

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

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

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

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide the philosophical framework of promotion, tenure, and merit evaluations, working definitions and criteria that must be addressed, and to delineate the nature of the documentation necessary for the faculty member to present the best case for successful tenure, promotion, and merit. The balance of this document has six major divisions. The first, Philosophical Foundations, details the five principle assumptions that form the basis of the document. The second, Criteria for Quality Scholarship, will outline the indices by which scholarship is judged in an academic setting. The indices are to be used in the evaluation and documentation of the types of scholarship. The third section, Assessment of Scholarship, outlines the areas to be judged in scholarship. The fourth section defines the criteria for promotion and tenure to both Associate and Full Professor in terms of the UCCSN Code. The fifth section outlines the information necessary for documentation of tenure and promotion. The final section details the criteria and documentation for Merit.

I. Philosophical Framework

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

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

documentation, process, and evaluative decisions surrounding promotion, tenure, and merit in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs.

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

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

3. The third principle is one that provides for broad definition of scholarship. The UCCSN Code defines faculty responsibilities as falling into three broad and largely undefined areas; research, teaching, and service. Given that the central feature of university life is one based upon scholarly pursuits, the faculty of this College view each of these activities as a scholarly endeavors operationally defined by the work of Boyer (19). The Boyer model is intended to embrace a new vision of traditional faculty responsibilities and to develop criteria to help us judge the full range of faculty contributions more fairly and more fully. This document adopts the approach proposed by Boyer to describe the range of creative, recognizably diverse, yet equally important activities that comprise what Boyer calls scholarship. Boyer defines four types of scholarship, distinguished by the goals or purposes of the activity.

•**Discovery**, the most easily recognized style of scholarship, refers to the identification of new knowledge and is what is sometimes called “basic” research. It is commonly disseminated through scholarly journals, books, and conference presentations, particularly competitive programs. Other formats for this style of scholarship might include the development of software as well as the production of documentary films or

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

media programming. Regardless of the format, this style of scholarship develops and adds to the knowledge base of a discipline.

• **Integration** adds to our understanding of disciplinary knowledge by synthesizing and integrating discovery scholarship in ways that provide new insights, thus adding to the knowledge base of a discipline. While integrative scholarship may be disseminated through the same outlets as the scholarship of discovery, it might also take the form of textbooks, handbooks, or curricular development.

• **Application** takes the knowledge of a discipline to the wider community to solve problems and enhance professional practice. This type of scholarly research, which focuses on addressing an immediate need, is typically disseminated through evaluation reports, program development proposals, as well as those disseminated through traditional scholarly outlets. Faculty who pursue the scholarship of application may be engaged in providing technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, community development, public education, and a host of other such activities. The outcome of application scholarship is an identifiable product that contributes to knowledge within an organization or the candidates profession.

• **Teaching** is often a type of scholarly activity. In developing new courses, introducing new approaches to teaching, integrating technology into their teaching, or drawing on the cutting edge knowledge in their fields, faculty may demonstrate the qualities that denote good scholarship. Syllabi for new courses, broad curricular development, innovative student assignments, presentations on pedagogy at conferences, as well as handbook and/or textbook writing, when based on the most current literature of a field, are common formats for this type of scholarship.

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

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

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

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

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

II. Criteria for Quality Scholarship

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

• ***Clearly defined goals.*** Clearly defined goals lay out the objectives of the scholarly activity and show their importance to the field, identify the methods to be used, and describe the plan for dissemination of the results. This is done in a systematic way that ties the scholarship to the body of knowledge to which it is intended to contribute. The faculty member should be able to put the goals of the scholarship into the context of the discipline, to show that the goals are realistic and achievable, and to show the potential for the scholarship to make a significant contribution to the knowledge base.

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

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

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

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

III. Assessment of Scholarly Activities

A. Scholarship of Discovery, Application, and Integration

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

1. **Narrative summary.** The faculty member's assessment of her/his own scholarship will be presented in the form of a well-articulated narrative summary that puts the scholarship into context so that it can be understood by a colleague who may be in a different field

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

(not more than 5 pages). Each narrative should identify the type of scholarship for each of the works under consideration and provide evidence for each of the quality indices (as noted in the section II). For example, the narrative will include a description of the nature of the work, its place in the field, the connection between the methods and the goals, its place in the faculty member's scholarship program, and the faculty member's own assessment of his/her success in achieving the goals and contribution to the field. The narrative summary is critical to helping colleagues understand one's work and thus, should include specific mention of the peer review measures described below.

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

- **Peer-reviewed journals.** Appearance of the work in peer-reviewed journals is an indication that the work has met a standard of excellence in the profession. The work may be further judged by characteristics of the journal, including its reputation and potential for impact on the field and its acceptance rate. All journal articles submitted to document satisfactory or better performance in any form of scholarship must provide statements from the editor or sponsoring organization about acceptance rates and the nature of the review process.
- Acceptance by **book** publishers that use a peer-review process. The faculty member should address the reputation or quality of the press, the review process, and the scholarly criteria for acceptance for their particular field of study.
- **Book chapters.** Again, the quality of the press and the degree of peer-review are important considerations in determining the quality of the chapter.
- **Citations** of the work. The nature of citations may be an important factor. However, numerous citations may not necessarily indicate high quality.
- Scholarly **reviews** of the work.

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

- Conference **presentations** depend upon the characteristics of the conference, including: whether there is peer review or critique of papers; if so, the acceptance rate of peer-reviewed presentations; the reputation of the conference, whether it is a national, regional, or state conference.
- **Funded grants.** Like publications, the quality of grants will differ depending on the nature of the review process, the acceptance rate, and the prestige of the granting agency.
- **Awards** that result from peer or expert review
- **Invitations** to speak or write resulting from the scholarship.

