

Nevada State College

School of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standards of Academe

The LAS Standards of Academe will be reviewed no less often than every three years.

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
STANDARDS OF ACADEME

1.0 OVERALL PHILOSOPHY

1.1 Philosophy

LAS subscribes to a philosophy that teaching should be the primary area of emphasis for faculty members, with scholarship and service as important but lower priorities. Faculty will be recruited, evaluated, awarded tenure, and promoted predicated on this perspective.

The academic evaluation and reward system in Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) has three purposes: (a) to provide the means by which faculty, through annual and post-tenure reviews, progress through the academic ranks; (b) to provide mechanisms for post-tenure reviews; and (c) to certify high achievement.

In this document, specific LAS expectations for annual, tenure, and post-tenure reviews are delineated.

1.2 Definitions of Concepts

The following section provides definitions of pertinent concepts.

Teaching

Because Nevada State College is a teaching institution, teaching is the most highly valued activity in LAS. Faculty members are expected to be accomplished teachers. Teaching is a highly complex activity and requires a variety of indicators. Section 2.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to evaluate teaching.

Scholarship

LAS values scholarly efforts that represent the spectrum of orientation from basic to applied, including the scholarship of teaching. Faculty members are expected to be accomplished scholars. Section 3.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to document accomplishment in scholarship.

Service

Service includes activities that contribute to the institution and community. There are two categories of service: (a) institutional and (b) professional and community/governmental. LAS faculty members highly value service; institutional service is particularly emphasized.

Section 4.0 provides a detailed description of the lines of evidence used within LAS to document accomplishment in service.

1.3 Annual Review Plans

At each annual review, the faculty member and evaluator will develop an annual review plan for the following year. The annual progress plan will include specific goals for the faculty member to achieve in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. At each annual review, the faculty member must provide a copy of the annual review plan agreed upon at the previous year's review and indicate which items from the plan were completed.

1.4 Flexibility in Annual Review Ratings

LAS sets the rating guidelines for assessing teaching, scholarship, and service on annual, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. Discipline-specific standards and constraints should be taken into account when evaluating the quality and quantity of faculty contributions, and evaluators may adjust the ratings requirements accordingly. *It is the responsibility of faculty members to justify flexibility in the application of LAS ratings guidelines to their teaching, scholarship, or service contributions.*

2.0 LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR JUDGING EFFECTIVE TEACHING

2.1 Overview

The lines of evidence for excellence in teaching provide some comparability in evaluation while recognizing the diverse ways in which teaching excellence may be demonstrated.

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a narrative description of teaching activities. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's teaching effectiveness. A narrative statement is optional in the annual and post-tenure review process.

For annual and post-tenure reviews, the faculty member must provide a syllabus (including several standard elements discussed below), student course evaluations (using the LAS standard form), and evidence of student learning or accomplishment for each course taught. In addition, the faculty member may choose to provide a reasonable amount of supplementary evidence of teaching effectiveness, which may take a variety of forms. The elements of both required and optional evidence are outlined in the following sections. In many cases, activities related to teaching also may have a scholarship and/or service component, such as research or publications on the scholarship of teaching or

mentoring students toward making a conference presentation. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide a rationale for why such activities should be counted in a particular category.*

2.2 Required Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Individual departments may adjust the required evidence of teaching effectiveness as necessary to ensure relevance to discipline-specific teaching methods.

For each course taught, the following are required lines of evidence:

- Syllabus that incorporates the elements in the standard NSC template;
- Student evaluations on the LAS standard form;
- Final grade distribution.

In most cases, evaluators have copies of course syllabi, final grade distributions, and student evaluations on file and these items do not need to be provided. The faculty member should verify that these required lines of evidence are already available to evaluators.

The faculty member also will provide a teaching evaluation from the departmental Chair for at least one course.

