Preamble

Decisions about the promotion and merit of faculty-in-residence within the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs (GCUA) are guided by three basic principles. First, a candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service will be evaluated primarily in terms of the significance of the work. Significant work is defined by its quality and impact. Benchmarks of significant work are suggested in Appendix B. Second, it is the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate the significance of his/her work by using these benchmarks or other direct evidence that clearly reveals its impact. Third, both internal and external sources of peer review will be used in all evaluative decisions to supplement and validate claims about the significance of the candidate’s work. In general, since faculty-in-residence are not expected to conduct research, evaluations for promotion and merit are based on the significance of the teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service activities.

Definition

Faculty in Residence are non tenure-track faculty who are not specifically addressed in either Board of Regents or the Nevada System of Higher Education codes or handbook. Nevertheless, faculty-in-residence typically carry increased teaching loads, heavy service and administrative obligations and/or specialized assignments, and stand for promotion and merit along with all other faculty. Faculty-in-residence have earned terminal degrees and bring both experiential and academic credentials to their positions in the college (See Appendix A for a working chart of non tenure-track positions). Faculty-in-residence contribute to both the undergraduate and graduate programs within the college, serve on and chair student committees, and provide service in significant administrative positions.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence

Because the NSHE code does not address criteria for promotion of faculty-in-residence; this section of the document provides guidance in the absence of codified criteria.

Distinctions between excellent and satisfactory performance within the GCUA are based on the quality and impact of the work. For decisions regarding merit and promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence, the specific benchmarks for “excellent” and “satisfactory” performance in the areas of teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service are summarized in the following section. Faculty-in-residence should meet the “excellent” benchmarks in either teaching or administration/specialized assignments, as well as the “satisfactory” benchmarks for the other. A rating of “commendable” represents performance that falls between the benchmarks for satisfactory and excellent. A candidate’s specific contractual duties may commingle teaching and administration/specialized assignment to a level in which it is impossible to separate the two. In these cases, it is the candidate’s responsibility to make the argument for an "excellent" ranking.
Excellence Ranking in Administration /Specialized Assignments

Evaluative decisions based on excellence in Administration/Specialized Assignments rest on the impact of the particular activity. The candidate’s portfolio will demonstrate the impact of his/her particular work according to benchmarks in this document or other direct evidence of impact. Most, if not all, faculty-in-residence serve their respective units in key administrative posts and spend as much or more time in administrative activity as in teaching. For this reason, faculty-in-residence need to demonstrate the breadth and scope of both academic and administrative service performed for their respective units.

There are many ways that a candidate can achieve an excellent rating in Administration/Specialized Assignments, and a detailed case should be made by the candidate. As a general standard, however, standard of excellence at the associate level is centered within the unit, the college, and the university. The following would likely achieve a rating of “excellent” in Administration/Specialized Assignments:

- Significant performance in a key administrative/specialized assignment role within the candidate’s unit beyond the normal expectations of academic faculty (e.g. graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/forensic coach).
- External awards or recognition of distinguished administration/specialized assignment activities from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence -- university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Significant contributions to a service role in the college beyond the normal expectations of the appointment (e.g. sitting on or chairing college committees).
- Significant advisory roles within the university (e.g. sitting on or chairing university committees, serving as the graduate college representative on graduate student committees).

Satisfactory Ranking in Administration/Specialized Assignments

A satisfactory rating in the above is required for promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence. The benchmarks for achieving this ranking involve measure of the quality, quantity, and the significance of the service activities (see Appendix B for specific indicators).

Excellence Ranking in Teaching

Evaluative decisions based on excellence in teaching rest on the significance of this activity. The candidate’s teaching portfolio will demonstrate the significance of his/her particular teaching-related activities according to established benchmarks (see Appendix B) or other direct evidence of its impact.

