and the goals, its place in the faculty member's scholarship program, and the faculty member's own assessment of his/her success in achieving the goals and contribution to the field. The narrative summary is critical to helping colleagues understand one's work and thus, should include specific mention of the peer review measures described below.

2. Peer Review. The notion that the approval of one's peers is an indicator of quality is basic to evaluation of scholarship. In addition to the evaluation by external reviewers required by the Bylaws for tenure and promotion, the candidate will provide measures of peer review. These measures will depend on the kind of scholarship being evaluated but will reflect the judgment of experts in the field. The following examples, while not exhaustive, will indicate the kinds of peer-related documentation that can provide evidence of quality. Please note that a Scholarship Portfolio for tenure, promotion, and merit need not include copies of all work produced by the faculty member. Rather the Portfolio should condense and display the best, most representative work of the faculty member.

· **Peer-reviewed journals**. Appearance of the work in peer-reviewed journals is an indication that the work has met a standard of excellence in the profession. The work may be further judged by characteristics of the journal, including its reputation and potential for impact on the field and its acceptance rate. All journal articles submitted to document satisfactory or better performance in any form of scholarship must provide statements from the editor or sponsoring organization about acceptance rates and the nature of the review process.

· Acceptance by **book** publishers that use a peer-review process. The faculty member should address the reputation or quality of the press, the review process, and the scholarly criteria for acceptance for their particular field of study.

· Book **chapters**. Again, the quality of the press and the degree of peer-review are important considerations in determining the quality of the chapter.

· **Citations** of the work. The nature of citations may be an important factor. However, numerous citations may not necessarily indicate high quality.

·Scholarly **reviews** of the work.

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 7

· Conference **presentations** depend upon the characteristics of the conference, including: whether there is peer review or critique of papers; if so, the acceptance rate of peer-reviewed presentations; the reputation of the conference, whether it is a national, regional, or state conference.

· Funded **grants.** Like publications, the quality of grants will differ depending on the nature of the review process, the acceptance rate, and the prestige of the granting agency.

·**Awards** that result from peer or expert review
·**Invitations** to speak or write resulting from the scholarship.

3. **Scholarship products.** Each application for tenure, promotion, and merit must include copies of the products of the scholarship. Again, the Scholarship Portfolio need not include all works; rather the faculty member should provide the best, most representative scholarly products.

B. Assessment of Teaching

All faculty who wish to be considered for promotion or tenure should present a **Teaching Portfolio**. The Portfolio will include four elements to document the faculty member's teaching performance: a statement of teaching philosophy; evidence of curricular development; peer evaluations; and student evaluations.

1. **Teaching philosophy:** This personal narrative, which should not exceed five double-spaced pages, with appropriate appendices, is the opportunity for faculty members to show the scholarly nature of their teaching and to demonstrate the relationship between their disciplinary knowledge and their pedagogical practices. The narrative should address the indices of quality scholarship noted in the sections above. Topics which might be included are: the faculty member's view of the teaching/learning process, an explanation of why s/he has designed a course in a particular manner; reflection on the changes in a course over time because of experiences with students. This philosophy should not address all courses that the faculty member has taught. Rather, the faculty member should choose a particular course for which s/he has responsibility to demonstrate the scholarship implicit in the pedagogy.

Supporting materials which might be included are:
·Syllabi for a specific course, planned, changed, implemented by faculty member. The final version can appropriately be sent to external reviewers for comment.
·Copies of exams.
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 8
·Examples of graded student work, such as professional papers/theses/projects accompanied by a brief rationale for the assignment.
·Comments from students in letters or evaluations.

2. **Evidence of Curriculum Development**. This section might include:
·Statements from the faculty member that reveals how s/he incorporates the teaching philosophy into the design or revision of curriculum.
·Syllabi or other forms which demonstrate curricular changes made by the faculty member.
·Documentation of new programs, tracks, or other learning experiences developed by the faculty member.
·New or revised courses for which the professor is responsible.
·Documentation of incorporation of recent literature into course revisions.