2.3 Optional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, not to exceed 15 pages, may be provided by the faculty member but is not required. Faculty should check with their departmental Chair before submitting additional evidence of this sort. This evidence might include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Additional course materials developed;
- Peer observations of teaching conducted by the faculty member
- Video recordings of teaching;
- Descriptions of innovative teaching methods used;
- Score distributions;
- Descriptions of how diversity issues were significantly incorporated into course content;
- Papers, projects, or other written assignments with teacher comments;
- Video and/or audio tapes of student performance;
- Teaching awards;
- Major exams or assignments developed by the instructor to measure student performance;
- Handouts and other materials used to aid instruction.

Additional evidence may be requested by the faculty member's Department Chair.

2.4 Activities Related to Teaching

As a part of their teaching responsibilities, faculty members often participate in related activities that enrich the quality of education at Nevada State College. A description of these activities should be provided in the annual review materials. These activities might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Course revisions or improvements;
- Fieldwork supervision;
- New preparations or substantial revisions of course content;
- Significant student mentoring that includes a teaching component.

2.5 Academic Leadership in Teaching

Faculty members are encouraged to demonstrate evidence of leadership in their teaching. We particularly value an emphasis on academic rigor and integrity. Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of academic leadership in teaching might include, but are not limited to, the following:

Curriculum development. The faculty member assumes significant responsibility for developing new academic programs or substantially revising existing academic programs, concentrations, majors, or minors. Assuming primary responsibility for developing new courses also will be considered.

Workshops/Seminars/Colloquia. The faculty member may offer a workshop, seminar or colloquium. This activity may be institutional, local, regional, national, or international in scope. It should be demonstrated that the activity is important to disseminating information to the broadest audience, thereby enhancing the faculty member's, the faculty's, and the college's reputation.

Regional or national recognition of teaching. The faculty member receives an award related to teaching or mentoring activities from a regional or national organization or learned society.

2.6 Rating Teaching in the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Process

When rating teaching, evaluators will consider the faculty member's progress toward meeting the goals set forth in the annual review plan. In the Commendable and Excellent ratings, quality of contributions will be rated higher than quantity.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Faculty members are expected to be competent teachers, as evidenced by the creation of a classroom climate that respects students and welcomes diversity and by quality contributions in all of the following areas:

A well-developed syllabus on the appropriate NSC template with adequate expectations and rigor that includes a course description, course objectives, evaluation criteria/methods, a course schedule, and office hours;

Availability to students outside of classroom hours;

Content that 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 and numerical ratings typically above 3.0 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being the highest (in cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores);

Student advising as appropriate within department guidelines;

Attendance at LAS faculty development activities and teaching-related meetings;

Major assignments or exams developed by the instructor;

Evidence of substantive feedback given to students regarding performance on major assignments or exams;

Final grade distributions that are not significantly skewed in a persistent manner.

Commendable (annual and post-tenure review ratings): Exceeds expectations

Faculty members are expected to meet the following criteria:

Meets Satisfactory performance standards;

Evaluations with generally positive written comments and numerical ratings typically above 3.7 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being highest (in cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide

an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores);

Quality contributions in some of the following major areas of teaching effort or equivalent:

- Significant progress toward meeting goals set in the annual review plan for the year;
- Significant level of curriculum development, as indicated by new course development or significant responsibility for new or revised academic programs;
- Significant student mentorship as evidenced by activities such as: independent study, honors activity, supervision of student research, and significant experiential learning activities (e.g. advising student government);
- Presentation at or leadership role in faculty or student development activities related to teaching;
- Leading a teaching workshop or seminar outside normal responsibilities;
- Incorporating or significantly addressing diversity issues in courses or course materials;
- Development or use of innovative course materials, teaching and active-learning techniques, or technologies.

Evaluators may also consider the following as evidence of teaching effectiveness:

- Development and dissemination of innovative teaching materials at a regional or national level;
- Recipient of a teaching award;
- Acceptance of external teaching-related grant.

