Faculty Evaluation and Workload Process: General Instructions and Procedures

The following procedural guide has been developed to take you step-by-step through the faculty evaluation and workload request process. As you read the process, please keep in mind the following guiding principles and timeframes for the process as a whole:

1. Non-tenured faculty members are evaluated annually on a calendar year basis.
2. Tenured faculty members and senior lecturers are evaluated every two years, on a calendar year basis, in even numbered years, which corresponds to the 1st year of the biennium, unless they request an annual review.
3. For all areas being evaluated, except for student evaluations, materials should be submitted for the calendar year(s) included in the evaluation period. Student evaluations from the preceding fall, spring, and intersession/summer semesters (non-tenured) or for the previous two fall, spring, and intersession/summer semesters (tenured and senior lecturers) will be utilized. Current fall semester student evaluations are not included, except for new faculty. In other words, student evaluations are reported on an academic year basis whereas other areas of your effort are reported on a calendar year basis.
4. The DRAFT Performance Evaluation Documentation and Curriculum Vitae are generated through Digital Measures by an assigned staff member (Mary Gregory). It is the faculty member’s responsibility to review the Performance Evaluation Documentation for completeness and where applicable, to provide the assigned staff member with updated information (e.g., publications, presentations) for inclusion in Digital Measures. It is strongly recommended that faculty do not directly enter their publications and presentations into Digital Measures since this information is used to populate the College’s website and for various reports.
   Consistency in entry is crucial. Faculty are reminded that the Performance Evaluation Document includes information that is not captured in Digital Measures. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to add the requested information to their Performance Evaluation Document.
   • Throughout the year, faculty are encouraged to send changes to their curriculum vitae to the assigned staff member (Mary Gregory) for entry into Digital Measures. For example, publications in press, presentations, awards. The updated information can be sent via email or in hard copy and the changes will be made within 10 working days.
   • Per University policy and in order to avoid repetitive information, data entry is done for the first UK author. Once it is entered for the first UK author it will then populate the same information for all the UK faculty listed on the publication, for example.
5. New faculty develop their "Goals and Plan for Professional Growth" early in the first semester of their employment or during the Distribution of Effort (DOE) negotiation process. If the new faculty member is non-tenured, his/her evaluation process for the first time will be delayed as long as possible to allow the person to complete at least one semester of teaching before being evaluated.
6. Please note that the terms “merit” and “high merit” refer to two distinctly different types of merit increases. “Merit” is given to full-time faculty based on satisfactory job performance. “High merit” refers to an additional incentive that is given only to faculty who apply for it and are recognized for outstanding achievements during the time period. In order to be eligible for “high merit”, the faculty member must have received “merit” for the period of time reviewed.
7. Annually, in late Fall, all full-time faculty submit their workload requests for the coming academic year.

Timeline for Faculty Evaluation and Workload Process

September - Clinical Faculty Only
A. Faculty with clinical practice responsibilities submit to reporting administrator the name of an individual in the clinical agency who is the appropriate person to provide performance evaluation feedback.
B. The reporting administrator requests agency input via a cover letter and the Faculty/Professional Staff Clinical Practice Evaluation Form (see Appendix A), if appropriate. Agency representatives will be told in the cover letter that the intent of the evaluation is to promote the growth and development of the practitioner and that the
evaluation will be shared with the faculty member. The evaluator may use the attached form or one that is already in use by the agency.
C. The completed evaluation is shared with the faculty member.

October
A. Faculty complete Performance Evaluation Documentation (see Appendix B) to include preceding spring, summer, and fall activities for the calendar year(s) being evaluated. (Note exception #3 above for student evaluations.) The faculty member is expected to prepare goals for the next review period and assessment of accomplishment of goals set for this reporting period must be addressed in the Performance Evaluation Documentation.
B. Faculty updates CV for inclusion with submitted materials.
C. Faculty completes Faculty Assignment Form and Teaching Preferences Grid (see Appendix C) for the coming academic year.

