

# AP 21: School of LASB Promotion, Tenure, & Annual Review Expectations

## Contents

|                                                                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| AP 21: School of LASB Promotion, Tenure, & Annual Review Expectations .....              | 1  |
| 21.1 Overview and Philosophy .....                                                       | 2  |
| 21.2 Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III).....        | 2  |
| 21.2.1 Required Ratings.....                                                             | 3  |
| 21.2.3 Relationship to Annual Review Ratings .....                                       | 3  |
| 21.2.4 Teaching/Other Professional Duties .....                                          | 3  |
| 21.2.5 Scholarship .....                                                                 | 4  |
| 21.2.6 Service .....                                                                     | 5  |
| 21.3 Expectations for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV) .....                             | 5  |
| 21.3.1 Teaching/Other Professional Duties .....                                          | 5  |
| 21.3.2 Scholarship .....                                                                 | 6  |
| 21.3.3 Service .....                                                                     | 6  |
| 21.4 Guidelines and Expectations for Promotion of Non-tenure-track Faculty (Rank I) .... | 7  |
| 21.4.1 Required Ratings.....                                                             | 7  |
| 21.4.2 Teaching/Other Professional Duties .....                                          | 7  |
| 21.4.3 Service .....                                                                     | 7  |
| 21.5 Guidelines and Expectations for Annual Reviews.....                                 | 8  |
| 21.5.1 Annual Reviews .....                                                              | 8  |
| 21.5.2 Teaching/Other Professional Duties .....                                          | 9  |
| 21.5.3 Scholarship (Tenure-track Faculty).....                                           | 14 |
| 21.5.4 Ratings for Service .....                                                         | 21 |
| 21.6 Related Information.....                                                            | 27 |
| 21.6.1 Revision History .....                                                            | 27 |
| 21.6.2 Guidelines & Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III) .....       | 27 |

|                                                                           |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 21.6.3 Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV) ..... | 32 |
| 21.6.4 Guidelines and Criteria for Lecturer Promotions.....               | 38 |

## 21.1 Overview and Philosophy

This document serves as policy and guidelines for promotion and tenure at all ranks. Tenure provides a substantial degree of security to faculty who have exhibited excellent abilities, sufficient to convince the Nevada community that their expected services and performances in the future justify the privileges afforded by tenure (NSHE Code Chapter 7, Section 7.1.2). A promotion advances and compensates full-time faculty with a demonstrated record of excellence in Teaching/OPD and appropriate levels of service and, for tenure-track faculty, scholarship. Advancement is reflected in promotion in academic rank or level, and compensation reflected in a salary increase.

This document outlines the guidelines and expectations for LASB Unit P&T Committees and the LASB Dean to review and use for making recommendations as to whether an applicant should receive promotion and/or tenure. The President makes final promotion decisions and will forward all positive tenure recommendations to the Nevada Board of Regents. The Board of Regents votes on tenure appointments.

## 21.2 Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III)

The only areas evaluated shall be teaching/OPD, scholarship, and service.

Evaluations for tenure and promotion in LASB assess a faculty member's developmental progression in teaching/OPD, scholarship, and service. In teaching, faculty are expected to demonstrate advances in pedagogy and contributions to the overall teaching program. In OPD, faculty are expected to demonstrate a record of excellence in performing assigned duties in the position description, including demonstrated effectiveness, efficiency, and professional growth and improvement over the course of the probationary period. Because the scholarship process varies by discipline and may involve progression over multiple years, tenure expectations for scholarship should focus on the faculty member's cumulative accomplishments during the probationary period at NS. In service, faculty are expected to progress in their service commitments and progressively assume additional responsibilities in the department, LASB, and NS. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to demonstrate evidence of sustained commitment to DEI at NS in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. More detailed examples and expectations for teaching/OPD, scholarship, and service are found in Appendix A and the NS Promotion & Tenure policy.

### 21.2.1 Required Ratings

To receive tenure and promotion, the NS Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee must assign a candidate's portfolio a rating of "Excellent" in teaching/OPD and a minimum rating of "Satisfactory" in scholarship and service. Candidates should submit a portfolio, following the page limits outlined in the P&T application, addressing the criteria for promotion and tenure.

|                        | Teaching/OPD | Scholarship                                   | Service                                       |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <i>Required rating</i> | Excellent    | Satisfactory,<br>Commendable, or<br>Excellent | Satisfactory,<br>Commendable, or<br>Excellent |

The Unit P&T Committee and the LASB Dean each recommend ratings for each area, as well as a recommendation as to whether the applicant should receive promotion and tenure, using the guidelines and expectations specific to LASB for each area of evaluation.

### 21.2.3 Relationship to Annual Review Ratings

Annual review criteria hold tenure-track faculty to high standards in teaching, scholarship, and service. While ratings on annual reviews inform the promotion and tenure review process, ratings may vary between annual reviews and the promotion and tenure review. Annual reviews are meant to inform faculty of their progress toward promotion and tenure, but they are not an equivalent; annual reviews do not substitute for NS and NSHE requirements to earn promotion and/or tenure, as outlined below.

Therefore, annual review ratings are contextualized to represent expectations for "Unsatisfactory", "Satisfactory", "Commendable", and "Excellent" ratings for tenure and promotion. Promotion and tenure ratings are based on faculty members' cumulative performance during the time leading up to the tenure and promotion review. A rating from the NS P&T Committee of "Unsatisfactory" in any area disqualifies a candidate from promotion and tenure.

### 21.2.4 Teaching/Other Professional Duties

Faculty must have a pattern of growth and excellence as an instructor. This includes, but is not limited to, the following: demonstrated teaching effectiveness and use of evidence-based practices for instructional design and delivery; the ability to communicate effectively with students and create an inclusive learning environment for a diverse student body; demonstrated skill in class management; and performance of other duties related to teaching and mentoring students. Faculty with OPD must have a record of excellence in performing assigned duties in the position description, including demonstrated effectiveness, efficiency, and professional growth and improvement over the course of the probationary period.

For supporting documentation, faculty members applying for tenure and promotion in LASB provide a brief narrative description of excellence in teaching/OPD. This narrative provides context for reviewing the individual's excellence in teaching or OPD. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Excellent" is achieved. Pedagogical rigor for each LASB course shall be prioritized over student perception and evaluation of Teaching effectiveness when a candidate makes a case for a rating of "Excellent" in teaching.

Lecturers may include their professional development in this section. Examples of professional development include: attending or presenting at a conference in one's discipline with a connection to instruction; attending or presenting at a conference centered on pedagogy; or similar activities.

### 21.2.5 Scholarship

To receive tenure, the candidate must have a record of accomplishments in the Scholarship of Dissemination leading to peer-reviewed contributions or equivalent that are appropriate to the candidate's field, position, and requirements or expectations of program-specific accrediting bodies. It is the candidate's responsibility to present evidence that the body of scholarship completed during the probationary period is sufficient to merit granting tenure and promotion.

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion provide a brief narrative description regarding scholarship. This narrative provides context for reviewing the individual's scholarship. External validation (peer review) of work in a published or exhibited product is required for promotion and tenure at NS. One published peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed, discipline-appropriate equivalent in a scholarly outlet is required for a "Satisfactory" rating and tenure. Faculty must demonstrate the status or quality of the outlet for equivalent works. Faculty must include descriptions of the publications that indicate that the outlet is a reputable peer-reviewed journal.

Evidence of productive scholarship may be supported by published records and other original discipline-specific peer-reviewed and editor-reviewed work of a professional nature, including research on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), creative works for those in the arts, and mentoring substantial student research projects. Scholarly collaboration is encouraged and supported, and each candidate's contribution to a peer-reviewed publication, per discipline best practices, will be considered for the purpose of promotion and tenure review.

Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not admissible. Tenure-seeking faculty members should plan out their scholarship agendas during their probationary period so they have time to complete the required expectations.

### 21.2.6 Service

The applicant must have a record of meaningful, active service to the faculty member's students, program, LASB, the broader institution, and/or the community. Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion provide a brief narrative describing performance in service. This narrative provides context for reviewing the individual's contributions to LASB, NS, students, the profession, and the community. A consistent rating of "Satisfactory" on annual reviews is not equivalent to a rating of "Satisfactory" on the tenure review. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Satisfactory" or higher is achieved.