Excellent (annual and post-tenure review ratings): Significantly exceeds expectations)

An Excellent rating is based on high-quality contributions to the areas listed in the Commendable section above. An Excellent rating is distinguished from the Commendable rating by the requirement of a significantly higher quantity and quality of contributions beyond the levels required for a Commendable rating. In addition, evaluations with generally positive written comments and numerical ratings typically above 4.0 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being highest (in cases where faculty members do not meet these criteria, they may provide an explanation of mitigating circumstances they believe led to unreasonably low scores)

3.0 LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR JUDGING EFFECTIVE SCHOLARSHIP

3.1 Overview

Evidence of productive scholarship can be supported by published records as well as other original discipline-specific peer-reviewed work of a professional nature, including research on the scholarship of teaching, creative works (for those in the arts), and the mentoring of substantial student research projects. Specific categories of evidence of scholarship are presented in Section 3.2 below. External validation (peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed) of one's work in a published product is requisite for promotion and tenure at NSC.

In annual and post-tenure reviews, departmental and school-level evaluators are responsible for judging the quality of scholarship done. In tenure reviews, school-level evaluators and the college-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee are responsible for judging the quality of scholarship. Quality can refer to the extent to which scholarship contributes to advances in knowledge, and, especially, the enrichment of teaching. This concept of quality places more importance on the process and effect than on the quantity of products. It should be assessed, in accordance with college guidelines, both by peers within the department and school and those from other higher education institutions.

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a narrative description of their scholarly activities. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's scholarship. A narrative statement is optional in the annual and post-tenure review process.

Collaboration on products is encouraged and supported by the faculty of LAS, although it is expected that a share of the products will reflect sole or senior authorship.

3.2 Evidence of Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of accomplishment in scholarship might include, but are not limited to:

Research and Professional Journals. Recognition is given to publications in research and professional journals. The quality of the products will be determined in the context of norms for the candidate's discipline. Generally, however, juried outlets are accorded more significance than editor-only reviewed publications.

Chapters in Books. Book chapters will be evaluated both in terms of the inherent quality of the piece and scope of impact or dissemination. Refereed chapters are given greater consideration than non-refereed chapters in edited volumes.

Books. Special consideration will be given to scholarly books that extend the frontiers of knowledge or produce novel applications of existing knowledge to professional problems, as well as textbooks that compile and organize existing knowledge. Readings, edited books, and proceedings shall, in turn, be given less importance than standard textbooks.

Undergraduate Research. Special consideration also will be given to those faculty members who devote significant time toward mentoring and supervising student research that results in peer-reviewed professional paper presentations or publication. Lengthy or time-consuming projects (which may extend over several years) will be given higher priority than mentoring students for one-shot poster presentations.

Professional Reports, Technical Reports, Informational Reports, Monographs, and Lab Manuals. Professional publications will be evaluated in terms of their quality, with reference to the intended audience. As with books and book chapters, the scope of dissemination will be considered.

Conference Paper and Poster Presentations. The value attributed to paper and poster presentations is variable, and will be evaluated by the following six factors (listed here in no particular order of importance): (a) the quality of the paper or poster, (b) the quality of the conference, (c) the scope of the conference - international, national, regional, or local, (d) the scope of the dissemination of the paper, (e) whether the paper was refereed, and (f) whether the paper was invited. Generally speaking, formal presentations will be granted more weight than poster presentations.

Scholarship-based Grants and Contracts. Funded grants and contracts will provide evidence of the capacity to organize fronts of scholarly activity that are judged meritorious by external funding agencies. Therefore, external funding will receive greater consideration than internal (college) funding. Grant and contract proposals should be evaluated in terms of the funding agency and the scope of the funded research.

Scholarship Production in Progress. Evidence of scholarship in progress, particularly that related to 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, completing a literature review, data collection and writing individual parts or chapters of a project are some examples of production in progress. Statements of scholarship in progress that are supported by evidence will be viewed more favorably than those without support.