November
A. If scheduled for performance review, by November 1st, faculty submit a hard copy and electronic copy of the Performance Evaluation Documentation for the period under review to the reporting administrator. In addition, all faculty submit a hard copy of a revised CV, Faculty Assignment Form and Teaching Preferences Grid to the reporting administrator. These latter two documents are used by the Coordinating Council to develop faculty DOEs for the coming academic year.
B. Faculty members confirm appointment and meet with reporting administrator to:
   1. Discuss Performance Evaluation Documentation, if applicable, and develop mutually agreed upon "Goals and Plan for Professional Growth".
   2. Discuss Faculty Clinical Practice Evaluation Form, if appropriate.
   3. Discuss workload preferences for coming academic year.
   4. Reporting administrator determines whether the faculty will be awarded merit. If the reporting administrator does not recommend merit, the faculty can appeal the decision in writing to the Dean within one month of notification of the reporting administrator’s decision.

December
A. By December 10th, the reporting administrator submits all documents Performance Evaluation Documentation, CVs, Faculty Assignment Form, and Teaching Preferences Grid to the Coordinator of Academic Affairs (Nancy McDevitt) who submits the materials to the Dean.
B. By December 10th, faculty members choosing to be reviewed for high merit will submit a Summary of Accomplishments Statement for High Merit (maximum of 2 pages total; see Appendix D) to the Coordinator of Academic Affairs. Only submit the materials that are requested, supplemental materials will not be considered for high merit.

January
A. PATA reviews High Merit applications using the High Merit Peer Review Guidelines and makes recommendations to the Dean by January 15th.
B. Dean reviews recommendations for high merit and makes final decision. In the case that a faculty member is not awarded high merit, he/she has the option of meeting with the Dean to discuss the decision.

January/February – Coordinating Council prepares workload assignments for the coming academic year.

March – Faculty member makes appointment with reporting administrator to review and finalize the DOE for the next academic year.

Note: Process was revised by a working group in 2008-2009; members included Melanie Hardin-Pierce, Lynne Jensen, Jane Kirschling, Nancy McDevitt, and Debra Moser. The workload process was added to this document as a result of faculty members requesting the opportunity to discuss their workload requests with their reporting administrator prior to the Coordinating Council’s workload meetings that occur early in the Spring semester. Process and forms were reviewed by Coordinating Council in Fall 2009 and minor changes made to clarify process, submission of vitae twice a year changed to one a year, in the Fall. In summer of 2012, Jane Kirschling and Nancy McDevitt revised with feedback from the 2011 Performance Evaluation Faculty Survey and with input from the Coordinating Council.
Faculty/Professional Staff Clinical Practice Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides clinical services that are consistent with agency mission and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides clinical services that are consistent with relevant standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of practice and/or clinical guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates effectively with other members of the health care team and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actively seeks an interdisciplinary approach to clients' health needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays effective communication skills with clients and others in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinical environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides clinical services as scheduled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays effective leadership skills in the clinical setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides services or support in response to needs identified by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages clinical resources in an efficient and cost-effective manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ethical integrity and sensitivity to human diversity in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the clinical environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, what was this provider’s most important contribution during the current evaluation period?

Do you have any suggestions for improvement or professional growth?

Please provide any additional feedback for the individual or the College of Nursing here:
APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF NURSING

Performance Evaluation Documentation¹
Time Frame Covered by the Report (Calendar Year(s))²

Name
Rank and tenure status (if applicable)
Title series

I. INSTRUCTION AND EDUCATION (___ % DOE)

A. Academic instruction - for each semester of the evaluation period, list:
   1) All courses taught. [from Digital Measures (DM)] [NOTE – new faculty need to enter current year Fall course assignments on this report]
   2) Qualitative and quantitative summary of student evaluations [faculty member prepares a succinct reflective summary not to exceed 1-2 paragraphs]
   3) Guest lecturers - course number, presentation topic, and venue [DM]
   4) Graduate student precepting [faculty member prepares]

B. Academic advising
   List of nursing practice, research, and or/ lab interns [DM]
   1) List of College of Nursing and other (specify) students for whom faculty member serves as DNP project or PhD dissertation committee chair or member [DM]
   2) Service as an outside examiner on dissertation committees [faculty member prepares]

C. Description of curriculum and course development activities (include curriculum committee work and other activities to improve, add to, or modify instructional offerings) and/or innovative instructional materials [faculty member prepares]