There are many ways that a candidate can achieve an excellent rating in teaching, and a detailed case should be made by the candidate. As a general standard, however, the accomplishment of most of the following activities would likely achieve a rating of “excellent” in teaching:

- A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by independent evaluations of one’s teaching portfolio, peer reviews of teaching, and strong student evaluations.
- Recipient of an external award for teaching from an honorary, learned, and/or professional society. A university-wide award for teaching-related activities is an equivalent criterion.
• A clear pattern of course and grading rigor, as shown in course syllabi, course requirements, and the distribution of course grades.

• Consistent evidence from standardized tests of substantial learning gains by students in multiple course offerings.

• Significant curriculum development, including the design of multiple courses for graduate and undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.

• A substantial record of extensive and successful mentoring of students, as indicated by (but not limited to) (1) active supervision of numerous undergraduate students in independent studies and internships; or (2) chairing or major participation in student committees beyond departmental or college norms; or (3) multiple instances of mentoring student work and projects.

Satisfactory Ranking in Teaching

The ranking of satisfactory performance in teaching involves activities that do not achieve the expectations for “excellent” in teaching. Over the candidate’s evaluation period for promotion, the following benchmarks for satisfactory performance in teaching would likely include all of the following activities:

• Participation in formal or informal efforts to improve teaching on a continuous basis.

• A clear record of satisfactory peer reviews and positive student evaluations of teaching.

• Participation in some mentoring activities, including serving on graduate and undergraduate committees (e.g., M.A. thesis, independent studies).

Satisfactory Ranking in Service

A satisfactory rating in service is required for promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence. The benchmarks for achieving this ranking involve measure of the quality, quantity, and the significance of the service activities (see Appendix B for specific indicators).

Criteria for Promotion to Professor-in-Residence

The rank of Professor-in-Residence is awarded to those who have gained national or international recognition for their administration/specialized assignments, teaching, or service contributions, maintained a strong record of quality teaching-related activities, or significant administrative/specialized assignment roles, and provided significant service duties within the unit, the university, the profession, and the community.

A successful candidate for promotion to Professor-in-Residence has a clear record of significant contributions across the range of faculty-in-residence responsibilities. It is incumbent upon the candidate to make an argument about the quality of such achievements. Generally speaking, the following would demonstrate acceptable indicators of quality (see Appendix B for specific indicators of quality/impact):

• Favorable external reviews of the quality, impact, and significance of the candidate’s teaching, or administrative/specialized assignment activities. Included in this category are citations and other references to the work, narrative descriptions of the work in external letters for promotion, and
direct evidence of the work’s impact through the prevalence of its dissemination and/or use within the profession and the wider community. These measures of the significance of this work will be used to indicate the visibility of the candidate’s activities exterior to the university.

- Evidence of steady and active participation in teaching-related activities, including course and curriculum development, authorship or co-authorship of text books, and student mentoring at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

- A record of leadership in university and/or professional service, including major administrative positions within the university that may be open to faculty-in-residence (e.g., chairing university-level committees, serving as assistant chair/director or as associate dean), service on editorial boards for professional journals, and/or service through appointments or elected positions within professional associations, learned societies, or community organizations.

Promotion to Professor-in-Residence does not occur automatically after an individual has spent a given number of years as an Associate Professor-in-Residence. Instead, if one has a strong record of accomplishments, a promotion to Professor in Residence may occur at any time after this earlier promotion.

**Documentation for Promotions**

Candidates for promotion are required to submit teaching and administrative/service portfolios that document their significant contributions in each of these areas. These portfolios include a short narrative statement and specific information that is necessary for external reviewers to make an informed evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. The necessary elements of these portfolios include the following:

**Administrative/Specialized Assignment Portfolio:**

- A narrative summary (1 page) of the general nature of one’s administrative/specialized assignment duties and contributions and academic activities (if applicable for the candidate).

- External evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these service specialized assignment activities.

**Teaching Portfolio:**

- A narrative summary (1 page) of a teaching philosophy, including one’s goals and expectations surrounding teaching.

