

# SAHS Faculty Meeting

## MINUTES

APRIL 28, 2009

11:30 AM

BHS 134

MEETING CALLED BY	John Mercer
ATTENDEES	JJ. Chen, Janet Dufek, Janis Glatzel, Larry Golding, Chad Hensley, Robbin Hickman, Vaune Kadlubek, Jan Klaassen, Merrill Landers, Joan MacDonald, Steen Madsen, Wes McWhorter, Molly Michelman, Amy Miracle, George Pales, Louie Puentedura, Mack Rubley, Sue Schuerman, Ralf Sudowe, Dick Tandy, Harvey Wallmann

## Agenda topics

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

DISCUSSION	Approved
------------	----------

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DISCUSSION	Approved
------------	----------

### RADIOGRAPHY VIDEO

DISCUSSION	George Pales brought in a video created by a Radiography student. John Mercer emphasized that this type of media is good advertising for the school and can be posted on websites. If any department is interested in creating something like this, contact George, who can put you in touch with his Radiography student.
------------	--

### HONORS AND AWARDS

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Laura Kruskall received the Outstanding Dietetic Educator Award from the American Dietetic Association.</li><li>Chad Hensley has been elected the President of the Association of Collegiate Educators in Radiologic Technology.</li><li>Nutrition student, Shannon Brown won the Nevada Dietetic Association Outstanding Didactic Program in Dietetics Student and Jamie Karp won an American Dietetic Association Outstanding Dietetic Intern award. Jamie's name will appear in a future issue of the Journal of the American Dietetic Association.</li><li>Mack Rubley was presented with the Nevada State Service Award from the Far West Athletic Trainers' Association (FWATA), District 8 of the National Athletic Trainers' Association and was appointed the chair of the Research and Grants Committee for FWATA.</li><li>Bill Holcomb received the CSUN faculty award.</li><li>Dr. Lawrence Golding was inducted to the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society as a Faculty Member and Martine Buffet, a Kinesiology major, was inducted as a Senior.</li><li>Vaune Kadlubek was entered into the Hall of Fame for her high school and she was awarded the UNLV Professional Staff of the Year Award.</li></ul>
------------	--

### PUBLICATIONS/PROPOSALS

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Pam Licalde and Bill Holcomb were awarded \$1096.00 from the Far West Athletic Trainers' Association (FWATA) to complete a study: "The Effects of Ultrasound Velocity on Intramuscular Tissue Temperature Across a Treatment Site."</li><li>Mack Rubley, Bill Holcomb and Barbara St. Pierre Schneider were approved to submit a full grant proposal to the NATA. The pre-proposal was titled, "The Effect of Local Multiple-Day Intermittent Cryotherapy on Leukocytes and Skeletal Muscle Healing." The full proposal will include Jack Young and Dick Tandy.</li><li>Deborah Keil and Shawn Gerstenberger submitted a grant application to NIH Center for Children's</li></ul>
------------	---

Health titled "Center for emerging contaminants in children's health".

- Janet Dufek, John Mercer, Harvey Wallmann, submitted a grant application to the Dr. Scholl Foundation titled: "A Low-Cost, Convenient Fall Prevention Strategy for Older Adults With and Without Fall Tendencies."
- Michele Clark, Janet Dufek, John Mercer, Richard Tandy, submitted an NIH Challenge Grant, 04-NR-101 application titled "Healthy Mind-Healthy Body: An Interactive Web Approach to Therapy for Persons with Traumatic Brain Injury."
- Lori Candela, Janet Dufek, John Mercer, and Leann Putney submitted a grant application to the American Nurses' Foundation Grant and School of Nursing/School of Allied Health Sciences Obesity Research Award titled "Translating the Diabetes Prevention Program to Middle and High School Students."

#### **PARKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION** Sue Schuerman's term in the Parking Advisory Committee ends this summer. If anyone is interested please let her know.

#### **INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND SCHOLAR DAY**

**DISCUSSION** The IRSD was held April 16<sup>th</sup> with many student and faculty participants from AHS.

#### **CLS 100X**

**DISCUSSION** Molly Michelman, Dick Tandy and Janis Glatzel are developing a CLS 100X distance education course. This course incorporates all Health Sciences professions. It is being developed for incoming freshman and eventually high school students. The development committee is asking if you have any material to be included in the course that would be promotional for your particular field, please give to Molly by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### **BUSINESS**

##### Standing Committees

The committee memberships were reviewed and vacancies were identified. Nominations for school at-large membership of the Faculty Appeals Committee are being accepted.