D. Continuing education preparation/instruction [DM]

E. Sponsored instruction and education
   1) Training or instructional/educational grants funded (for each, list name of PI and co-investigators, title of the grant, funding agency, period of funding, and total amount of funding) [DM with faculty member update]
   2) Training or instructional/educational grants submitted (for each, list name of PI and co-investigators, title of the grant, agency submitted to, period of requested funding, total amount of funding requested) and expected award date/status [DM with faculty member to prepare information on award date/status]

II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP (____% DOE)

A. Internally funded research and scholarship
   1) UK funded projects [DM]
   2) Projects submitted for UK funding (and expected award date/status [DM with faculty member to prepare information on award date/status]
   3) Start-up funded research projects [faculty member prepares]

B. Externally funded research and scholarship

¹ Information available in Digital Measures, assuming faculty member has provided it to be entered, will be generated on the “draft” Performance Evaluation Documentation.
² Performance Evaluations are for the calendar year, not the academic year, and consideration for High Merit, as requested by the faculty member, is for the calendar year.
1) Externally funded projects [DM]
2) Projects submitted for external funding and expected award date/status [DM with faculty member to prepare information on award date/status]

C. Research-based publications [DM with faculty member designating publications that were previously listed as “in press” or as an E-pub on last Performance Evaluation Document]

D. Other publications [DM with faculty member designating publications that were previously listed as “in press” or as an E-pub on a last Performance Evaluation Documentation]

E. Paper presentations categorized as UK, local, state, regional, national, or international [DM]

F. Poster presentations categorized as UK, local, state, regional, national, or international [DM]

G. Other scholarly productivity (e.g., videotapes, modules, computer programs, media contributions) [DM]

III. SERVICE (___% DOE)

A. Faculty practice, include time involved and nature of practice, if applicable [DM]

B. Service to the profession
   1) Manuscript reviewing, service on editorial boards or NIH/other funding study sections, officer or committee member in professional organizations, etc. [DM]
   2) Consulting related to the profession (federal, state, and local agencies, professional accreditation bodies, etc.) [DM]
   3) Other service to the profession [DM]

C. Service to UK, including Academic Health Center (e.g., committee memberships, service to student organizations, special assignments, exclude service resulting from a formally assigned position such as associate dean, which are reported under IV. Administration and Professional Development) [DM]

C. Service to College of Nursing (e.g., committee memberships, service to student organizations, track coordinator, special assignments, recruitment activities, development activities; exclude service resulting from a formally assigned position such as associate dean, which are reported under IV. Administration and Professional Development) [DM]

D. Service to the public (include only the service that is due to your professional expertise, e.g., consulting. Exclude service due to your status as a citizen. Include activities such as speeches, papers, or workshops for community groups, community agency/organization activity or consultation, memberships on community advisory boards, and legislative/policy activities.) [DM]

IV. ADMINISTRATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (___% DOE)

A. Activities that provide administrative support and management, giving direction to instruction, research, and service programs of the University (e.g., service as Dean, Associate Dean). Exclude activities for elected positions such as University Senate Chair or positions reported under Service. [DM]

B. Professional development (e.g., sabbatical, conferences and continuing education programs attended, pursuit of advanced degree or certification, courses taken). [DM with faculty member updates]

V. HONORS AND AWARDS [DM]

VI. GOALS FROM PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING THE GOALS [faculty member prepares]
VII. STRENGTHS [faculty member prepares]

VIII. AREAS FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH [faculty member prepares]

IX. GOALS & PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH FOR NEXT REVIEW PERIOD [faculty member prepares with reporting administrator update]

X. SUMMARY EVALUATION [reporting administrator prepares]

Reporting administrator - approve merit based on performance: _____ Yes _____ No

Signature of Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: __________________
Signature of Faculty Member: ______________________ Date: __________________
Signature of Dean: _______________________________ Date: __________________

Dean’s Comments, if any:
APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF NURSING

Workload and Preferences for Teaching Assignments Form: 2013-2014

This document contains: (1) Faculty Assignment Form and (2) the Teaching Preferences Grid. The listing of the courses that are scheduled to be offered during the coming academic year will be provided to faculty. Please review the directions and complete the information as requested. If you would like to review a course syllabus please do not hesitate to contact Peg Teachey for BSN courses, Pamela Knight for MSN and DNP courses or Lena Howard for PhD courses.