3. **Peer Evaluations**. These might include, but are not limited to peer assessment of course syllabi; curriculum/course development activities; constructive changes in existing courses; grading criteria, methods, and practices. Formal mentoring relationships with frequent feedback to junior faculty and team teaching should be part of this process. For junior faculty, the department or unit should set up regularly scheduled visits by various faculty to the classes. Each year the junior faculty member should be observed by two different faculty members, who meet with the instructor before the visit to

discuss goals and criteria (College evaluation form should be used). In addition, the junior faculty member and the chair should receive a written report of the visit, which becomes part of the personnel file. The annual evaluation of a faculty member should reflect these written comments. All faculty who seek promotion or merit must have a record of peer evaluation for the two years previous to their application for promotion and tenure.

While the above is a suggested minimum of classroom observations, more frequent visits may be requested or required by individuals or by department consensus. Portfolios may contain video tapes of classroom activities instead of, or in addition to, reports.

4. Student Evaluations. Student evaluations are an important component of the assessment of teaching. However, if each department uses an entirely distinct
inventory, interpretation of the data is impossible. Thus, each department will collect data using the College teaching evaluation forms. Each unit may collect additional information to further evaluate teaching. At a minimum each unit will report the data collected from the standard form and will provide an interpretative framework for each faculty member by providing comparisons to other faculty in the unit. Data from student evaluations should be collected each semester, from each class, on the College form.

C. Assessment of Service

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 9

Service is an important faculty contribution to the mission of both the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs and the University. Service may be performed within the University (institutional service), within the community (community service), or within a professional discipline (professional service). Institutional service might include active service on college and university committees or administrative responsibilities that are above and beyond those of the typical faculty role. Community service includes those activities involved in community development, expert testimony, public outreach and education, policy analysis or local program evaluation. Professional service includes activities within one's discipline including holding professional office, serving on journal editorial boards, serving on professional task forces or committees on the national level. Whether in the institution, community, or profession, service used to document a case for tenure, promotion, or merit should be activities that draw upon the faculty members professional training, education and experience in the conduct of the effort. In some situations the scholarship of application may be similar to the activities of service. The activities differ in regard to the product of the work. The scholarship of application results in a clearly identifiable scholarly product that is disseminated. Service results in products that are either nonspecific or more indirectly based in the processes of scholarship.

Like scholarship, service (be it institutional, community, or professional) is evaluated on its quality rather than its quantity. Quality in service is determined by the following criteria:

1. **Role and contribution**. Different roles make different contributions to the service activity. Quality service involves active participation in the service role that makes a contribution to the completion and product of the activity. The degree of contribution may be measured by the extent of the responsibility and participation. Chairing committees or serving as the primary author in an evaluation report may make more of a contribution than simple membership. Faculty members should specifically define their roles and the extent of the contribution in the service activity.

2. **Methods and Activities**. The activities of service should rely on the faculty member's professional training and expertise. Higher quality service involves activities that rely extensively on the professional expertise of the faculty member. Such service would use professional methods that are systematically applied toward the completion of the activity. The faculty members should clearly define their specific activities engaged in and the ways in which they applied their expertise.

3. **Significance.** Different service activities have different impacts. The significance and impact of the service activity are an important criteria in judging its quality. The faculty member should provide a context within which the significance of his/her service activities might be judged.

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 10

4. **Product and Dissemination.** The product of the service activity and the degree and extent of its dissemination are measures of its impact and quality. Identifiable products resulting from service activities (an evaluation report, a program review, a journal review, a national policy report, a major committee accomplishment) have the potential to have a greater impact than those activities without specific products. The faculty member should include and/or describe the product and its impact.

IV. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Because tenure and promotion to associate professor normally occur concurrently, criteria for both are defined together.

A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The UCCSN calls for a successful candidate to be excellent in at least one of the areas of teaching or research, at least satisfactory in the other, and at least satisfactory in service. In addition, it is assumed that the candidate will be an active participant in activities of his/her department. Moreover, the candidate must be a collegial and collaborative citizen of the department, college, university, and professional communities. In addition to these basic qualifications, the following criteria will be used for assessing the nature of a candidate's scholarship.

· *Excellence:* Evidence of extensive and on-going scholarship that meets the quality indices described above. Typically the "excellent" researcher will be highly productive with a clear program of scholarship from which the faculty member is gaining recognition for the significant contribution his/her work makes to the field. Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated by outstanding curricular development, innovative approaches to teaching, unusually intense or successful mentoring of students, or significant contributions to pedagogy. Excellence in service would reflect a record of unusually extensive or important service to the campus and the professions. For example, chairing a major committee or task force with responsibility for producing a significant report is an example of excellent service.