- A listing of major teaching activities over the evaluation period (e.g., lists of courses taught and numerical summaries of student evaluations of them, curricular development, student mentoring activities, and other pedagogical activities).

- Evidence of the quality/significance of teaching-related activities (e.g., internal and external peer-reviews, awards, or other assessments of learning gains).

- Copies of course materials (e.g., syllabi, handouts, and assignments/exams) for one graduate and one undergraduate class. Provide materials for two different undergraduate courses if not involved in graduate teaching.
Service Portfolio:

- A listing of major service activities and one’s role (e.g., member, chair, associate) within each of the following areas: (1) institutional academic and administrative service (e.g., department, college, and/or university), (2) professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing textbooks for publishers, holding elected/appointed positions in professional associations or honorary societies), and (3) community service (e.g., workshops, public outreach/education activities related to the candidate’s field).

- External evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these service activities.

Other required documents for promotion decisions include copies of:

- Annual evaluations over the evaluative period in question.

- Chair/Director evaluations within each area of administrative/specialized assignment, or teaching and service.

- External reviews of portfolios (see Appendix B for the process of selecting outside reviewers).

Criteria and Documentation for Merit Decisions

Contrary to the multi-year period covered in promotion decisions, merit decisions are typically based on one’s yearly performance. Both types of evaluations, however, are guided by assessments of the quality and impact of administrative/specialized assignment, or teaching, and service activities (see Appendix B for specific indicators of quality/impact). Positive merit evaluations will be given to candidates who demonstrate significant work in these activities. Exceptional performance in any or all areas will be recognized in merit decisions, as will published scholarship (journal articles, scholarly books, etc.), since these fall outside of expectations for faculty-in-residence.
## Appendix A: Non Tenure-Track Positions (All Rank 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Search Required</th>
<th>Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Evaluated</th>
<th>Merit Eligible</th>
<th>Promotable (Title Only)</th>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct (Rank 0)</td>
<td>Assistant Associate Professor</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Duties to be defined by requesting unit prior to appointment</td>
<td>Volunteer: No remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate (Rank 0)</td>
<td>Professor Rsch. Prof.</td>
<td>Waiver</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Teaching: 12 credits per semester; advanced specialized courses, not for introductory courses</td>
<td>Based on training or experience; eligible for teaching assignments or reassignment s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Residence (Rank 0)</td>
<td>Assistant Associate Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teaching: 12 credits per semester; instruction and service</td>
<td>Little or no research or creative activity is expected, but may be eligible for other assignments and reassignment s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Residence</td>
<td>Executive Scholar Artist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Duties to be defined</td>
<td>Primarily research or creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rank 0)</td>
<td>(Open)</td>
<td>Rsch. Ass’t. Rsch. Assoc. Rsch. Prof.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>by requesting unit prior to appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Residence (Rank 0)</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No: Only COLA, but may negotiate salary adjustment</td>
<td>No: May negotiate a new title if re-hired</td>
<td>Teaching: 12 credits per semester, instruction and service</td>
<td>Little or no research or creative activity is expected, but may be eligible for other assignments and reassignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting (Rank 0) (3 yrs. max)</td>
<td>Assistant Associate Professor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No: Only COLA, but may negotiate salary adjustment</td>
<td>No: May negotiate a new title if re-hired</td>
<td>Teaching: 12 credits per semester, instruction and service</td>
<td>Little or no research or creative activity is expected, but may be eligible for other assignments and reassignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes, or Waiver</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teaching: 12 credits per semester</td>
<td>NOT generally eligible for other teaching assignments or reassignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Indicators of the Significance (Quality and Impact) of the Work

I. Administrative/Specialized Assignment

Indicators of quality and significance may include (but are not limited by or to) the following factors:

- Significance of the specialized assignment within the candidate's unit and/or the university
- Significance of the specialized assignment within the candidate's professional and/or academic area of expertise
- Curriculum/program development, accreditation.
- Administrative/fiscal management.
- Key administrative/specialized assignment role within the candidate's unit beyond the normal expectations of academic faculty (e.g. graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/forensic coach).
- External awards or recognition of distinguished administration/specialized assignment activities from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence --university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Significant contributions to a service role in the college beyond the normal expectations of the appointment (e.g. sitting on or chairing college committees).
- Significant advisory roles within the university (e.g. sitting on or chairing university committees, serving as the graduate college representative on graduate student committees).