The decision about whether a course will be offered is based on a number of factors, including projected student enrollment for the course. All faculty members should indicate at least their 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices for the courses listed for the Fall and Spring on the summary grid. Please note – the intent is that you identify courses and not 3 different combinations of courses that you might be assigned to teach.

FACULTY ASSIGNMENT FORM

Information is used by Coordinating Council to Develop Individual Faculty Member’s DOE for coming academic year

To be completed by Full-time Faculty ONLY (.75 FTE or greater)

Please complete and return to reporting administrator by November 1st.

Name: _________________________________________________

1) Anticipated changes in salary support (please describe any changes that may affect your availability to contribute to the College’s teaching mission, including potential grant funding and changes in practice time, if applicable).

2) List independent studies that you have committed to for the coming academic year (include student name, degree program, and semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name / Degree Program</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Semester (Fall/Spring)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Ongoing College and University (includes Academic Health Center) Committee assignments for coming academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College (check)</th>
<th>University (check)</th>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Expected post-doctoral fellows in the upcoming academic year, provide names and length of fellowship:

5) Are you interested in providing continuing education through the College in the upcoming academic year? If yes, identify potential areas of interest.

6) Are you interested in working with Chandler’s post-BSN residency program as part of your DOE?

7) If you are interested in teaching a new elective in the upcoming academic year, please describe the course content, expected credit hours, and proposed semester.

8) “Unique” aspects of workload – please describe any “unique” arrangements made in relation to workload that the Coordinating Council should take into consideration as they make assignments (for example, enrolled in a doctoral program, include information on expected progress during the coming year; special assignments within the College).
2013-2014 PREFERENCES FOR TEACHING PREFERENCES GRID
To be completed by Full-time Faculty (including .75 FTE or greater)

Please complete and submit to reporting administrator by November 1st.

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Full-time faculty – identify any specific “absences” for a semester(s) or requested change in FTE during coming academic year that will influence your assignments:

For each semester list your **first, second, and third choices for course assignments. Please list ONE course in each column and row indicating your preference of course assignment for each semester.** List the course number (from the attached listing) and specific hours if applicable for the courses you are requesting. The intent is that you identify courses and not 3 different combinations of courses that you might be assigned to teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any additional comments to be considered as assignments are made for coming academic year should be provided below.
Summary of Accomplishments Statement for High Merit
Deadline for applying – December 10, 2012

This summary should not exceed two single spaced typed pages (Times New Roman, 12 pt). Only submit the materials that are requested, supplemental materials will not be considered for high merit.

The summary should include examples of how the faculty member exceeded expectations for his/her rank within title series as outlined in the College’s EVIDENCE OF HIGH MERIT document. Examples should be from the time period under review and only include activities that were not previously recognized for purposes of high merit.

Faculty member ________________________________ Date ____________

Period of High Merit Review: ____ 2012 or ____ 2011 and 2012
Faculty members are reviewed for high merit in the scholarship category using guidelines by title series and rank. The following suggested examples are not hard and fast criteria but rather reflect what faculty members are expected to accomplish annually related to one category of scholarship: publications and presentations. Faculty will likely exceed what is listed in the boxes below to be seriously considered for high merit in the scholarship category. While first authorship of publications and presentations is desirable, consideration for participation in scholarly activities with others will also be considered in review for high merit. In addition, it is important to note that data-based, senior authored manuscripts (i.e., senior author is typically listed as last, if not first) are considered to have equal weight as first authored papers if the manuscript is based on data from the senior author’s program of research. Please note that other modes of scholarship are also considered (e.g., DVDs, social media). Excellence in instruction (e.g., development of new courses), service, and clinical practice is also evaluated for high merit.