Other Peer-Reviewed Creative Endeavors. Evidence provided for scholarship production in other forms (lectures, creative work, unique equipment, computer software/program design, video productions) will be evaluated in terms of (a) scope of dissemination, (b) character of receiving audience, (c) prestige of validating authority, institution or agency. External validation of quality is essential.

Refereeing Peer-Reviewed Books and Journal Articles. Indicates contributions to other scholarly work in the field. Such activities will be given less importance than original peer-reviewed contributions such as journal articles.

Shorter Works that Advance Public Knowledge. This may include short articles published in the bulletins of academic organizations and various forms of public media (newspapers, legitimate web magazines, etc.) that advance the general public knowledge. Such activities will be given significantly less importance than original peer-reviewed contributions such as journal articles. Two works that fall into this category together count as *one* item for the purposes of annual review. This combined item cannot be counted more than once in any given review year.

3.3 Academic Leadership in Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of academic leadership in scholarship might include, but are not limited to, the following:

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 one's recognition and involve other faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and staff. The recognition of the institution served also will be considered.

Developing regional, national, or international conferences, symposia, or the like for the dissemination of research findings.

Membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals.

3.4 National Recognition in Scholarship

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of national recognition in scholarship might include, but are not limited to, the following:

Development of a model or practice that is widely adopted.

Extensive publications in primary scholarly outlets.

Record of high accomplishment in creative endeavors of relevance to the fields.

Frequent citations in appropriate literature.

Obtaining funding through competitive proposal writing.

Number and quality of invited addresses, symposia, colloquia, and presentations.

3.5 Rating Scholarship in the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Process

Each year, all faculty members shall present evidence of scholarly progress that outlines their scholarly contributions over the year in review. Evaluators will then assess each faculty member's scholarly output by applying the categories in 3.6 to the ratings requirements in 3.7.

3.6 Categories for Rating Evidence of Scholarship in the Annual and Post-Tenure Review

The following categories are not hard and fast, but should provide a general guideline for assessing an individual's work. Contributions not listed here, as well as those contributions listed in 3.3 and 3.4, should be taken into account. As LAS values quality over quantity, evaluators should adapt these categories where necessary, especially when dictated by the standards or requirements of a particular field or discipline.

Level A: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Begin a research project with students;
- Give an academic presentation to an external audience;
- Preparation or submission of scholarly work for presentation or peer review;
- Completion of other scholarly products (e.g., software or conference proceedings);
- Refereeing an article for a peer-reviewed journal;
- Presentation of a poster at professional conference;
- Publication of a research note or book review;
- Submission of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers).
Note: Submission of national-level external grant applications that require significant research and preparation may be considered as a level B item at evaluators' discretion;
- Management of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers).

Note: Management of a large national-level external grant may be considered as a level B item at evaluators' discretion;

- Substantial role in mentoring student(s) toward the successful presentation of a scholarly poster board at a professional conference;
- Two (2) short discipline-specific published works that advance public knowledge (non-refereed). Note: Two works that fall into this category together count as *one* item for the purposes of annual review. This item cannot be counted more than once in any given review year.

Level B: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Presentation of scholarly paper at professional conference;
- Substantial role in mentoring student(s) toward the successful presentation of a scholarly paper or poster presentation at a professional conference;
- Substantive involvement in developing a new or ongoing research project, data collection, etc.;
- Presentation as keynote or invited speaker at a conference, symposia, colloquium, or other significant academic event;
- Published book chapter (non-refereed);
- Publication of a peer-recognized field-specific encyclopedia article;
- Refereeing a book for an academic press;
- Acceptance of a local or regional external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Peer-reviewed exhibition or peer-reviewed release of a single, discipline-specific, stand-alone piece of creative work (for those in the arts);
- Publication of scholarly technical/professional report or monograph;
- Publication of a laboratory work book;
- Editing a peer-reviewed journal, academic website, or listserv;
- Successful completion of peer reviewed scholarly product (e.g., software);
- Developing and/or supervising a major new student research initiative;
- Completion of a major discipline-specific creative project or set of works for peer review (i.e. developing artwork for a major regional or national exhibition or finishing a feature film or novel, for those in the arts).