II. Teaching

Indicators of quality and significance may include (but are not limited by or to) the following factors:

- External awards for teaching from honorary/learned/professional societies.
- Internal awards for teaching excellence--university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Refereed publications on teaching pedagogy.
- A consistent record of innovative and effective teaching that is validated by multiple peer-reviews.
- Major innovations/developments in teaching related activities.
- Authorship of textbooks
- Significant curriculum development, including the development of multiple classes for graduate and undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.
- Consistent evidence from standardized tests of substantial learning gains by students in multiple course offerings.
- A substantial record of student mentoring as indicated by
Extensive supervision of undergraduate students in independent studies, practica, and internships.
Chairing multiple M.A. and/or Ph.D. committees beyond departmental or college norms.
Addresses or other substantial presentations on teaching pedagogy at honorary/learned/professional societies.

III. Service

Indicators of quality and significance may include (but are not limited by or to) the following factors:

- External awards of distinguished service from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence in service--university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Writing grants that help support the unit’s teaching or service missions
- University-based service activities:
  - Major administrative appointments (e.g., graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/forensics coach).
  - Chairing university, college, and departmental committees.
  - Active participation as a member of multiple committees at all levels (i.e., university, college, and departmental).
  - Individual service initiatives that benefit the University (e.g., writing accreditation reports, coordinator of student service organizations).
- Professional service activities:
  - Membership on editorial boards and other review bodies.
  - Reviews of textbooks and manuscripts for professional journals.
  - Organization of professional conferences.
  - Elected positions or appointments to leadership positions in professional organizations.
  - Individual service initiatives that benefit the profession (e.g., workshop coordinators, site coordinator, web-based development).
- Community service activities:
  - Appointments to leadership positions within community-based organizations.
  - Active participation in multiple collaborative partnerships between the university and community organizations.
  - Individual service initiatives that benefit the community (e.g., service training, outreach).

Appendix B: Selection of Outside Reviewers

Outside reviewers for promotion decisions are distinguished individuals who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record. The particular process of selecting outsider reviewers and their specific tasks include the following:

- The appropriate departmental official (e.g., Chair, Director, Personnel Committee) develops a list of potential reviewers. That list will include four names from the candidate and four names from the department personnel committee. Potential reviewers will be from outside the university and should have no close personal or professional relationship with the candidate. Dissertation/thesis advisors and all research collaborators are explicitly prohibited as external reviewers.
• From the list of potential outside reviewers, a total of four reviewers will be selected (2 from the candidate’s list, 2 from the department’s list).

• The outside reviewers will receive a letter that describes the principles and criteria for promotion in the GCUA. Included with this letter will be copies of (1) GCUA’s Promotion Guidelines, (2) the candidate’s vitae, (3) a descriptive summary of the candidate’s teaching, service (and, if applicable, administrative) activities, and (4) supporting documents.

• In their evaluation of the candidate for promotion, reviewers will be asked to answer the following questions: (1) the nature of his/her relationship to the candidate, (2) the significance of the candidate’s work in terms of its quality and impact, and (3) whether the reviewer considers the candidate to be promotable under the guidelines set forth in GCUA and UNLV.

• The reviewer will also provide an abridged vitae with their evaluations.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

\(^1\) This chart has no specific provenance. It has circulated since 2004 but the authors are now unknown. It does, however, graphically illustrate the different types of non tenure-track faculty at the university.
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