## 21.3 Expectations for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV)

In evaluating a candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor, any accomplishments since applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be considered. The applicant must present evidence of continued effective performance in teaching/OPD, scholarship, and service that align with the criteria for promotion to Rank IV. An Associate Professor is expected to be at that rank for five years before applying for promotion. Applying for promotion to the rank of Professor is optional, and a faculty member whose application is denied may reapply.

The rank of Professor is awarded to those who demonstrate the following: cumulative and ongoing professional achievements; significant contributions to advancing the University's mission; continued innovation and dedication in teaching/OPD; leadership with sustained contributions in service beneficial to the University and internal and/or external communities in significant ways; professional growth and improvement over time germane to the applicant's position; and scholarly contributions. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to demonstrate evidence of sustained commitment to DEI at NS in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. More detailed examples and expectations for teaching/OPD, scholarship, and service are found later in this document and in the NS Promotion & Tenure Policy.

To be eligible for promotion, the University P&T Committee must assign a candidate's portfolio a rating of "Excellent" in teaching/OPD and a "Commendable" in either scholarship or service, with a rating of at least "Satisfactory" in the third area. A rating from the NS P&T Committee of "Unsatisfactory" in any area disqualifies a candidate from promotion.

### 21.3.1 Teaching/Other Professional Duties

The applicant must provide evidence of consistent, sustained activities and contributions that benefit the University community. Faculty members provide a brief narrative describing their performance in teaching/OPD.

#### *21.3.1.1 Teaching*

Candidates should demonstrate continued innovation, professional growth, and improvement that builds on evidence-based practices and the candidate's own evolving methods or practices. It is expected that the candidate will share successful efforts with other faculty and their professional community through leadership in campus initiatives related to their position and fulfillment of the University's mission. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Excellent" is achieved.

#### *21.3.1.2 Other Professional Duties*

Applicants must show consistent, sustained, and meaningful undertaking and execution of professional duties, including serving in capacities that benefit the University, the profession, the community, and/or NSHE, when relevant. Faculty members who have other professional duties provide a brief narrative describing their performance. Professional duties rendered to the University will be given the most emphasis in evaluations. The rank of Professor comes with the expectation that the candidate will have fulfilled other obligations professionally, with leadership roles being a prominent part of those duties. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Excellent" is achieved.

### **21.3.2 Scholarship**

Candidates must show scholarly contributions since applying for tenure and promotion to Rank III. Faculty members provide a brief narrative describing their performance in scholarship. Candidates must include accomplishments in the Scholarship of Dissemination leading to peer-reviewed contributions or equivalent that are appropriate to their field, position, and requirements or expectations of program-specific accrediting bodies. The candidate is responsible for making a case that the level of "Satisfactory" or higher is achieved. One published peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed, discipline-appropriate equivalent in a scholarly journal or outlet is required for a "Satisfactory" rating. All scholarly work under consideration must be produced since applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and while the applicant is affiliated with NS.

### **21.3.3 Service**

Applicants must show consistent, sustained, and meaningful service, including serving in capacities that benefit the University, NS staff and students, the profession, NSHE, the broader institution, and/or the community. Faculty members provide a brief narrative describing their performance in service. Service to the University will carry the most significance in evaluations and should include leadership roles. The rank of Professor comes with the expectation that the candidate will have fulfilled service obligations professionally, with leadership roles being a prominent part of that service. The candidate is responsible for making a case that the level of "Satisfactory" or higher is achieved.

## 21.4 Guidelines and Expectations for Promotion of Non-tenure-track Faculty (Rank I)

Full-time academic faculty in Lecturer (Level I) and Senior Lecturer (Level II) positions who satisfy the required years of employment are eligible to apply for promotion. Lecturers are not required to apply for promotion; those applying for promotion submit their materials in accordance with the published timeline.

### 21.4.1 Required Ratings

To receive a promotion to Senior Lecturer (Level II), the NS P&T Committee must assign a candidate's portfolio a rating of "Excellent" in teaching /OPD and a minimum rating of "Satisfactory" in service. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to demonstrate evidence of sustained commitment to DEI at NS in teaching and/or service. More detailed examples and expectations for teaching/OPD and service are found in Appendix C and the Non-tenure-track Faculty Promotion Policy.

To receive a promotion to Distinguished Lecturer, the NS P&T Committee must assign the applicant's portfolio a rating of "Excellent" in teaching/OPD as well and a rating of "Commendable" in service. A rating from the NS P&T Committee of "Unsatisfactory" in either area disqualifies a candidate from promotion.

### 21.4.2 Teaching/Other Professional Duties

#### *21.4.2.1 Promotion to Senior Lecturer*

Faculty members provide a brief narrative description of excellence in teaching. The narrative provides context for reviewing the individual's teaching excellence. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Excellent" is achieved.

#### *21.4.2.2 Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer*

Faculty members must provide evidence of a pattern of sustained and substantial excellence in teaching, with meaningful contributions in other areas of evaluation. Appropriate and consistent application of rigor for each course shall be prioritized over student perception of teaching effectiveness when a candidate makes a case for a rating of "Excellent."

### 21.4.3 Service

The applicant must have a record of meaningful, active service to the faculty member's students, program, LASB, or the institution.

#### *21.4.3.1 Promotion to Senior Lecturer*

Faculty members provide a brief narrative describing their performance in service. The narrative provides context for reviewing the individual's contributions to LASB, NS, students, the profession, the broader institution, and/or the community. It is the

candidate's responsibility to make a case that the level of "Satisfactory" or higher is achieved.

#### *21.4.3.2 Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer*

Applicants must make a case that the level of "Satisfactory" or higher was sustained in service since applying for promotion to the level of Senior Lecturer.

## **21.5 Guidelines and Expectations for Annual Reviews**

LASB subscribes to the philosophy that teaching should be the primary area of emphasis for faculty members, with scholarship (for tenure-track faculty) and service as important but lower priorities. Faculty are recruited, evaluated, awarded tenure, and promoted based on this perspective. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to demonstrate evidence of sustained commitment to DEI at NS in teaching, scholarship (for tenure-track faculty), and/or service.

The academic evaluation process and reward system in LASB has three purposes: to provide an opportunity through which faculty, by acting on feedback from annual reviews, progress through the academic ranks; to certify high achievement; and to determine eligibility for merit pay, when applicable. The annual review serves as a guide of progress toward promotion and/or tenure, but not as a substitute for the criteria for promotion and tenure.

Annual review ratings are used to inform the promotion process, but the annual review and promotion rankings may vary.

### **21.5.1 Annual Reviews**

Faculty submit a self-evaluation each year responding to goals and listing accomplishments, in consultation with their supervisor or evaluator. The annual review includes goals for the faculty member to achieve in teaching, scholarship (tenure-track faculty only), and service to ensure they are on track toward tenure and/or promotion. At each annual review, the faculty member must provide a copy of the goals agreed upon in the previous year's review and indicate which items they completed. Faculty members indicate progress toward each goal during the year under consideration, with an emphasis on teaching goals. Faculty members may not fully accomplish each goal but should demonstrate effort toward achieving them while striving for development. Faculty may also include accomplishments beyond the goals, and new faculty who do not have an annual review plan from a previous year should discuss accomplishments rather than goal fulfillment.

#### *21.5.1.1 Annual Review Portfolio*

Faculty submit materials each year responding to their goals and listing accomplishments. Faculty may be required by their supervisor to submit additional materials. Any page or word limits on evidence do not apply to CVs, syllabi, student evaluations, student papers

submitted to demonstrate instructor feedback, or items specifically requested by the evaluator after receiving the portfolio.

## 21.5.2 Teaching/Other Professional Duties

For annual reviews, teaching refers to the act of cultivating a rich learning environment, which includes sharing knowledge, nurturing critical inquiry, inspiring curiosity, and encouraging students to apply what they have learned in an inclusive environment. Teaching primarily reflects instruction-related activities that directly impact student learning. Because NS is a teaching institution, offering engaging and meaningful instruction is highly valued in LASB.

According to the University mission statement, “excellence in teaching leads to innovative, technology-rich learning opportunities that promote the acquisition of interdisciplinary knowledge and skills.” To support this mission, the lines of evidence for excellence in teaching provide some comparability in evaluation while recognizing the diverse ways in which faculty may demonstrate teaching excellence.

As part of their annual review materials, faculty members submit a teaching narrative that provides context for reviewing the individual’s teaching effectiveness. The narrative is a reflection on important teaching activities, accomplishments, and challenges experienced in the year under review.

Faculty with OPD, including activities supported through a course release, should submit an additional narrative outlining the duties and their impact, when possible.