· *Commendable:* Evidence of continuing research that meets the quality indices. The faculty member is developing a coherent program of scholarship that is likely to lead to recognition of significant contributions to the field. Commendable teaching evinces careful revision and development of courses, effective classroom practices, successful mentoring of students, and other contributions to pedagogy. Commendable service reflects extensive, significant, service on committees, on task forces, or in faculty governance.

· *Satisfactory:* Evidence of continuing scholarship that meets the quality indices.
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 11
Satisfactory teaching is marked by sound pedagogy, careful classroom management, and successful work with students. Satisfactory service entails contribution to committees and task forces as well as active participation in other forms of faculty governance.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

Full Professor is a rank of distinction to be awarded to those who have made extraordinary contributions, as recognized by their peers, to the discipline and the community at large, as well as to the university and their unit within the university. Promotion to Full Professor does not occur automatically after an individual has spent a given number of years as an Associate Professor, even though s/he may perform duties in a satisfactory fashion.

The record of a successful Full Professor candidate is one who demonstrates success across the range of faculty responsibilities (research, teaching, and service). Moreover, the candidate is expected to have provided senior leadership through professional service to his/her discipline. Furthermore, a successful candidate is one who has demonstrated the ability to be a leader that has made a significant contribution to the department, college, university, and professional communities through the application of his/her scholarly knowledge in leadership roles. These scholarship and service activities should have led to a record of significant contribution to the discipline that earns the faculty member a national/international reputation.

V. Documentation for Tenure and Promotion

The goal of these guidelines is to make clear the materials that are necessary for the Candidate to make a strong case in his/her behalf. The list of materials indicated below should reflect a *selection of materials* rather than an exhaustive collection. The candidate should display his/her best products to demonstrate excellent performance. Since the candidate will be judged on the basis of the criteria contained in this document, it is in his/her best interest to ensure that the documentation specifically addresses the features of quality scholarship outlined above.

A. Scholarship Portfolio

1. A narrative (of no more than five pages) of the faculty member's coherent record of the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching (see section V B for documentation of scholarly teaching). This statement should indicate the focus, goals, and accomplishments of the faculty member in these areas as well as the articulation of the indices of quality noted above.

2. A selection of representative documents or other materials to demonstrate the scholarly accomplishments. Published essays should indicate whether they are refereed and the acceptance rate (provided by the current editor) for the journal.

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 12
B. Teaching Portfolio
    1. A statement of teaching philosophy of no more than five pages.
    2. Demonstration of curricular development through syllabi, assignments etc.
    3. Summary of peer reviews of teaching, syllabi etc. for a minimum of two years (every year for junior faculty)
    4. Summary of student evaluations for classes with comparison to other faculty in the unit. This may also include a summary of all written comments by students.
C. Service Portfolio
    1. Explanation of professional and institutional service activities.
    2. Clarification of the candidate's role(s) and responsibilities in the activity.
    3. A statement of the specific contribution(s) by the candidate to the service activity.
D. Annual Evaluations
    The candidates annual evaluations should be included.
E. Midtenure Evaluation
    Any midtenure evaluation reports should be included.

In order to complete the total promotion and/or tenure portfolio, the following items will need to be added as the documentation as it proceeds through the department/school review process. These elements must come forward with the portfolio in order to complete the tenure/promotion package.

F. Chair/Director Evaluation
    The unit head should provide an assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the three categories outlined by the UCCSN Code: research, teaching, and service. The evaluation should use the definitions of research, teaching, and service defined in this document. Furthermore, the evaluation should be based on the criteria set forth in this document.
G. External Reviews
    Each candidate shall have four external reviews. External reviews should follow the process outlined in Appendix A.