Level C: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Acceptance and/or publication of a peer-reviewed journal article;
- Substantial commitment to mentoring and/or supervising a undergraduate research project that is accepted for peer-reviewed publication;

- Acceptance of a national-level external research grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Acceptance of refereed book chapter;
- Publication of refereed book chapter;
- Acceptance of prospectus for book;
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted book;
- Completion of final draft of accepted book;
- Publication of book;
- Exhibition, publication, or release of a substantial creative work in a peer-reviewed venue (for those in the arts);
- Exhibition or publication of a major discipline-specific nationally- or regionally-recognized peer-reviewed creative work(s) (i.e. a major exhibition or defining film or novel release for those in the arts).

3.7 Scholarship Ratings for Annual and Post-Tenure Review

LAS sets the following rating guidelines for assessing Scholarship on the annual and post-tenure review. These benchmarks serve solely as a guide. Evaluators can be flexible in the ratings in cases where faculty members have undertaken forms of scholarship or scholarly leadership not listed here.

Note: A consistent rating of Satisfactory on annual reviews is not equivalent to a rating of Satisfactory on the tenure review. Tenure-seeking faculty should plan out their scholarship agendas so that they have time to complete the required expectations listed in section 5.3.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Active program of quality research or creative activity which contributes to the discipline's body of knowledge and includes either:

Two (2) items at Level A or equivalent

OR

One (1) Level B item or equivalent.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishment as evidenced by either:

Two (2) Level B items, or equivalent

OR

One (1) Level B item *and* two (2) Level A items, or equivalent.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

Distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by:

One (1) Level C item, or equivalent

OR

Two (2) Level B *and* two (2) Level A items, or equivalent.

4.0 LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR JUDGING EFFECTIVE SERVICE

4.1 Overview

Each tenure-track and tenured faculty member is expected to demonstrate service. Service encompasses two areas: (a) institutional and (b) service to the profession or community.

As a developing institution, NSC has considerable service needs and consequently service to this institution is given highest priority and value. Contributions to the profession or community that directly or indirectly serve the mission of Nevada State College also are valued.

When evaluating faculty contributions in the area of service, the quantity or frequency of service should not be the only consideration. Quality of service should be the most important consideration. First and foremost, faculty are expected to demonstrate how they contribute significantly to resolving the needs of the institution, followed to a lesser degree by contributions to the profession and community or government agencies. Moreover, failure to meet designated service obligations may diminish a faculty member's annual and post-tenure review ratings, regardless of other contributions in this area.

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of service activities. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's service. A personal statement is optional in the annual and post-tenure review processes.

4.2 Evidence of Service

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of accomplishment in service are listed below, but these are examples only and do not exhaust the range of possibilities.

Institutional Service Examples

- Faculty Senate member or officer;
- Search Committee;
- Curriculum Committee;
- Student Retention Committee;
- Promotion and Tenure Committee;
- Faculty Adviser to individual students or student organizations;
- Institutional leadership (for example, coordinating Student Academic Center services);
- Orientation Day presenter/organizer;
- Participation in *ad hoc* committees.

Community and Professional Service Examples

- Officer in local, state, regional, or national professional or learned society;
- Consultant to individuals or local, state, regional, national, or federal organizations (in general, consultants serve in a non-profit capacity);
- Evidence of a substantial contribution to a committee for a governmental, academic, or community organization;
- Volunteer for private or public organization that directly or indirectly relates to the faculty member's discipline, position, or skills.