### 21.5.2.1 Ratings for Teaching

Teaching is an essential element of an academic faculty member’s position and an integral part of creating a healthy and thriving campus and local community through higher education. Institutions such as NS value the teaching contributions of its faculty. It is the primary avenue by which faculty fulfill our mission. First and foremost, faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching.

| Rating             | Definition                                 | Criteria                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Excellent</i>   | Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner | Consistently meets and exceeds Commendable performance standards and consistently and effectively elevates students’ learning experiences through student-centered pedagogy, thoughtfully designed activities and assignments, and inclusive classroom practices. |
| <i>Commendable</i> | Exceeds expectations                       | Meets and exceeds Satisfactory performance standards and makes effort to elevate students’ learning experiences through student-centered pedagogy, thoughtfully designed activities and assignments, and inclusive classroom practices                            |

|                       |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                       |                            | with an absence of patterns or themes of problematic issues in student feedback.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <i>Satisfactory</i>   | Meets expectations         | Faculty members are expected to be competent instructors, as evidenced by the creation of a classroom climate that respects students and welcomes diversity. If patterns or themes of problematic issues in student feedback are present, faculty corrected the issues or will design a plan to do so. |
| <i>Unsatisfactory</i> | Fails to meet expectations | Has not effectively executed some essential teaching responsibilities and/or approach to teaching and assessment results, and there are recurring patterns or themes of problematic issues in student feedback without correction.                                                                     |

#### *21.5.2.2 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness*

Material evaluated for annual reviews includes required and suggested materials. These include supervisors' course observations, student course evaluations, grade distributions, an evaluation of syllabi, teaching materials, learning management system course builds, and any other evidence of student learning or accomplishment provided by the faculty member or requested by the evaluator. No single item should determine the rating; all evidence should be taken together as a whole.

Items submitted as evidence of teaching effectiveness should relate to the quality of the learning environment provided to students in courses. Additionally, participation in professional development activities, especially when resulting in specific changes or improvements to course methods, may be included in teaching. Other items that may be related to teaching, such as research or publications in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning or mentoring students toward presenting at a conference, as defined in this document, may be categorized as scholarship. When there is a choice of placement, the candidate may make that decision.

#### **Required Evidence**

- Canvas shells and syllabi will be reviewed by chairs/deans, and these materials should be available to reviewers.
- Official student evaluations, aggregated across each course taught during the review period. The faculty member may request that the evaluator exclude course evaluations with extremely low response rates.
- Record of office hours, such as those included in syllabi, posted on an office door, or posted in a digital space.
- Final grade distributions, aggregated across each course taught during the review period (supplied by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness).
- Teaching observation(s) from the Department Chair, Dean, or Dean's designee.

- Teaching narrative highlighting teaching exemplars and other examples of teaching effectiveness.

### **Additional Evidence**

May include, but is not limited to:

- Exams, assignments, projects, or other assessments developed by the instructor to measure student performance.
- Lectures, handouts, and other materials used to aid instruction.
- Peer observations of teaching conducted by the faculty member.
- Peer observations of teaching conducted by faculty peers.
- Video- or audio-recordings of teaching.
- Descriptions of innovative teaching methods used.
- Grade distributions for specific assignments or exams.
- Descriptions of how diversity issues were incorporated into course content.
- Examples of feedback provided on papers, projects, exams, or other assignments.
- Data-driven (quantitative and/or qualitative) assessment of the effectiveness of an assignment, activity, or instructional technique used in a course.
- Video- or audio-recordings of student performance.
- Website or digital address of a technological assignment completed by students.
- Nomination for and/or recipient of teaching award.
- Evidence of excellent student coursework (such as being published in an undergraduate journal/magazine, accepted for a conference, or performance at literary and arts festivals).
- Student reflections/portfolios.
- Other discipline-specific evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- Recipient of an external teaching-related grant.
- Additional evidence as requested by the evaluator
- Evidence with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **Activities Related to Teaching**

As a part of their teaching responsibilities, faculty members often participate in related activities that enrich the quality of instruction at NS. A description of these activities should be provided in the annual review materials. Activities may include, but are not limited to:

- New preparations or substantial revisions or improvements to a course the faculty member is teaching, to be counted in the year the course is first offered by the faculty.
- Fieldwork supervision as part of a course.
- Supervision of course assistants or supplemental instructors.
- Developing and leading a campus-wide teaching opportunity, such as a speaker series or pedagogical workshop.
- Develop and lead in-class workshops for students.

- Structured mentorship for peer tutors/mentors.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### *21.5.2.3 Ratings Guidelines for Teaching*

#### **Excellent**

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner. Faculty consistently meet and exceed “Commendable” performance standards and consistently and effectively elevate students’ learning experiences through student-centered pedagogy, thoughtfully designed activities and assignments, and inclusive classroom practices.

- Evaluations with consistently positive written (qualitative) comments and numerical ratings (quantitative). These will be evaluated holistically and faculty may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores in their teaching narrative.
- Receives a teaching award.
- Consistently integrates active learning strategies in the classroom.
- Consistently designs and/or integrates highly engaging and appropriate learning materials that are targeted toward the respective course and student learning outcomes.
- Designs innovative student assessments or activities that assess the highest levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.
- Uses techniques or assignments that build, scaffold, or strengthen student learning over the term.
- Demonstrates efforts to design and revise courses based on evidence from published literature on teaching effectiveness.
- Earns external certification in teaching practices.
- Uses evidence-based feedback techniques when evaluating student work, such as live grading, “wise” feedback, or post-exam reflection.
- Is highly attentive to classroom dynamics and works to ensure the participation of all students.
- Demonstrates consistent and well-researched innovation in pedagogy, such as technologies and teaching techniques that are practically applied and successful most of the time.
- Demonstrates use of inclusive policies such as late policies and assignment revision policies.
- Demonstrates responsiveness to students’ individual circumstances, such as identifying students who need additional support or who show improvement.
- Effectively integrates written work and use of data-driven strategies that improve students’ writing skills.
- Evaluators may also consider acceptance of an external teaching grant as evidence of excellence in teaching and professional development.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

**Commendable**

Faculty consistently meet and exceed “Satisfactory” performance standards and consistently and effectively elevate students’ learning experiences through student-centered pedagogy, thoughtfully designed activities and assignments, and inclusive classroom practices.

- Meets annual review goals.
- Evaluations with mostly positive written (qualitative) comments and numerical ratings (quantitative). These will be evaluated holistically and faculty may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores in their teaching narrative.
- Develops and uses innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies.
- Adapts and improves teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and the Chair, Dean, or Dean’s designee.
- Provides individualized feedback on student work.
- Applies appropriate rigor for the course level.
- Designs multiple forms of assessment or activities that measure various levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.
- Incorporates or significantly addresses diversity issues in courses or course materials, such as readings, texts, or other materials from culturally diverse authors or on culturally diverse topics.
- Incorporates practices that foster an inclusive classroom, such as universal design principles and culturally diverse and responsive examples.
- Designs well-organized and navigable learning management system course shells.
- Uses experiential learning activities that include assessment of student learning.
- Uses NS student support services such as CARE referrals and Scorpion Success Network, when appropriate.
- Assesses effectiveness of teaching endeavors.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

**Satisfactory**

Meets expectations. Faculty members are expected to be competent instructors, as evidenced by the creation of a classroom climate that respects students and welcomes diversity, the absence of patterns or themes of problematic issues in student feedback related to an instructor’s courses, and by quality contributions in all of the following areas.

- Well-developed syllabi with adequate expectations and rigor that include a course description, course objectives, evaluation criteria/methods, office hours, and a well-developed and feasible calendar of course topics.