##### Committee Reports

- University Academic Assessment Committee (Mack Rubley)
  - Assessment reports are now one year as opposed to semester by semester. There will be an assessment workshop during the second week in May after finals. There is a stipend of \$800 for attending the workshop and are very beneficial. Mack has been on the committee for three years and will be stepping off this committee.
  - Robbin Hickman volunteered to represent the school on this committee.
- Undergraduate/graduate Curriculum (Dick Tandy)
  - The next meeting will be on May 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Faculty Appeals (Laura Kruskall)
  - There are no appeals this semester.
  - The committee will be working on policies and procedures.
- Bylaws – N/A
- Clinical education (Jan Klaassen)
  - The committee is still working with the VA to establish affiliation agreements.
  - Valley Health Systems agreement will be in place this summer.
- Academic standards – N/A
- Faculty review (Merrill Landers)
  - The committee is working on policies for 1) Promotion and Tenure and 2) Merit. Drafts of each policy were presented to the faculty with a discussion on key points taking place (attached). The key points discussed were:
    - Merit policy
      - Teaching requirements – a faculty member must teach 6 credits per semester to be eligible for teaching merit. Overall, the faculty tended to be in agreement with this requirement.

- Student evaluations – Average score must be at or above school the median in order to be eligible for teaching merit. The faculty members were not in agreement on this point. Some of the key discussion points were:
  - Tough courses may get lower evaluations.
  - Evaluating teaching is difficult – peer review is an alternative but would be difficult to implement given the small size of our faculty.
  - It was recognized that student evaluations are intended to be objective measures; however, a concern was raised that use of student evaluation scores only to determine merit eligibility may cause an inflation of evaluation scores.
  - There was no consensus on this point.
- Classes that have fewer than three student evaluations will not be counted since there would be a confidentiality concern. Overall, the faculty were in agreement on this point.
- Research
  - It was presented that a faculty member may elect to count articles in press may towards merit. In this case, the manuscript would not be counted when the article is in print (i.e., manuscripts will be counted only once, either in the year they are in press or in print). The faculty members were not in agreement on this point. Some of the discussion points were:
    - There was a discussion about the concern of how the policy would be enforced to prevent counting an article more than once.
    - There was disagreement whether or not there was an advantage to counting articles in press.
    - There was discussion as to how long-term scholarship activity (e.g., five year grant) would be counted each year in the merit process.
    - It was discussed that research grants should be considered separate from service grants.
    - It was discussed that the quality of the journal should be considered.
  - Each 3 credits of reassignment from teaching for research will negate one primary research activity.
    - There was agreement from faculty that reassignment should be incorporated in the merit decision but the exact way to do so was not clear.
- Tenure and promotion
  - There was a brief presentation and discussion on the guidelines for promotion and tenure. The discussion centered on 1) the number of publications that a candidate should have when applying for tenure, 2) who votes on P & T decisions, 3) mechanism for review feedback to the applicant. The Faculty Review Committee will hold additional meetings to get more discussion and feedback on P & T.

## FACULTY COMMITTEE

### DISCUSSION

We ran out of time for Faculty committee reports. Jan will send email to all faculty with the information she had planned to discuss.

# **School of Allied Health Sciences**

## **Procedure and Guidelines for Determining Merit**

### **2009**

#### **Definition of Merit**

Merit salary increases are awarded to faculty members for exceptional performance in one or more of the evaluated areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Exceptional performance is established by ranking a faculty member's accomplishments in relation to their faculty peers in the School.

#### **Eligibility for Merit Consideration**

To be eligible for merit, a faculty member must first satisfactorily meet the specifications in their employment contract; however, eligibility does not guarantee that a merit increase will be awarded. A faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" annual evaluation rating in at least one of the evaluated areas is not eligible to apply for a merit increase.