VI. Criteria and Documentation of Merit

Merit is a reward to the faculty for their exceptional accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching or professional and/or institutional service. Thus, merit is a reward for faculty who go beyond the baseline of good teaching, scholarship, and service expected of every faculty

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 1 3
member. The level of accomplishment needed to qualify for merit awards is likely to change each year. To be considered for merit, a faculty member must formally apply by indicating so on his/her annual report. The annual report will serve as the merit portfolio and is intended to document ways in which the faculty member has gone beyond the expected levels of activity within any given year. To qualify for merit on the basis of scholarship in any area, the faculty member in his/her annual report must demonstrate exceptional performance based on the criteria described in the previous sections of this document. Accomplishments may be used only one time in any merit application. In applying for merit, the candidate agrees to have his/her merit material open for review by any member of the college according to the guidelines of the Faculty Senate. If a candidate for merit decides to seek external reviews these reviews must follow the process outlined in Appendix A.

Merit applications are first reviewed by the Unit head, who will make a recommendation of merit and rank order the candidates and forward the recommendations to the Dean. The College Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Committee, will also review merit applications and make recommendations to the Dean. The Dean will determine the merit pay recommendations.

Only accomplishments from the merit period can be included in any one year's merit applications. For example, if on a previous merit application an item was listed as formally accepted for publication it cannot be listed when it actually appears in print. The following criteria will be used to assess merit applications and specific supporting documentation should be included in any merit application.

- ·Scholarship of discovery and integration is evidenced by quality of peer reviewed works. The same quality indices noted above apply for merit including the quality of the journal or press, level of peer review, prestige of the award or grant, excellent publications and presentations (please refer to Section #II, A).
- ·Scholarship of application is evidenced by published reports that have accompanying documentation indicating impact, etc (please refer to the section II A).
- ·Scholarship of teaching is evidenced by significant curricular development or revision usually beyond the level of a single course, introduction of innovative strategies or approaches, and unusually extensive and successful mentoring of students (please refer to the section II B).

·Service. Professional service is evidenced by active participation on editorial boards, program review committees, national professional leadership. The nature of one's professional service, its extent, and the degree of active participation will determine excellence. Institutional service is evidenced by significant involvement in

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Merit Guidelines 14
departmental, college, university, or community committees or task forces. In each case, the service must, of course, extend beyond mere membership on a committee. The nature of the committee and extent of active contribution will determine excellence (please refer to the section, II C).

SELECTION OF OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

Outside reviewers, whether it be to document merit or to evaluate a promotion and/or tenure portfolio, are intended to give a perspective broader then that available to a department and/or college faculty. Outside reviews are most helpful when they are unbiased reports made by qualified reviewers from comparable institutions, who specifically address the criteria guiding promotion, tenure, and/or merit in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to use the following process in selecting reviewers. First, a list of potential reviewers will be developed. That list will be composed of four names from the candidate and four names from the department personnel committee. Potential reviewers should have no close personal or professional relationship with candidate and be capable of making an unbiased evaluation. From this list, the chair, in conjunction with the department personnel committee, shall select four reviewers of which two are from the candidate list. Because of the unique nature of these guidelines, reviewers will receive a letter clearly describing the principles, assumptions, and criteria of tenure and promotion in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs. This letter should make it clear that the reviewer's evaluation of the candidate should be based on the principles set forth in this document. In addition, the reviewers will be provided with copies of relevant sections of the UCCSN Code, the College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and any unit guidelines that might be relevant, and a complete copy of the candidates' portfolio (as described earlier in this document). Reviewers will be asked to answer the following questions:

·the nature of his/her relationship to the candidate.
·the quality of the scholarly work in terms of its questions, methods, and impact (as defined in this document).
·the contribution of the work to the discipline.
·whether, in his/her professional view the candidate is promotable under the guidelines set forth in this document.

In the cases where solicited peer review is used to document quality for merit, the reviewers should meet the same criteria and be asked to determine:

·the nature of his/her relationship to the candidate.
·the quality of the work
·its significance and contribution to the discipline
·the quality of its questions, methods, and dissemination.

WPDocs\P&T98\GUIDELINES.WPD 6/22/98

tests, assignments, teaching philosophy, work with students etc. of the faculty member.
• Summary (one page) of student evaluations of instructor (items 17 and 18 of student evaluation form – provide average, number of respondents, course title and semester). *In addition, you must provide all the comparative data from the college form.*
• Typed comments of **all** open ended statements by students of faculty from dean's office. DO NOT include only selected comments.

•

Section IV Service
- Service narrative (one page only)
- Include description of type and amount of work for each service assignment