- Availability to students outside of classroom hours, such as established/posted office hours and other scheduled appointments.
- Content is relevant to the course, as evidenced by adequately rigorous readings, texts, and updated course materials that demonstrate a systematic effort by the instructor to convey course material.
- Student evaluations include written comments that are generally satisfactory. Where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may explain mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably poor student evaluations in their teaching narrative.
- Major assignments, projects, exams, or other assessments developed by the instructor that assess course learning outcomes.
- Grading assignments in a timely fashion.
- Demonstrated evidence of consistent feedback given to students regarding performance on major assignments, exams, and high-stakes learning projects/activities.
- Final grade distributions not significantly skewed in a persistent manner. Faculty members may submit a rationale in their teaching narrative explaining cases in which grade distributions are skewed, which will be considered by the evaluator.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **Unsatisfactory**

Fails to meet expectations. The faculty member has not effectively executed some essential teaching responsibilities and/or their approach to teaching and assessment results in patterns or themes of problematic issues in student feedback. Indicates evidence of more than one of the following conditions:

- Fails to produce evidence of a “Satisfactory” performance.
- Fails to sufficiently improve in aspects of teaching identified in previous annual reviews as essential areas for improvement.
- Existence of major student written complaints about one or more of the instructor’s courses backed by other sources of data including course observations by evaluator. The faculty member may provide a justification or explanation of the student complaints in their teaching narrative. This explanation will be considered by the evaluator when determining whether an “Unsatisfactory” rating is appropriate.
- Evaluator feedback of teaching documents unsatisfactory teaching.
- Little to no student-centered pedagogy.
- Fails to satisfactorily carry out essential teaching responsibilities such as instruction, assessment of student work, and posting grades.

### **21.5.3 Scholarship (Tenure-track Faculty)**

LASB sets the following rating guidelines for assessing scholarship for annual reviews of tenure-track faculty. These benchmarks are a guide. Evaluators may be flexible in the ratings where faculty members have undertaken forms of scholarship or scholarly

leadership not listed here, and as accounted for in a narrative provided by the faculty. A consistent rating of “Satisfactory” on annual reviews is not equivalent to a rating of “Satisfactory” on a tenure or promotion review. Tenure- and/or promotion-seeking faculty should plan their scholarship agendas to complete the required expectations listed in this document and referenced in the NS Promotion & Tenure Policy.

| Rating                | Definition                                 | Criteria                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Excellent</i>      | Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner | Distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 A-level item or</li> <li>• 2 B-level items + 2 C-level items, or equivalent.</li> </ul>                     |
| <i>Commendable</i>    | Exceeds expectations                       | Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishment as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 B-level items or equivalent or</li> <li>• 1 B-level item + 2 C-level items, or equivalent.</li> </ul>                                 |
| <i>Satisfactory</i>   | Meets expectations                         | Active program of quality research or creative activity which contributes to the discipline’s body of knowledge and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 C-level items or equivalent or</li> <li>• 1 B-level item or equivalent.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Unsatisfactory</i> | Fails to meet expectations                 | Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

### 21.5.3.1 Evidence of Scholarship

#### Research, Journal Articles, and Professional Publications

The quality of the candidate’s research and professional publications or reports will be evaluated within the context of norms for the discipline. Juried outlets are accorded more significance than publications that do not undergo peer review.

- *Peer-Reviewed Journal Article*. One published peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed, discipline-appropriate equivalent in a scholarly outlet.
- *Book Chapters*. Quality will be evaluated within the context of norms for the discipline. Refereed chapters are accorded more significance than non-refereed ones.
- *Books*. Scholarly books that broaden a disciplinary knowledge base with original research or produce novel applications of existing knowledge to professional problems are accorded the most significance. A book of translation that has significant scholarly framing also falls within this subcategory. Textbooks that compile and organize existing knowledge are weighted less than unique work, but the scope of works should be considered.

Readings, edited books, and conference proceedings are, in turn, given less significance than standard textbooks.

- *Artistic Production*. NS respects the work of artistic scholars and supports their efforts. For those in fields where artistic production is standard, works that are creative in nature (such as fine art, films, creative writing, poetry, and others) will be evaluated within the context of norms for the discipline.
- *Undergraduate Research*. Faculty members are encouraged to mentor and support student research and research projects. Mentorship and supervision of student research will be evaluated in terms of the length of project, dissemination of the research, and peer-reviewed professional publications. Projects that are more time-intensive (over several semesters) will be accorded more significance than those where faculty take a more peripheral role in mentoring students or research projects. Student work accepted for publication in a professional, peer-reviewed publication will be accorded the most significance within this subcategory.
- *Professional Reports, Technical Reports, Informational Reports, Monographs, and Lab Manuals*. These publications will be evaluated in terms of their quality, with reference to the intended audience and the scope of dissemination.
- *Conference Papers and Poster Presentations*. The value attributed to paper and poster presentations varies and will be evaluated by the following six factors (in no particular order of importance): quality of the paper or poster; quality of the conference; scope of the conference (international, national, regional, or local); scope of dissemination; whether the item was refereed; and whether the paper or poster was invited. Generally, paper presentations will be granted more significance than poster presentations. Evaluators may also grant more significance to papers or presentations that include significant student involvement.
- *Scholarly Grants and Contracts*. Funded grants and contracts provide evidence of the capacity to organize scholarly activity judged meritorious by external funding agencies. Therefore, external funding is accorded more significance than internal NS funding. Grant and contract proposals should be evaluated in terms of the competitiveness of the funding agency and the scope of the funded research, such as total amount funded and scope of the research agenda.
- *Scholarship Production in Progress*. Evidence of scholarship in progress, particularly the continuation of funded endeavors, manuscripts under review, exhibitions under development, and formal working papers, serves as an indicator of the candidate's intent to complete projects. Completing a prospectus, literature review, or data collection, and writing individual parts or chapters of a project, are examples of production in progress. Additional examples include attendance at professional events that further the production of the work, such as writers' conferences and generative

workshops that lead to the advancement of manuscripts. Statements of scholarship in progress should be supported by artifacts, such as working drafts or notes.

- *Peer-reviewed Creative Endeavors*. Evidence of scholarship in other forms, such as lectures, creative work, unique equipment, computer software/program design, and video productions, will be evaluated in terms of the scope of dissemination, character of receiving audience, and prestige of validating authority, institution, or agency. External validation of quality is essential.
- *Other Scholarly Endeavors*. Evidence of scholarship in other forms, including but not limited to lectures, software or app design, intellectual property development, patent applications, consulting, and related activities, will be evaluated according to discipline-specific practice and the scope of the work. External validation may be requested by the evaluator.
- *Refereeing Books and Journal Articles*. Reviewing the contributions of other scholars is an important service. This achievement will be evaluated based on the length and/or quantity of manuscripts/publications reviewed, as well as the overall impact.
- *Shorter Works that Advance Public Knowledge*. This may include short articles published in bulletins of academic organizations and various forms of public media such as newspapers and legitimate web magazines that advance general public knowledge. Such activities are distinct from original peer-reviewed contributions such as journal articles insofar as they may advance public awareness and education. Therefore, two works that fall into this category count as one item for annual review. This category cannot be counted more than once in any review year, regardless of the total number of items published.
- Evidence of scholarship with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **Academic Leadership in Scholarship**

May include, but not limited to:

- Identifying, developing, funding, designing, implementing, and completing research, development, dissemination, or evaluation projects of significant scope. Evaluations will consider the extent to which such projects enhance the faculty member's reputation and involve other faculty, students, and staff.
- Developing regional, national, or international conferences, symposia, or the like for disseminating research findings.
- Guest editing an issue of a journal or collection/anthology.
- Internal and cross-institutional mentorship of colleagues regarding their scholarship.
- Active membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals or creative publications, including journals/magazines.

- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **National Recognition in Scholarship**

May include, but not limited to:

- Development of a model or practice that is widely adopted.
- Extensive publications in scholarly outlets.
- Record of high accomplishment in creative endeavors of relevance to the field.
- Frequent citations in the literature.
- Obtaining funding through a competitive grant process.
- Number and quality of invited addresses, symposia, colloquia, and presentations.
- Serving as sole editor or managing editor of a scholarly journal/magazine.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

#### *21.5.3.2 Rating Scholarship in Annual Reviews*

Tenure-track faculty members present evidence of scholarly progress that outlines their contributions over the year in review. Evaluators assess scholarly output by applying the following categories. These align with the tenure and/or promotion guidelines in this document and in the NS Promotion & Tenure Policy. Items in Levels A and B are important work toward tenure and/or promotion, but do not replace the A-level publication required for tenure and/or promotion.

Contributions to scholarship not listed will be considered based on the scope and contribution to knowledge in the relevant field.

### **Level A**

Includes superior contributions in some major areas of scholarly effort or equivalent (emphasis is on quality and substance, not quantity), and demonstrates scholarship that is peer reviewed, juried, or undergoes equivalent external review. Examples include:

- Acceptance of a peer-reviewed journal article for publication.
- Substantial role in guiding an undergraduate research project that is accepted for peer-reviewed publication.
- Acceptance of a national external research grant; level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers.
- Acceptance of a scholarly peer-reviewed or editor-reviewed book chapter.
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted editor- or peer-reviewed scholarly book based on original research and thought.
- Completion of final draft of an accepted scholarly book that is based on original research and thought.