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

B. Assessment of Teaching

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

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

Supporting materials which might be included are:

- Syllabi for a specific course, planned, changed, implemented by faculty member. The final version can appropriately be sent to external reviewers for comment.
- Copies of exams.

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

- Examples of graded student work, such as professional papers/theses/projects accompanied by a brief rationale for the assignment.
- Comments from students in letters or evaluations.

2. Evidence of Curriculum Development. This section might include:

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

3. Peer Evaluations. These might include, but are not limited to peer assessment of course syllabi; curriculum/course development activities; constructive changes in existing courses; grading criteria, methods, and practices. Formal mentoring relationships with frequent feedback to junior faculty and team teaching should be part of this process. For junior faculty, the department or unit should set up regularly scheduled visits by various faculty to the classes. Each year the junior faculty member should be observed by two different faculty members, who meet with the instructor before the visit to discuss goals and criteria (College evaluation form should be used). In addition, the junior faculty member and the chair should receive a written report of the visit, which becomes part of the personnel file. The annual evaluation of a faculty member should reflect these written comments. All faculty who seek promotion or merit must have a record of peer evaluation for the two years previous to their application for promotion and tenure.

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

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

C. Assessment of Service

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

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

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

1. **Role and contribution.** Different roles make different contributions to the service activity. Quality service involves active participation in the service role that makes a contribution to the completion and product of the activity. The degree of contribution may be measured by the extent of the responsibility and participation. Chairing committees or serving as the primary author in an evaluation report may make more of a contribution than simple membership. Faculty members should specifically define their roles and the extent of the contribution in the service activity.
2. **Methods and Activities.** The activities of service should rely on the faculty member's professional training and expertise. Higher quality service involves activities that rely extensively on the professional expertise of the faculty member. Such service would use professional methods that are systematically applied toward the completion of the activity. The faculty members should clearly define their specific activities engaged in and the ways in which they applied their expertise.
3. **Significance.** Different service activities have different impacts. The significance and impact of the service activity are an important criteria in judging its quality. The faculty member should provide a context within which the significance of his/her service activities might be judged.

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

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

IV. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

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

A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

- ***Excellence:*** Evidence of extensive and on-going scholarship that meets the quality indices described above. Typically the "excellent" researcher will be highly productive with a clear program of scholarship from which the faculty member is gaining recognition for the significant contribution his/her work makes to the field. Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated by outstanding curricular development, innovative approaches to teaching, unusually intense or successful mentoring of students, or significant contributions to pedagogy. Excellence in service would reflect a record of unusually extensive or important service to the campus and the professions. For example, chairing a major committee or task force with responsibility for producing a significant report is an example of excellent service.
- ***Commendable:*** Evidence of continuing research that meets the quality indices. The faculty member is developing a coherent program of scholarship that is likely to lead to recognition of significant contributions to the field. Commendable teaching evinces careful revision and development of courses, effective classroom practices, successful mentoring of students, and other contributions to pedagogy. Commendable service reflects extensive, significant, service on committees, on task forces, or in faculty governance.
- ***Satisfactory:*** Evidence of continuing scholarship that meets the quality indices.

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

Satisfactory teaching is marked by sound pedagogy, careful classroom management, and successful work with students. Satisfactory service entails contribution to committees and task forces as well as active participation in other forms of faculty governance.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

V. Documentation for Tenure and Promotion

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

A. Scholarship Portfolio

1. A narrative (of no more than five pages) of the faculty member's coherent record of the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching (see section V B for documentation of scholarly teaching). This statement should indicate the focus, goals, and accomplishments of the faculty member in these areas as well as the articulation of the indices of quality noted above.
2. A selection of representative documents or other materials to demonstrate the scholarly accomplishments. Published essays should indicate whether they are refereed and the acceptance rate (provided by the current editor) for the journal.

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

B. Teaching Portfolio

1. A statement of teaching philosophy of no more than five pages.
2. Demonstration of curricular development through syllabi, assignments etc.
3. Summary of peer reviews of teaching, syllabi etc. for a minimum of two years (every year for junior faculty)
4. Summary of student evaluations for classes with comparison to other faculty in the unit. This may also include a summary of all written comments by students.

C. Service Portfolio

1. Explanation of professional and institutional service activities.
2. Clarification of the candidate's role(s) and responsibilities in the activity.
3. A statement of the specific contribution(s) by the candidate to the service activity.

D. Annual Evaluations

The candidates annual evaluations should be included.

E. Midtenure Evaluation

Any midtenure evaluation reports should be included.

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

F. Chair/Director Evaluation

The unit head should provide an assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the three categories outlined by the UCCSN Code: research, teaching, and service. The evaluation should use the definitions of research, teaching, and service defined in this document. Furthermore, the evaluation should be based on the criteria set forth in this document.

G. External Reviews

Each candidate shall have four external reviews. External reviews should follow the process outlined in Appendix A.

VI. Criteria and Documentation of Merit

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

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

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

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

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

- Scholarship of discovery and integration is evidenced by quality of peer reviewed works. The same quality indices noted above apply for merit including the quality of the journal or press, level of peer review, prestige of the award or grant, excellent publications and presentations (please refer to Section #II, A).
- Scholarship of application is evidenced by published reports that have accompanying documentation indicating impact, etc (please refer to the section II A).
- Scholarship of teaching is evidenced by significant curricular development or revision usually beyond the level of a single course, introduction of innovative strategies or approaches, and unusually extensive and successful mentoring of students (please refer to the section II B).
- Service. Professional service is evidenced by active participation on editorial boards, program review committees, national professional leadership. The nature of one's professional service, its extent, and the degree of active participation will determine excellence. Institutional service is evidenced by significant involvement in

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

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

Appendix A

SELECTION OF OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

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

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

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

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