Based on the NSHE Governing Documents, Title 5, Chapter 6, Section 10, a merit award is expected to recognize the person who has (1) performed at least "satisfactorily" in the areas for which the person is evaluated and (2) is considered meritorious in at least one of those areas. Merit awards are specifically not to be confused with inequity adjustments. Reasons to award merit may include but are not limited to the following:

- A. To encourage exceptional academic faculty with excellent mobility to remain at UNLV;
- B. To reward exceptional performance in any of the several areas for which academic faculty are evaluated; and,
- C. To allow for other specific or general exceptions, which to the evaluators represent some outstanding, reason for awarding merit.

Individuals who have received promotion in rank during the evaluated year are not eligible for merit for the same year. For example, if a faculty member is granted promotion in the 2008 academic year, they cannot be considered for merit for that year.

*Exceptions to any of the SAHS merit guidelines must be pre-approved in writing before the semester in question by the Department Chair and Dean.*

#### **Procedure**

A faculty member wishing to apply for a merit increase must submit a portfolio, which includes an application (Faculty Annual Work Report) and supporting evidence, to their department chair at the time specified for annual evaluations. It is the responsibility of the faculty applicant to supply supportive documentation in all evaluated areas (teaching, research and/or service). The department chair should assure that cited faculty accomplishments are accompanied by accurate supporting documentation. The department chair will evaluate the faculty member in teaching, research and/or service on the Departmental Merit Evaluation form (see Appendix) and forward the portfolio and rating form to the Faculty Review Committee.

Members of the faculty review committee will review the portfolios and assesses the accomplishments of the applicants. The committee will then meet to rank the applicants based upon their accomplishments in the three areas of assessment. Teaching and research will be given equal weight in the ranking process. Service accomplishments will be used to make adjustments such as advancing a faculty member on the list due to outstanding service-related accomplishments. The committee will also

provide a justification for the ranking assigned to each faculty member. The rankings, and justification for the rankings, will be forwarded to the SAHS Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee will meet to evaluate the ranked list compiled by the FRC. The Executive Committee may contact the faculty review committee for clarification of their rankings. They may make changes to the rankings; however, they must provide written documentation detailing their rationale for the changes. The Dean, under the advisement of the Executive Committee, will assign dollar amounts for each faculty member and forward the list to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

*The awarding of merit is a distinct process from the review and awarding of promotion and/or tenure. Faculty must be aware that the awarding of merit does not necessarily equate to making satisfactory progress toward promotion and/or tenure.*

Once submitted, the applications and supporting documentation remain in the SAHS. Exceptions may be made for textbooks or similar materials at the discretion of the Dean.

Criteria demonstrating excellence for each area of assessment (teaching, research, and service) have been outlined below. These criteria should serve as guidelines and may require judgment in interpretation. Applicants who have an accomplishment related to, but not specified by the criteria, may submit it with appropriate documentation for consideration. Department criteria, if different from SAHS criteria identified in this document, must be submitted with the application. Department criteria may be more stringent than, but cannot be less than, SAHS criteria.

## **TEACHING**

Faculty must teach a minimum of 6 credits during each fall and spring semester to meet the basic teaching requirement for merit eligibility before other supporting activity is considered. Summer school courses do not count toward the basic teaching requirement.

Data for determination of merit in this area will be taken from the annual work report sections that pertain to teaching responsibilities such as the Student Appraisal of Teacher Effectiveness Form, student comments, and the Department Chair-generated merit recommendation.

- 1) To be considered meritorious in teaching, the annual credit-weighted mean (rounded to one decimal place) for student evaluations of teaching effectiveness must be at or above the School median.
  - a. **Classes that have fewer than 5 student evaluations will not be counted in the assessment.** The overall teaching score is a weighted calculation by credit for each of the classes taught during the evaluation period.
  - b. Ratings for teaching may be adjusted by consideration of the following:
    - i. Total number of credits taught;
    - ii. Developing/revising/teaching a new course; and,
    - iii. Class size.
- 2) The FRC will also consider the following optional supportive activities in their assessment:
  - a. Serving as a chair on a thesis or dissertation committee during the evaluation period;
  - b. Serving as a committee member or outside graduate college representative on a thesis/dissertation committee during the evaluation period; and/or

- c. Preparation of a workbook, laboratory manual, textbook, or other original material for student use.