- Exhibition or publication of a substantial major creative, discipline-specific work that is nationally or regionally recognized in a peer-reviewed venue, such as a major exhibition or film or novel release (for those in the arts).
- Serving as editor of a peer-reviewed journal, ideally for tenured faculty.
- Guest editing an issue of a journal.
- Publication of a paper in the proceedings of a major conference.
- Development and publication of a significant software application that serves academic, public, or business needs in a novel and major way.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **Level B**

Includes high-quality contributions in some major areas of scholarly effort (or equivalent). Emphasis is on quality and substance, not quantity. Examples include:

- Substantial internal and/or cross-institutional mentorship of colleagues regarding scholarship that leads to presentations, submissions, or publications.
- Submission of a manuscript to a refereed publication for initial review.
- Resubmission of a revised article to a peer-reviewed journal that required revisions. Could be considered a Level A achievement based on the amount of work required; the faculty member must provide evidence that the resubmission is equivalent to other Level-A achievements.
- Submission of an external grant; level of contribution may be indicated by whether the faculty member is among principal researchers. Submission of external grant applications that require significant research and preparation may be considered as Level-A items at evaluators' discretion.
- Presentation of a new scholarly paper or research presentation at a professional conference.
- Substantial role in mentoring student(s) toward successful presentation of a scholarly paper or poster at a professional conference.
- Mentoring a student to publish work in an undergraduate research journal or creative outlet.
- Presentation as keynote or invited speaker at a conference, symposium, colloquium, or other significant academic event.
- Refereeing a book for an academic press.
- Receipt of a local or regional external grant; level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers.
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted book that is a synthesis of previously compiled knowledge.
- Completion of final draft of an accepted book that is a synthesis of previously compiled knowledge.
- Peer-reviewed exhibition or release of a single, discipline-specific, stand-alone piece of creative work (for those in the arts).

- Completion of a technical/professional report or monograph.
- Publication of a lab workbook.
- Successful resubmission of an accepted book chapter that required substantial revisions or further research, as documented by evidence.
- Acceptance of book prospectus.
- Participation in a scholarship-oriented writing group that meets regularly for one or more terms.
- Acceptance to a scholarship-oriented institute or professional development opportunity requiring multi-day commitment, such as the Summer Scholarship Institute or statistics camp.
- Creation of a substantial, public-facing data project.
- Submission of a pre-print working paper demonstrating substantive statistical analysis.
- Development and publication of a software application that serves academic, public, or business needs in a novel way.
- Management in the role of PI or co-PI of an external grant. Managing a large external grant may be considered a Level-A item at evaluators' discretion.
- Development of novel intellectual property.
- Evidence of applied research.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

### **Level C**

Includes quality contributions in some major areas of scholarly effort or equivalent.

Emphasis is on quality and substance, not quantity. Examples include:

- Evidence of preparation of scholarly work, such as pilot testing, data collection, or literature reviews, with a timeline for completion but not completed during the year under review. Faculty may generally receive credit for a single year of preparation for a given work, with the exception of multiyear book-length projects.
- Submission of an IRB protocol or equivalent to engage in research.
- Completion of human subjects protections training or equivalent.
- Participation in a scholarship-oriented professional development opportunity requiring one-time commitment, such as a training workshop.
- Submission of scholarly work for presentation at a conference.
- Completion of other scholarly products, such as software development or conference proceedings, commensurate in effort or scope with other items in this list.
- Refereeing an article for a journal.
- Presentation of a new poster at professional conference.
- Publication of a research note or book review.
- Publication of a field-specific encyclopedia article.
- Submission of an external grant; level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers. Submission of external grant

applications that require significant research and preparation may be considered as a Level-B or Level-A item at evaluators' discretion.

- Participation as personnel on an external grant; may be considered a Level-B item at evaluators' discretion.
- Internal and/or cross-institutional mentorship of colleagues regarding their scholarship.
- Scholarly support activities associated with the publication of a major work, such as media interviews following book publication.
- Creation of a minor public-facing data project or aiding in the creation of a major public-facing project.
- Minor statistical consulting for an interdisciplinary academic work or public project, such as one that merits acknowledgement but not authorship.
- Management of an external grant; level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers. Managing a large external grant may be considered a Level-B item at evaluators' discretion.
- Two short discipline-specific published works that advance public knowledge but are non-refereed. Two works in this category together count as one item for annual reviews. This item cannot be counted more than once in any review year.
- Evidence of activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to the items above.

#### 21.5.4 Ratings for Service

LASB defines service as a faculty member's professional responsibilities to NS and its external community. Service is a standard element of an academic faculty member's position and an integral part of creating a healthy and thriving campus and local community through higher education. NS values the service contributions of its faculty. It is one of the many ways that faculty work together to fulfill our mission.

Service encompasses three areas: service to the institution, service to students, and external service to the profession and community. Faculty can demonstrate service in all three areas; however, LASB places most emphasis on institutional service. First and foremost, faculty are expected to demonstrate how they contribute significantly to meeting the needs of the University, followed to a lesser degree by contributions to students, the profession, the community, and external agencies. Faculty should plan their service agendas to complete the required expectations listed in this document and referenced in the NS Promotion & Tenure Policy.

Evaluators should converse with the faculty member to determine the quality of service, considering the time and effort required and the substance of the contribution. The quantities indicated below are general guidelines, not fixed designations. The quantity required may vary based on the quality of the contribution. Failure to meet designated obligations may diminish a faculty member's annual review ratings, regardless of other contributions.

- A-level service = 4 points
- B-level service = 2 points
- C-level service = 1 point

| Rating                | Definition                                 | Criteria   | Examples                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Excellent</i>      | Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner | 8 points   | 1. 1 Level A + 2 Level B items = 8 points<br>2. 1 Level A + 1 Level B + 2 Level C items = 8 points<br>3. 3 Level B + 2 Level C items = 8 points |
| <i>Commendable</i>    | Exceeds expectations                       | 6-7 points | 1. 2 Level B + 3 Level C items = 7 points<br>2. 1 Level A + 1 Level B items = 6 points<br>3. 3 Level B items = 6 points                         |
| <i>Satisfactory</i>   | Meets expectations                         | 4-5 points | 1. 2 Level B items + 1 Level C item = 5 points<br>2. 1 Level B + 3 Level C items = 5 points<br>3. 1 Level A item = 4 points                     |
| <i>Unsatisfactory</i> | Fails to meet expectations                 | 0-3 points | 1. 1 Level B item + 1 Level C item = 3 points<br>2. 3 Level C items = 3 points<br>3. 1 Level B item = 2 points                                  |

#### 21.5.4.1 Evidence of Service

When evaluating faculty service contributions, both quantity and quality are important considerations. Quantity in the absence of quality is insufficient to earn high ratings in service. As part of their annual review materials, faculty members submit a brief narrative description of their service activities. The examples below are not exhaustive, and faculty may describe the amount of investment for service activities and request that they be categorized at a higher level, at evaluators' discretion. Service may include stipend-compensated activities. Faculty may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions by their evaluator.

These ratings align with the tenure and/or promotion guidelines. Items in Levels B and C are important work toward tenure and/or promotion, but do not replace the required A-level work for tenure and/or promotion. A faculty member who

completes seven or more Level C activities would not meet the standards for “Commendable,” because they require at least one Level A or B activity.

## **Institutional Service**

### *Level A*

Substantive involvement in or guidance of a meaningful endeavor that requires a significant time commitment, involves an important leadership role, and reflects the faculty member’s contribution to accomplishing an essential institutional goal. The examples are not exhaustive, and faculty may describe the amount of investment for institutional service activities and request consideration at a higher level, at evaluators’ discretion. Faculty may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions by their evaluator. Examples include:

- Serving as Faculty Senate chair.
- Serving as Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA) chair.
- Serving as Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee chair.
- Chairing the University-level Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- Chairing a search committee.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

### *Level B*

Substantive involvement in a meaningful endeavor that requires a moderate time commitment and/or reflects contributions to accomplishing an important institutional goal. Examples include:

- Assisting with significant departmental service such as evaluating part-time instructors, coordinating multi-section courses, or similar responsibilities.
- Holding office in Faculty Senate (vice-chair, secretary, or parliamentarian).
- Chairing a Faculty Senate committee or actively serving on a Faculty Senate committee that holds regular meetings.
- Serving as a search committee member.
- Serving as a Curriculum Committee member.
- Serving as LASB Strategic Planning chair.
- Serving as a Faculty Senate representative.
- Serving as assessment chair.
- Serving on Dean’s faculty advisory council.
- Substantially developing or revising curricula or programs, such as proposing a new course, carrying out an NSHE curriculum initiative, redesigning a program, or making substantial degree revisions.
- Leading ongoing faculty workshops or development, such as an FLC or workshop series.
- Leading NSU or NSHE programming initiatives such as Core revisions, corequisite revisions, or similar activities.
- Providing substantive comments, feedback, or multiple revisions on one or more policies.