4.3 Academic Leadership in Service

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of academic leadership in service might include, but are not limited to, the following:

Chairing a standing or *ad hoc* unit or campus committee;
Holding national office in a learned society;
Invitations to speak at regional, national, or international meetings;
Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate;
Active participation on committees of learned societies;
Serving in a significant leadership role within LAS or NSC.

4.4 National Recognition in Service

Lines of evidence related to the demonstration of national recognition in service might include, but are not limited to, the following:

Involvement with professional, volunteer, or technical organizations to a significant degree;
Holding of high office in a professional or volunteer organization or learned society.

4.5 Rating Service in the Annual Merit and Post-Tenure Review Process

The following are selected, non-comprehensive examples of how service to the institution and community/profession might be evaluated for annual and post-tenure reviews. Evaluators should converse with evaluatees to determine the quality of service, taking into account the time and effort required as well as 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 service obligations may diminish a faculty member's annual and post-tenure review ratings, regardless of other service contributions.

While the emphasis is on institutional service, faculty members may propose including significant forms of academic leadership in service or service to the profession or community as part of the performance rating. Such service should be demonstrably related, directly or indirectly, to the mission of NSC or LAS or to the faculty member's specific discipline or department.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance.

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

An active, productive contribution to three forms of institutional service.

Commendable (annual merit and post-tenure review ratings, respectively): Exceeds expectations

Meets Satisfactory performance standards.

Active, productive contributions to at least four forms of institutional service.

Excellent (annual merit and post-tenure review ratings, respectively): Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

Meets Commendable performance standards.

Active, productive contributions to five or more forms of institutional service.

5.0 GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE IN LAS

5.1 Overview

The annual review process applies very stringent standards to achieve high levels of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. It is not the intent of LAS to expect or require consistent Excellent ratings on annual reviews in order to receive an overall Excellent rating in any of the three areas when applying for tenure. Therefore, annual review ratings must be contextualized to represent expectations for Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Commendable, and Excellent ratings in the tenure application process. These ratings will be based on the cumulative performance of faculty members during the time leading up to the tenure review.

Teaching and service operate on yearly cycles, so annual review ratings are utilized extensively in determining tenure ratings in these areas. However, scholarship does not operate on a yearly cycle, but is instead marked by projects that can take multiple years. Consequently, the tenure expectations for scholarship must be more independent of the annual review ratings and focus on the cumulative accomplishments of the faculty member.

5.2 General Expectations for Tenure in Teaching

Faculty members applying for tenure and promotion shall provide a brief narrative description of excellence in teaching. This narrative will provide a context for the review of the individual's excellence in teaching. This narrative is critical to provide justification or evidence of appeals to annual reviews that do not meet the requirements set forth in these standards. The evaluator has some latitude to make exceptions to the requirements in the case of extreme circumstances as presented in the narrative.

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Annual review ratings of Satisfactory or above in the last three years.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory in the last three years

and

At least two annual review ratings of Commendable or higher in the last three years, one of which must be in the last year before tenure review.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory in the last three years

and

At least one annual review rating of Excellent in the last three years.

5.3 General Expectations for Tenure in Scholarship

LAS has set the following benchmarks for rating scholarship in the tenure review process. These benchmarks serve solely as a guide. Evaluators can be flexible in those cases where faculty members have undertaken exemplary forms of scholarship or scholarly leadership not listed here. Faculty members who lack the specific kinds of facilities needed for conducting research in their disciplines should focus on other forms of scholarship such as the scholarship of teaching.

Note: A consistent rating of Satisfactory on Annual Review is not equivalent to a rating of Satisfactory on the Tenure Review. Tenure-seeking faculty members should plan out their scholarship agendas during their probationary period so they have time to complete the required expectations listed below. External validation (peer reviewed, juried, or editor-reviewed) of one's work in a published product is requisite for promotion and tenure at NSC.