## RESEARCH

To be considered meritorious in research, a faculty member must demonstrate excellence through peer-reviewed publications, writing a book/book chapter, or research grant<sup>1</sup> procurement. The journal article must be in print (PDF, offprint, or photocopy of the original article) and the funded grant must have the money on campus during the year being evaluated. Submitted manuscripts, accepted manuscripts, or grants that have been submitted or are pending funding will not be considered meritorious. Articles or books accepted for publication will be considered for merit only in the year that they are *in print*. Articles or books *in press* will not be considered for merit.

The *quality* and *quantity* of publications will be considered by the review and recommending bodies. Applicants are required to submit ISI Journal Citation Report rankings (Impact factor, Immediacy index, and Cited-half life) for each of their published manuscripts. When reviewing grants, the FRC will consider the quality, total monetary value, monetary value of indirect costs, competitiveness of the grant, and the source of the granting agency (internal or external).

**Each 3 credits of research reassignment will negate one primary research activity** (i.e., published peer-reviewed article, book chapter, book, internal research grant, external research grant). For example, if a faculty member had a 3-credit reassignment for research to produce one published article, then the article will not count toward the final tally of peer-reviewed publications when awarding merit. Additionally, if the 3 credit reassignment was to write a grant, then the grant submission will not count toward merit. These reassignment stipulations are the basic workload expectation of the faculty member.

- 1) To be considered meritorious in this area, the applicant must have accomplished at least one of the following (ranked in order of importance):
  1. Published a peer-reviewed article and two supporting activities
  2. Published at least two peer-reviewed articles
  3. Published a book and a peer-reviewed article (or a book and one supporting activity)
  4. Awarded a peer-reviewed external research grant and one supporting activity
  5. Published a book chapter and two supporting activities
  6. Awarded a peer-reviewed internal research grant and two supporting activities
- 2) Supporting activities include:
  - a. Refereed (peer-reviewed) book chapter in print
  - b. Internal or external grant submitted or funded
  - c. Refereed (peer-reviewed) proceedings with published abstracts
  - d. Presentations at national or international professional meetings
  - e. Oral or poster presentations at national or international professional meetings with published abstracts
  - f. Other activities may be considered but must be accompanied by documentation. It is at the discretion of the review and recommendation committees whether other types of scholarly activity may be considered supportive and contributes to an excellent or commendable recommendation in the area of scholarly activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The primary goal of a research grant is data collection leading to peer-reviewed publication or patent. If the primary focus of a grant is service oriented, this work will be considered service, not research activity.

## SERVICE

To be considered eligible for merit in service, a faculty member must be a member of a department or a school committee before the committee will evaluate any other activities for meritorious service during the year being evaluated. Applicants have the responsibility to list and provide documentation of the type and quality of service performed that is sufficient to allow reasonable judgments by the review and recommending bodies.

When reviewing service, *quality* as well as *quantity* will be considered. The following will be assessed:

- 1) University (System, University, School, or Department), Professional, and Community (Professional discipline related) service as a committee member or as a chair.
- 2) Review of professional work, including review of books or book chapters for publication, preparation and/or review of test questions for national exams.
- 3) Review of professional work (e.g. manuscript reviewer for a professional journal, abstract reviewer for a national/international conference, book/book chapter reviewer).
- 4) Editor or editorial board member for a peer-reviewed or professional publication.
- 5) Service grant or contract for the purpose of providing a service to the university or a community entity. Service grants and contracts with indirect cost returns will be ranked higher than those without financial return to the School or Department.
- 6) Significant contributions to the Department, School, or University above and beyond basic workload requirements.
- 7) Community involvement related to faculty appointment.