- Providing significant administrative support for program or department organization and function.
- Designing and leading campus events to foster campus community, pedagogy, and/or support, such as Tunnel of Awareness, Nepantla Día de los Muertos, or similar activities.
- Developing and leading training workshops for faculty.
- Developing and leading groups for faculty scholarly support.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

### *Level C*

Substantive involvement in a single meaningful event such as a University fair or participation in an endeavor that requires a relatively low time commitment.

Examples include:

- Leading a campus presentation.
- Serving on the Travel and Incentive Grant Committee or another committee with infrequent meetings.
- Actively recruiting at University fair events.
- Representing a department or organization at a campus event.
- Participating in campus events to foster campus community, pedagogy, and/or support.
- Participating in NSU or NSHE programming initiatives such as Core revisions, corequisite revisions, or similar activities.
- Presenting at a faculty development workshop.
- Serving as an LASB Strategic Planning member.
- Serving as a faculty liaison to the Academic Advising Center.
- Providing some comments or feedback on a policy.
- Drafting and submitting strategic initiative budget requests on behalf of a department or unit.
- Serving as a faculty mentor or providing significant mentorship to another faculty member.
- Providing administrative support for department organization and function, such as maintaining social media, websites, and/or bulletin board, coordinating meeting agendas, and/or taking and disseminating minutes.
- Participating in candidate recruitment activities such as attending teaching demonstrations or presentations and attending meetings and/or meals with a candidate as a non-committee member.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

### **Service to Students**

Service contributions to the University also include support for students, as these contribute to the mission and promote the objectives of NS. An example is providing mentorship or support to students that goes well beyond the advisory role expected of faculty. Faculty members may submit relevant evidence, such as a list of students served,

thank you letters, sign-in sheets, a summary of calendar meetings, written feedback to students, and/or copies of letters of recommendation, that reflects service to students. Where relevant, faculty should indicate work with underrepresented minorities, first-generation students, and/or other historically bypassed individuals. The examples below are not exhaustive, and faculty may describe the amount of investment for student related service activities and request consideration at a higher level, at evaluators' discretion. Faculty may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions by their evaluator.

#### *Level A*

Level A is typically reserved for institutional service. However, a faculty member may argue that a particular combination of student service activities goes beyond Level B and deserves a rating of Level A.

#### *Level B*

Involvement with one or more students that requires a moderate time commitment.

Faculty may describe the time commitment. Examples include:

- Acting as a faculty advisor to a student organization.
- Documented mentorship of students that significantly extends beyond an advisory role.
- Documented student meetings that provide substantive mentorship, such as career or professional advising, that goes significantly beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Student meetings that provide substantive personal support that goes well beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Other documented, substantive student-centered activities that go well beyond a faculty advisory role.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to those above.

#### *Level C*

Involvement with students that requires a relatively low time commitment. Faculty may describe the time commitment. Examples include:

- Documented student meetings that provide some mentorship, such as career or professional advising, beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Documented student meetings that provide some personal support beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Writing letters of recommendation.
- Participating in a panel or professional event for students.
- Providing substantive feedback on student applications or materials, such as cover letters, resumes, and graduate program statements.
- Other documented student-centered activities that go beyond a faculty advisory role.

- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment to those above.

### **External Service**

External service is defined by contributions of time, intellectual labor, and social value to the profession and/or community. The examples below are not exhaustive, and faculty may describe the amount of investment for external service activities and request consideration at a higher level, at evaluators' discretion. Faculty may be asked to provide additional evidence of service contributions during the annual review process.

#### *Level A*

Level A is typically reserved for institutional service. However, a faculty member may provide evidence that a particular external service activity goes beyond Level B and deserves a higher rating. For example, a faculty member who plans an entire national conference in Las Vegas that directly benefits the University may argue that the effort justifies Level A status.

#### *Level B*

Substantive involvement in a meaningful service endeavor in the community or profession that requires a moderate time commitment. Examples include:

- Participating in a significant humanitarian endeavor that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, or skills.
- Playing a significant role in planning a conference that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and/or skills.
- Creating and disseminating substantial pedagogical materials for a cross-institutional audience.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### *Level C*

Substantive involvement in a single meaningful event, such as participating as a speaker at a community event, or participation in an endeavor that requires a relatively low time commitment. Examples include:

- Serving as an officer in a professional or learned society.
- Providing pro bono consultation to individuals or local, state, regional, national, or federal organizations.
- Contributing in a significant way to a committee for a governmental, academic, or community organization.
- Writing a grant for a community organization.
- Establishing partnerships with external organizations, such as creating student internship opportunities.
- Volunteering with a private or public organization that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, or skills.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

## 21.6 Related Information

- NS Promotion & Tenure Policy
- Board of Regents [NSHE Code, Chapter 5](#)
- Board of Regents [NSHE Code, Chapter 7](#)
- Yearly Memorandum on P&T Timeline

### 21.6.1 Revision History

- Replaces NS Policy AA 14 Standards of Academe: Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty and Tenure Guidelines (School of Liberal Arts and Sciences approved January 1, 2015).
- Replaces NS Policy AA 15 Standards of Academe: Lecturers (School of Liberal Arts and Sciences approved June 22, 2019).
- Revised by Dr. Gwen Sharp, Interim Provost, 8/03/2026; corrected misnumbered section and added table of contents.

### 21.6.2 Guidelines & Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III)

#### 21.6.2.1 *Teaching*

##### 21.6.2.1.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner through demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Consistently meets and exceeds “Commendable” performance standards.
- Consistent excellence in teaching evidenced by evaluators’ observations.
- Consistently positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Sustained and evidenced responsiveness to student feedback in course evaluations.
- Consistently applies appropriate rigor for meeting course outcomes.
- Consistently integrates active learning strategies in the classroom.
- Consistently uses highly engaging and appropriate learning materials targeted to the course and student learning outcomes.
- Efforts to design and revise courses based on evidence from published literature on teaching effectiveness.
- Course development, course sequence development, new areas of instruction, and/or significant improvements and revisions to curricula.
- Earning/maintaining external certification in teaching/professional practice.
- Teaching awards from the University or professional organizations.
- Effective integration of written work and use of data-driven strategies for improving students’ writing skills, in courses that require or can benefit from written assignments.
- Highly attentive to classroom dynamics and works to ensure the participation of all students.

- Consistent and well-researched innovation in andragogy, such as technologies and teaching techniques that are practically applied and successful most of the time.
- Consistent demonstration of teaching methodology aligned with best practices in DEI.
- Consistent demonstration of course content aligned with best practices in DEI.
- Documented and measurable classroom application of professional development centered on DEI.
- Documented dissemination of effective teaching methodology to colleagues through formal workshops or other professional venues.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.1.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner through demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Applies appropriate rigor for the level of the course.
- Generally positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Development and use of innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies.
- Adapting and improving teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and the Chair, Dean, or Dean’s designee.
- Assessing the effectiveness of teaching endeavors and student learning outcomes.
- Application in the classroom professional development and/or pedagogy centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.1.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations in a sustained manner through a demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Well-developed syllabi and topical calendar.
- Evaluator feedback assesses teaching as adequate based on course observations.
- Adequate student evaluation ratings, including positive written comments.
- Availability to students outside of classroom hours.
- Use content that is relevant to the course.
- Major assignments, projects, exams, or other assessments are developed by the instructor.
- Final grade distributions not significantly skewed in a persistent manner.
- Application in the classroom of professional development centered on DEI.
- Incorporating or significantly addressing DEI in courses or course materials.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.1.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations.

- Fails to produce evidence of “Satisfactory” performance.
- Evaluator feedback assesses teaching as poor based on course observations.
- Little to no student-centered pedagogy.
- Failure to carry out teaching responsibilities satisfactorily.