Categories for rating evidence of scholarship

Level A: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Begin a research project with students;
- Give an academic presentation to an external audience;
- Preparation or submission of scholarly work for presentation or peer review;
- Completion of other scholarly products (e.g., software or conference proceedings);
- Refereeing an article for a peer-reviewed journal;
- Presentation of a poster at professional conference;
- Publication of a research note or book review;
- Submission of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers).
Note: Submission of national-level external grant applications that require significant research and preparation may be considered as a level B item at evaluators' discretion;

- Management of an external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers). Note: Management of a large national-level external grant may be considered as a level B item at evaluators' discretion;
- Substantial role in mentoring student(s) toward the successful presentation of a scholarly poster board at a professional conference;
- Two (2) short discipline-specific published works that advance public knowledge (non-refereed). Note: Two works that fall into this category together count as *one* item for the purposes of annual review. This item cannot be counted more than once in any given review year.

Level B: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Presentation of scholarly paper at professional conference;
- Substantial role in mentoring student(s) toward the successful presentation of a peer-reviewed scholarly paper or poster presentation at a professional conference;
- Substantive involvement in developing a new or ongoing research project, data collection, etc.;
- Presentation as keynote or invited speaker at a conference, symposia, colloquium, or other significant academic event;
- Published book chapter (non-refereed);
- Publication of a peer-recognized field-specific encyclopedia article;
- Refereeing a book for an academic press;
- Acceptance of a local or regional external grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Peer-Reviewed exhibition or peer-reviewed release of a single, discipline-specific, stand-alone piece of creative work (for those in the arts);
- Publication of scholarly technical/professional report or monograph;
- Publication of a laboratory work book;
- Editing a peer-reviewed journal, academic website, or listserv;
- Successful completion of peer reviewed scholarly product (e.g., software);
- Developing and/or supervising a major new student research initiative;
- Completion of a major discipline-specific creative project or set of works for peer review (i.e. developing artwork for a major regional or national exhibition or finishing a feature film or novel, for those in the arts).

Level C: Includes the following items or equivalent:

- Acceptance and/or publication of a peer-reviewed journal article;

- Substantial commitment to mentoring and/or supervising a undergraduate research project that is accepted for peer-reviewed publication;
- Acceptance of a national-level external research grant (level of contribution may be indicated by whether faculty member is among principal researchers);
- Acceptance of refereed book chapter;
- Publication of refereed book chapter;
- Acceptance of prospectus for book;
- Completion of two or more chapters of an accepted book;
- Completion of final draft of accepted book;
- Publication of book;
- Exhibition, publication, or release of a substantial creative work in a peer-reviewed venue (for those in the arts);
- Exhibition or publication of a major discipline-specific nationally- or regionally-recognized peer-reviewed creative work(s) (i.e. a major exhibition or defining film or novel release for those in the arts).

Scholarship Ratings for Tenure

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of a Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

Active program of quality research or creative activity as exemplified by sustained involvement in the scholarly activities listed in 3.6 and at least:

One published peer-reviewed article

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Evidence of quality peer-reviewed research accomplishment as evidenced by at least:

Two published peer-reviewed articles. Note: A single article in a journal consensually defined in the field of study as a preeminent publication also may be considered; it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that the journal meets this standard.

and

two conference presentations

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

Distinguished by the quality and quantity of contributions which advance knowledge, as indicated by at least:

- Three published peer-reviewed articles

and

- Two conference presentations

OR

- Two published peer-reviewed articles

and

- Five conference presentations

OR

- One peer-reviewed, discipline-specific book

or peer-reviewed, discipline-specific equivalent.

5.4 General Expectations for Tenure in Service

Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet expectations

Fails to produce evidence of Satisfactory performance (see below).

Satisfactory: Meets expectations

No annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory in the last three years.

Commendable: Exceeds expectations

Three annual review ratings of Commendable or above in any years preceding tenure review.

Excellent: Exceeds expectations in a sustained manner

At least one annual review rating of Excellent and three annual review ratings of Commendable (or better) in any years preceding tenure review.