Revised 1/2009

## DEPARTMENTAL MERIT EVALUATION

**FACULTY NAME:**

**2009 Workload** (Based on 2009 contract):

2009	Credit expectation	Actual credits taught	Credits release time		
			Research	Service	Admin.
Spring					
Fall					

*\*If the faculty member was on sabbatical or faculty development leave during this year of assessment, then please attach the contract.*

Following my review of the merit application, I recommend that the applicant receive merit in the following categories:

**TEACHING**

Overall weighted student rating =

REMARKS REQUIRED:

**RESEARCH**

REMARKS REQUIRED:

**SERVICE**

REMARKS REQUIRED:

**Summary/Recommendations**

REMARKS REQUIRED:

Chair Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT

# **School of Allied Health Sciences (SAHS)**

## **Policies and Procedures for Determining Tenure and Promotion**

### **2009**

The provisions for tenure and promotion are stipulated in the NSHE Code (Title 2, Chapter 3) and UNLV By-Laws (Rev. 234 (06/08) Title 5, Chapter 6, Page 34), respectively. The SAHS provision for tenure and promotion can be found in Chapter 3 of the SAHS By-Laws. The appeals process for denied tenure and promotion is found in the UNLV Senate By-Laws for Grievance.

#### **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Because tenure and promotion to associate professor normally occur concurrently, criteria for both are defined together. A successful candidate must possess a terminal degree and must 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<sup>1</sup> 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 candidate:

#### **Excellence:**

- Research: Evidence of consistent and on-going, high quality scholarship and/or grantsmanship. Evidence for high quality scholarship can be documented by utilizing ranking from the ISI Journal Citation Reports. 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 his/her field. This can be documented through research awards, professional scholarship recognition, and number of times that published articles have been cited (e.g., SCOPUS, Google Scholar).
- Teaching: 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. Teaching scores are routinely in the upper half of faculty within the SAHS.
- Service: Excellence in service would reflect a record of unusually extensive or important service to the campus and the professions.

#### **Commendable:**

- Research: Evidence of consistent and continuing scholarship and/or grantsmanship. The faculty member is developing a coherent program of scholarship that is likely to lead to recognition of significant contributions to his/her field.
- Teaching: Commendable teaching evinces careful revision and development of courses, effective classroom practices, successful mentoring of students, and other contributions to pedagogy. Teaching scores are regularly near the median of faculty within the SAHS.

---

<sup>1</sup> “...the demonstrated ability to work productively with colleagues, staff and students” (UNLV By-Laws) and “...ability to work with the faculty and students of the member institution in the best interests of the University of Nevada and the people that it serves, and to the extent that the job performance of the academic faculty member’s administrative unit may not be otherwise affected” (NSHE Code)

- Service: Commendable service reflects extensive, significant, service on committees, on task forces, or in faculty governance.

**Satisfactory:**

- Research: Evidence of consistent and continuing scholarship.
- Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is marked by sound pedagogy, careful classroom management, and successful work with students. Teaching evaluations scores are regularly above 3.8 out of 5.
- Service: Satisfactory service entails contribution to committees and task forces as well as active participation in other forms of faculty governance.

**Mid-tenure review – Policies and Procedures**

Per Department, School and University bylaws, tenure-track faculty are evaluated at the midpoint of the probationary period to assess progress towards tenure.

Procedure:

1. A faculty member who is eligible for mid-tenure review must submit a mid-tenure report to the Department Chair at the midpoint of the probationary period. The schedule for mid-tenure for faculty hired with a July 1st start day is detailed below. For faculty hired on a January 1st start day, the mid-tenure schedule will be adjusted by one semester.<sup>2</sup>
  - a. For those entering with no years toward tenure, the mid-tenure evaluation will occur during their sixth semester (excluding summer term) at UNLV or before the end of the third contract year. The review process should be complete no later than at least five (5) working days prior to June 30th.
  - b. For those entering with one year toward tenure, the mid-tenure evaluation will occur during their fifth semester (excluding summer term) at UNLV or before the end of the third contract year. The review process should be complete no later than at least five (5) working days prior to December 15th.
  - c. For those entering with two years toward tenure, the mid-tenure evaluation will occur during their fourth semester (excluding summer term) at UNLV. The review process should be complete no later than at least five (5) working days prior to June 30th.
  - d. For those entering with three years toward tenure, the mid-tenure evaluation will occur during their third semester (excluding summer term) at UNLV. The review process should be complete no later than at least five (5) working days prior to December 15th.

Mid-tenure and tenure schedule:

		Years toward tenure			
Year	Example	0	1	2	3
1	F2009 S2010				
2	F2010 S2011				
3	F2011 S2012	Mid-tenure <sup>3</sup>			

<sup>2</sup> Regardless of the hiring date, applications for **tenure** are submitted by the end of the 2nd week of the fall semester before the completion of the final year of the probationary period.