#### 21.6.2.2 Scholarship

##### 21.6.2.2.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, consistent with a nationally recognized research agenda, with outcomes as indicated by the following:

- Exceeds “Commendable” performance standards.
- Three or more published peer-reviewed journal articles, three editor-reviewed book chapters, or three peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalents. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not admissible.
- Peer-reviewed, discipline-specific book or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.
- Invited addresses, symposia, colloquia, or presentations.
- Obtaining funding through competitive grant writing.
- Sustained demonstration of research centered on DEI in the faculty’s field of study.
- Documented application of research centered on DEI with measurable outcomes, such as peer citations.
- Documented dissemination of research methodology centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

##### 21.6.2.2.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations with evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishments as evidenced by the following:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Two or more published peer-reviewed articles, two editor-reviewed book chapters, or two peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalents. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not admissible.
- A single article in a journal consensually defined in the field as a preeminent publication may be considered; it is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide evidence that the journal meets this standard.
- Professional reports, technical reports, monographs, and lab manuals.
- Leadership in regional, national, or international conferences to disseminate research, such as conference planning, review of abstracts, or conference organization.
- Refereeing a book, book chapter, or other significant work for an academic press.

- Incorporation of research methodology germane to one's field centered on DEI and disseminated as noted in this list.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.2.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations with evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishments as evidenced by the following:

- One published peer-reviewed article, editor-reviewed book chapter, or peer-reviewed discipline-appropriate equivalent. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not admissible. This requirement can be accompanied by, but not replaced by, additional forms of scholarship.
- Completion of an editor-reviewed book chapter yet to be published.
- Active program of quality research or creative activity as exemplified by sustained involvement in scholarly activities.
- Conference papers, poster presentations, or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalents.
- Mentorship of undergraduate research students.
- Publication of shorter works that advance public knowledge.
- Active membership on editorial or review boards of scholarly journals.
- Publication of a research note or book review.
- Submission of a scholarly grant.
- Documented research centered on DEI germane to one's field.
- Research methodology centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.2.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of a "Satisfactory" performance.

### 21.6.2.3 Service

#### 21.6.2.3.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Exceeds "Commendable" performance standards.
- Chairing a search committee for LASB or another unit.
- Chairing the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.
- Holding office in Faculty Senate, NFA, or a significant professional or community organization, such as vice-chair, secretary, or parliamentarian.
- Participating in a significant humanitarian endeavor that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills.
- Playing a significant role in planning a conference that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills.

- Documented leadership in service centered on social justice and/or DEI at the Department, School, University, or professional level.
- Documented dissemination of professional expertise centered on social justice and/or DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.3.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Primary role in organizing and leading a campus-wide presentation.
- Contributing significant content for a campus-wide presentation.
- Presenting at a faculty development workshop.
- Chairing or actively serving on a Faculty Senate committee.
- Serving on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- Serving as a search committee member for a search external to one’s department.
- Serving as a search committee member for LASB.
- Chairing a standing LASB committee.
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization(s).
- Leading a CTLE Faculty Learning Community.
- Contributing in a significant way, such as giving a public lecture or facilitating a workshop for a governmental, academic, or community organization.
- Writing a grant for a community organization.
- Serving as a board member for a community or professional organization.
- Establishing partnerships with external organizations, such as creating student internship opportunities.
- Documented collaborative service activity centered on social justice and/or DEI at the Department, School, University, or professional level.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.3.3. Satisfactory

Meets expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Serving on a University-level Committee.
- Serving on an LASB ad-hoc task force.
- Serving on an LASB subcommittee.
- Actively recruiting at University fair events.
- Serving as a Faculty Senate representative.
- Serving on an LASB or department standing committee, with regular attendance and substantive contributions demonstrated by evidence.
- Volunteering with a private or public organization that directly relates to the faculty member’s discipline, position, or skills.

- Participating in a Department, School, University, professional, or community committee or organization centered on social justice and/or DEI, with documented time and contributions.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.2.3.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of “Satisfactory” performance.

### 21.6.3 Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV)

#### 21.6.3.1 Teaching

##### 21.6.3.1.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Consistently meets and exceeds “Commendable” performance standards.
- Consistent evidence of applying appropriate rigor for meeting course outcomes.
- Consistently positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Continued innovation that builds on best pedagogical practices and the candidate’s own evolving methods.
- Mentorship and leadership to share successful practices with other faculty and the teaching community.
- Teaching awards from the University or professional organizations.
- Consistently uses highly engaging and appropriate learning materials targeted to the course and student learning outcomes.
- Efforts to design and revise courses based on evidence from personal reflection, student evaluations, and published literature on teaching effectiveness.
- Earning/maintaining external certification in teaching/professional practice.
- Effective integration of written work and use of data-driven strategies for improving students’ writing skills (for courses that require or can benefit from written assignments).
- Developing new methods to ensure the participation of all students through attention to classroom dynamics and best practices.
- Continued innovation in andragogy, such as technologies and teaching techniques to achieve positive student outcomes.
- Documented sustained classroom application of professional development centered on DEI.
- Documented and sustained dissemination of effective teaching methodology to colleagues through formal workshops or other professional venues.
- Participation in assessment activities, focusing on course and program student learning outcomes.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.1.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Applies appropriate rigor for the level of the course.
- Generally positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Development and use of innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies.
- Consistently integrates active learning strategies in the classroom.
- Adapting and improving teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and the Chair, Dean, or Dean’s designee.
- Participating in structured assessment of the effectiveness of teaching endeavors and student learning outcomes.
- Incorporating or significantly addressing diversity issues in courses or course materials.
- Incorporating professional development and/or pedagogy centered on DEI into the classroom.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.1.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations in a sustained manner by demonstrating several items and examples:

- Well-developed syllabi and topical calendar.
- Adequate student evaluation ratings, including positive written comments.
- Availability to students outside of classroom hours.
- Use of content that is relevant to the course.
- Major assignments, projects, exams, or other assessments are developed by the instructor.
- Final grade distributions not significantly skewed in a persistent manner.
- Classroom application of professional development centered on DEI.
- Participating in a Department, School, University, professional, or community committee or organization centered on social justice and/or DEI, with documented time and contributions.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.1.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of “Satisfactory” performance.

### 21.6.3.2 Scholarship

#### 21.6.3.2.1 Excellent

Accomplishments should have an impact on the discipline at a national level and be distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions that advance knowledge, as indicated by the following items and examples:

- Exceeds “Commendable” performance standards.
- Published three or more peer-reviewed articles, editor-reviewed book chapters, and/or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent in a scholarly journal or outlet. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not acceptable.
- Peer-reviewed, discipline-specific book.
- Development of a model or practice that is widely adopted.
- Invited address, symposia, colloquia, or presentation.
- Obtaining funding through competitive grant writing, including managing an external grant.
- Editor of a peer-reviewed journal.
- Mentoring other faculty regarding their scholarship.
- Documented application of research centered on DEI, with measurable outcomes such as peer citations.
- Documented dissemination of research methodology centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.2.2 Commendable

Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishments as evidenced by the following items and examples:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Published two peer-reviewed articles, editor-reviewed book chapters, and/or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalents in a scholarly journal or outlet. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not accepted. A single article in a journal consensually defined in the field as a preeminent publication may be considered; it is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide evidence that the journal meets this standard.
- One peer-reviewed book chapter or scholarly equivalent.
- Professional reports, technical reports, monographs and lab manuals.
- Leadership in regional, national, or international conferences for disseminating research, such as conference planning, review of abstracts, or conference organization.
- Documented application of research centered on DEI.
- Documented research methodology centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.2.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations with an active program of quality research or creative activity since applying for tenure, as exemplified by sustained involvement in scholarly activities such as the following:

- Published one peer-reviewed article or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent in a scholarly journal or outlet. Predatory or pay-for-publication outlets are not admissible.
- Completion of an editor-reviewed book chapter yet to be published.
- Exhibition or release of a substantial creative work in a peer-reviewed venue related to discipline-specific aesthetics such as poetry, art, and music.
- Conference papers, poster presentations, or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalents.
- Mentorship of undergraduate research, including guiding students toward publication of their work.
- Publication of shorter works that advance public knowledge.
- Active membership on editorial or review boards of scholarly journals.
- Publication of a research note or book review.
- Submission of a scholarly grant.
- Refereeing a book or other major work for an academic press.
- Documented research centered on DEI relevant to the faculty member's field.
- Research methodology centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.2.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of a "Satisfactory" performance.