<sup>3</sup> Mid-tenure report is due to the Department Chair by 5:00pm on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of April

4	F2012	Mid-tenure			
	S2013	Mid-tenure			
5	F2013	Mid-tenure			
	S2014	Mid-tenure			
6	F2014	Tenure <sup>4</sup>	Tenure	Tenure	Tenure
	S2015				

2. Department tenure committee: Upon receiving the mid-tenure report from the candidate, the Department Chair will notify department faculty that a mid-tenure report has been submitted and is available for review. The department tenure committee (composed only of tenured faculty within the department) that will participate in the mid-tenure assessment will review the submitted materials. This committee will submit a report to the Department Chair. The report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Satisfactory progress towards tenure, or
  - b. Unsatisfactory progress towards tenure.
    - 1) If the committee deems progress towards tenure is unsatisfactory, the committee shall recommend:
      1. Remediation, or
      2. Non-reappointment.
3. Department Chair: The Department Chair will report to the Dean his/her evaluation of the faculty member's progress towards tenure. In this report, the Department Chair will include the recommendation/s of the department tenure committee. The report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Satisfactory progress towards tenure, or
  - b. Unsatisfactory progress towards tenure.
    - 1) If the Department Chair deems progress towards tenure is unsatisfactory, the Department Chair shall recommend:
      1. Remediation, or
      2. Non-reappointment.
4. Faculty Review Committee: The SAHS Faculty Review Committee (composed only of tenured faculty) will review the materials submitted by the faculty member along with the Department Chair's assessment and will provide the Dean their determination about the faculty member's progress towards tenure. The Faculty Review Committee report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Satisfactory progress towards tenure, or
  - b. Unsatisfactory progress towards tenure.
    - 1) If the Faculty Review Committee deems progress towards tenure is unsatisfactory, the committee shall recommend:
      1. Remediation, or
      2. Non-reappointment.
5. Dean: The Dean will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, and 3) Faculty Review Committee. The Dean will then make a determination about the faculty member's progress towards tenure in consultation with the SAHS Executive Committee. If it is determined that unsatisfactory progress is being made, the dean shall recommend remediation or issue a letter of non-reappointment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tenure application is due to the Department Chair by 5:00pm on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of Fall semester

## **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor – Policies and Procedures**

Although the NSHE Code says that one may apply in any year,<sup>5</sup> it is recommended that application for tenure and promotion be submitted by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the Fall semester before the end of the final year of the probationary period (See Mid-tenure and tenure schedule table above for details). The application procedure is as follows:

1. Department tenure committee: Upon receiving the tenure application from the candidate, the Department Chair will notify department faculty that a tenure application has been submitted and is available for review. The department tenure committee (composed of all non-abstaining tenured faculty within the department) will review the submitted materials. This committee will vote for or against tenure. However, all department faculty may vote on promotion to Associate Professor. The report must contain one of the following overall recommendations from the committee with rationale:
  - a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
2. Department Chair: The Department Chair will report to the Dean his/her recommendation for or against tenure and promotion. In this report, the Department Chair will include the recommendation of the department tenure committee. This recommendation will then be sent to the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate.<sup>6</sup> This report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
3. Faculty Review Committee: The SAHS Faculty Review Committee (composed only of tenured faculty) will review the materials submitted by the faculty member along with the Department Chair's recommendation and will provide the Dean their determination about the faculty member's tenure and promotion. This recommendation will then be sent to the Dean and the candidate. The Faculty Review Committee report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
4. Dean: The Dean will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, and 3) Faculty Review Committee. The Dean will then make a determination about the faculty member's tenure and promotion and will review the decision with the SAHS Executive Committee. This recommendation will then be sent to the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee and the candidate. The report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
5. Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee: The Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, and 4) Dean. This committee will then make their recommendation to the Provost. This report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:
  - a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
6. Provost: The Provost will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, 4) Dean, and 5) Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee.

---

<sup>5</sup> Early applicants will be held to the same scholarly and teaching standard as those applicants who have undergone the typical probationary period of 5 years.

<sup>6</sup> At this time, early applicants may retract their application for tenure and promotion.