#### 21.6.3.3 Service

##### 21.6.3.3.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner with evidence of items and examples:

- Chairing a search committee chair for LASB or other units.
- Chairing Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.
- Chairing NS Promotion & Tenure Committee.
- Holding office in Faculty Senate, NFA, or a significant professional or community organization (such as vice-chair, secretary, or parliamentarian).
- Serving on an NSHE committee or advisory board.
- Taking a leadership role in a University task force to advance the University's mission.
- Participating in a significant humanitarian endeavor that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills and increases the visibility or stature of the University.

- Playing a significant role in planning a conference that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills.
- Documented leadership in service centered on social justice and/or DEI at the Department, School, University, or professional level.
- Documented dissemination of professional expertise centered on social justice and/or DEI, with demonstrated impact.
- Documented writing and/or significant revision of policy to positively impact social justice and/or DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.3.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations, with documentation of items and examples:

- Primary role in organizing and leading a campus-wide presentation.
- Contributes significant content for a campus-wide presentation.
- Presenting at a faculty development workshop.
- Chairing or actively serving on a Faculty Senate committee.
- Serving on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- Serving as a search committee member on a search in LASB or another unit.
- Chairing a standing LASB committee.
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization(s).
- Substantially developing or revising curricula or programs, redesigning a program, or making substantial degree revisions.
- Leading a CTLE Faculty Learning Community.
- Providing individual mentorship to students that goes well beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Contributing in a significant way to a committee for a governmental, academic, or community organization.
- Writing a grant for a community organization.
- Serving as a board member for a community or professional organization.
- Establishing partnerships with external organizations, such as creating student internship opportunities.
- Documented collaborative service activity centered on social justice and/or DEI at the Department, School, University, or professional level.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.3.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations with items and examples:

- Serving on a University-level committee.
- Serving on a LASB ad-hoc task force or subcommittee.
- Actively recruiting at University fair events.
- Serving as a Faculty Senate representative.

- Serving on an LASB committee, with evidence of regular attendance and substantive contributions.
- Volunteering with a private or public organization relating to the faculty member's discipline, position, or skills.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.3.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of "Satisfactory" performance.

#### 21.6.3.4 Other Professional Duties

##### 21.6.3.4.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner with items and examples:

- Documented pattern of building operational excellence, including developing, implementing, evaluating, and/or revising professional duties and/or areas of supervision to the University, with favorable measurable outcomes for multiple stakeholders.
- Evidence of excellent management of staff provided through staff and supervisor evaluations.
- Documented improvement with measurable results or new initiatives related to social justice and/or DEI in the professional area of responsibility.
- Evidence of meeting deliverables required for OPD and improving processes and procedures or implementing innovative strategies or practices.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

##### 21.6.3.4.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations with items and examples:

- Evidence of creating and/or sustaining operations.
- Evidence of consistent attention to DEI for unit or University stakeholders.
- Evidence of "Commendable" management of staff, as indicated by staff and supervisor evaluations.
- Documented improvement or new initiatives related to social justice and/or DEI in the professional area of responsibility.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

##### 21.6.3.4.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations with items and examples:

- Evidence of sustaining operations.
- Evidence of attention to DEI for unit or University stakeholders.
- Evidence of satisfactory management of staff, as indicated by staff and supervisor evaluations, if applicable.
- Evidence of meeting deliverables in a timely fashion.

- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.3.4.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of “Satisfactory” performance.

### 21.6.4 Guidelines and Criteria for Lecturer Promotions

#### 21.6.4.1 *Teaching/Other Professional Duties*

Some examples overlap with service so that Lecturers may decide where to place evidence in their application for promotion.

##### 21.6.4.1.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner through demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Consistently meets and exceeds “Commendable” performance standards.
- Consistent excellence in teaching as assessed by evaluators’ observations.
- Consistently positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Sustained and evidenced responsiveness to student feedback in course evaluations.
- Consistently applies appropriate rigor for meeting course outcomes.
- Consistently integrates active learning strategies in the classroom.
- Consistently uses highly engaging and appropriate learning materials targeted to the course and student learning outcomes.
- Efforts to design and revise courses based on evidence from published literature on teaching effectiveness.
- Course development, course sequence development, new areas of instruction, and/or significant improvements and revisions to curricula.
- Earning/maintaining external certification in teaching/professional practice.
- Teaching awards from the University or professional organizations.
- Effective integration of written work and use of data-driven strategies for improving students’ writing skills, in courses that require or can benefit from written assignments.
- Highly attentive to classroom dynamics and works to ensure the participation of all students.
- Consistent and well-researched innovation in andragogy, such as technologies and teaching techniques that are practically applied and successful most of the time.
- Consistent demonstration of teaching methodology aligned with best practices in DEI.
- Consistent demonstration of course content aligned with best practices in DEI.
- Documented and measurable classroom application of professional development centered on DEI.

- Documented dissemination of effective teaching methodology to colleagues through formal workshops or other professional venues.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.4.1.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner through demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Exceeds “Satisfactory” performance standards.
- Applies appropriate rigor for the level of the course.
- Generally positive student evaluation ratings with positive written comments.
- Development and use of innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies.
- Adapting and improving teaching based on feedback from students, peers, and the Chair, Dean, or Dean’s designee.
- Assessing the effectiveness of teaching endeavors and student learning outcomes.
- Application in the classroom professional development and/or pedagogy centered on DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.4.1.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations in a sustained manner through demonstrating several items and examples below:

- Well-developed syllabi and topical calendar.
- Evaluator feedback assesses teaching as adequate through course observations.
- Adequate student evaluation ratings, including positive written comments.
- Availability to students outside of classroom hours.
- Use content that is relevant to the course.
- Major assignments, projects, exams, or other assessments are developed by the instructor.
- Final grade distributions not significantly skewed in a persistent manner.
- Application in the classroom of professional development centered on DEI.
- Incorporating or significantly addressing DEI in courses or course materials.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.4.1.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations.

- Fails to produce evidence of “Satisfactory” performance.
- Evaluator feedback assesses teaching as poor based on course observations.
- Little to no student-centered pedagogy.
- Fails to carry out teaching responsibilities satisfactorily.

#### 21.6.4.2 Service

Some examples overlap with teaching so that Lecturers may decide where to place evidence in their application for promotion.

##### 21.6.4.2.1 Excellent

Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner, with items and examples:

- Chairing a search committee for LASB or other units.
- Chairing Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.
- Holding office in Faculty Senate, NFA, or a major professional or community organization (such as vice-chair, secretary, or parliamentarian).
- Participating in a significant humanitarian endeavor that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills.
- Playing a significant role in planning a conference that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, and skills.
- Developing innovative approaches to student advising and mentoring.
- Documented dissemination of professional expertise centered on social justice and/or DEI, with demonstrated impact.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

##### 21.6.4.2.2 Commendable

Exceeds expectations, with items and examples:

- Primary role in organizing and leading a campus-wide presentation.
- Contributes significant content for a campus-wide presentation.
- Chairing or actively serving on a Faculty Senate committee.
- Serving as a search committee member for LASB or other units.
- Chairing a standing LASB committee.
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization(s).
- Substantially developing or revising curricula or programs, redesigning a program, or making substantial degree revisions.
- Providing individual mentorship to students that goes well beyond the advisory role expected of faculty.
- Contributing in a significant way to a committee for a governmental, academic, or community organization.
- Serving as a board member for a community or professional organization.
- Establishing partnerships with external organizations, such as creating student internship opportunities.
- Documented leadership in service centered on social justice and/or DEI at the Department, School, University, or professional level.
- Documented dissemination of professional expertise centered on social justice and/or DEI.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.4.2.3 Satisfactory

Meets expectations, with items and examples:

- Serving on a University-level committee.
- Serving on an LASB ad-hoc task force or subcommittee.
- Actively recruiting at University fair events.
- Serving as a Faculty Senate representative.
- Serving as an active advisor to LASB students.
- Serving on a department or LASB standing committee, with regular attendance and substantive contributions demonstrated by evidence.
- Volunteer activities with a private or public organization that directly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, or skills.
- Participating in a Department, School, University, professional, or community organization or committee centered on social justice and/or DEI, with documented time and contributions.
- Activities with similar time, scope, and intellectual commitment.

#### 21.6.4.2.4 Unsatisfactory

Fails to meet expectations or to produce evidence of "Satisfactory" performance.