The Provost will then make their recommendation to the President of UNLV and to the candidate. This report must contain one of the following recommendations with rationale:

- a. Recommendation for tenure and promotion, or
  - b. Recommendation against tenure and promotion.
7. President: The President of UNLV will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, 4) Dean, 5) Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee, and 6) Provost. The President will then make the decision on whether or not to grant tenure and promotion. This is forwarded to the NSHE Board of Regents for ratification.
  8. Board of Regents: Ratification of the decision of the President of UNLV is done according to Nevada state open meeting law.

### **Documentation for Tenure and Promotion**

An updated version of the mid-tenure application and the tenure and promotion application can be found on the Provost's webpage: <http://provost.unlv.edu/pandt.html>. It is the candidate's responsibility to include all supporting evidence into a portfolio along with the application.

### **Promotion to Full Professor**

Full Professor is a rank of distinction to be awarded to those who possess a terminal degree, have demonstrated continued collegiality, and have made extraordinary contributions, as recognized by their peers, to his/her profession and the community, 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 he/she may perform their duties satisfactorily.

The record of a successful Full Professor candidate is one who demonstrates success across the range of faculty responsibilities (research, teaching, and service). The successful candidate has demonstrated success as a wise counselor of students, excellence in teaching, and has demonstrated consistent, high quality publication during their tenure at UNLV as evidenced by rankings in the ISI Journal Citation Reports. The successful candidate will have demonstrated grantsmanship as evidenced by procurement of internal or external funding. Moreover, the successful candidate has provided evidence of 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, school, university, and his/her profession. These scholarship and service activities should have led to a record of significant contribution to the discipline that earns the faculty member a national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of support, awards and citations totals of published work.

Although the NSHE Code says that one may apply in any year,<sup>7</sup> it is recommended that application for promotion to Full Professor be submitted within 8 years of promotion to Associate Professor. Regardless of the year of application, it must be submitted by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the Fall semester. The application procedure is as follows:

1. Department faculty: Upon receiving the application from the candidate, the Department Chair will notify department faculty that an application for Full Professor has been submitted and is available for review. The department faculty (composed of all non-abstaining faculty regardless of rank within the department) will review the submitted materials. This committee will vote for or against promotion to Full Professor. The report must contain one of the following overall recommendations from the committee with supporting documentation:

---

<sup>7</sup> Early applicants will be held to the same scholarly and teaching standard as those applicants who have undergone the typical probationary period of 5 years.

- a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
2. Department Chair: The Department Chair will report to the Dean his/her recommendation for or against promotion to Full Professor. In this report, the Department Chair will include the recommendation of the department faculty. This recommendation will then be sent to the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate. This report must contain one of the following recommendations with supporting documentation:
  - a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
3. Faculty Review Committee: The SAHS Faculty Review Committee (composed only of tenured faculty) will review the materials submitted by the faculty member along with the Department Chair's recommendation and will provide the Dean their recommendation about promotion to Full Professor. This recommendation will then be sent to the Dean and the candidate. The Faculty Review Committee report must contain one of the following recommendations with supporting documentation:
  - a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
4. Dean: The Dean will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, and 3) Faculty Review Committee. The Dean will then make a determination about the faculty member's promotion to Full Professor and will review the decision with the SAHS Executive Committee. This recommendation will then be sent to the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee and the candidate. The report must contain one of the following recommendations with supporting documentation:
  - a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
5. Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee: The Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, and 4) Dean. This committee will then make their recommendation to the Provost. This report must contain one of the following recommendations with supporting documentation:
  - a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
6. Provost: The Provost will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, 4) Dean, and 5) Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Provost will then make their recommendation to the President of UNLV and to the candidate. This report must contain one of the following recommendations with supporting documentation:
  - a. Recommendation for promotion to Full Professor, or
  - b. Recommendation against promotion to Full Professor.
7. President: The President of UNLV will review all materials submitted by the: 1) Faculty member, 2) Department Chair, 3) Faculty Review Committee, 4) Dean, 5) Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee, and 6) Provost. The President will then make the decision on whether or not to promote the candidate to Full Professor.
8. Board of Regents: Ratification of the decision of the President of UNLV is done according to Nevada state open meeting law.