### Peer Reviewed Publications and Presentations

#### Annual Expectations by Title Series (includes typical DOE time assigned for Scholarship) and Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Clinical Title Series (scholarship 10%, if applicable)</th>
<th>Special Title Series (scholarship 20-25%)</th>
<th>Regular Title Series (research 50%)</th>
<th>Research Title Series (research 100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years, regional OR</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years, regional or national</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 regional or national</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 regional or national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 publication every 2 years, substantive contribution</td>
<td>1 publication every year with pattern of 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; authorship</td>
<td>2 data-based every year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
<td>3 data-based every year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years, regional or national</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years, 1 national or international</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 national or international</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, national or international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years</td>
<td>1 publication every year with pattern of 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; authorship</td>
<td>2 data-based every year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
<td>3 data-based every year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years national</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 national or international</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 national or international</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every year, 1 national or international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years</td>
<td>1 publication every year with 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author every 2 years</td>
<td>2.5 data-based every year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
<td>3.5 data-based each year with 1 as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Examples of Evidence in Support of High Merit

Faculty who elect to apply for “high merit” should provide evidence for exceeding rank expectations in one or more mission – teaching, research/scholarship, and service, which includes practice, for the period under review. High merit is awarded for accomplishments within the calendar year(s) under review.

Examples include but are not limited to:

1. Professional recognition, including at the
   a. local level for Lecturer and Clinical Instructor
   b. state level for Senior Lecturer
   c. regional for Assistant Professor (all series)
   d. national Associate Professor (all series) or Clinical Professor
   e. international for Professor (all series)

---

<sup>3</sup> When a faculty member’s DOE scholarship time is less or more than the “typical assigned” percentage, annual expectations for presentation and publication will be adjusted accordingly.

<sup>4</sup> For clinical title series and special title series, in press or published manuscripts in peer reviewed journals, book chapters, and monographs will be considered. It is expected that across years a faculty member in one of these title series will publish in peer reviewed journals. For regular and research title series, it is expected that publications will be in peer reviewed journals and will be in press or published.
2. Creative pedagogy which has been sustained and disseminated in peer reviewed venues
3. Substantive participation in a public organization because of expertise (e.g., American Cancer Society), including at the
   a. local level for Lecturer and Clinical Instructor
   b. local or state level for Senior Lecturer
   c. state or regional for Assistant Professor (all series)
   d. national level for Associate Professor (all series)
   e. national or international level for Professor (all series)
4. Leadership in a public organization because of expertise (e.g., American Cancer Society), including at the
   a. local or state level for Assistant Professor (all series)
   b. regional level for Associate Professor (all series)
   c. national level for Professor (all series)
5. Leadership in professional organization, including at the
   a. local level for Lecturer and Clinical Instructor
   b. state level for Senior Lecturer
   c. regional level for Assistant Professor (all series)
   d. national level for Associate Professor (all series)
   e. international level for Professor (all series)
6. Participation in clinical initiatives that strengthens College’s relationships across disciplines and settings for Lecturer
7. Engage in clinical practice innovation that positively impacts patient and/or delivery system outcomes and that
   strengthen College’s relationships across disciplines and settings for Clinical Instructor
8. Influence clinical practice beyond assigned clinical setting (e.g., practice guidelines adopted across multiple settings,
   statewide conference on best-practices)
9. Active engagement in research/scholarship (e.g., collaborate with established research team) that exceeds
   expectation for rank and title series, as applicable
   a. Substantive contribution to peer reviewed presentations and/or publications for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer
      and Clinical Instructor
   b. Substantive contribution to scholarly creativity that produces book chapters, audiovisual learning tools, or
      other published/manufactured educational materials for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer
   c. Substantive contribution to peer reviewed publication(s)4 that describe practice innovation, teaching
      innovation, and/or unique contribution to the literature that exceeds expectations for rank within Clinical
      and Special Title series and for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers
   d. Substantive contribution to peer reviewed data based publications4 that exceeds expectations for rank and
      Regular and Research Title series
10. Serving on an editorial board for Associate Professor (all title series) or as editor of a journal for Professor (all title
    series)
11. Service on regional research grant review panels for Assistant Professor and national research grant review panels
    for Associate Professor
12. Invited and serve as consultant on a funded grant for Assistant Professor
13. Invited and serve as a Visiting Professor for an Associate Professor
14. Participate in policy initiatives related to health care, including at the
    a. local level for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Clinical Instructor, and Assistant Professor (all title series)
    b. state level for Associate Professor (all title series)
    c. national level for Professor (all title series)
15. Sustained mentorship of others (e.g., students, pre- or post-doctoral fellow, other health care professionals) in
    scholarship, research, practice innovation, or teaching innovation

NOTES: Revised Evidence of High Merit document removed from Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria by
Title Series document and approved by College of Nursing Faculty March 2011. College of Nursing Evidence of High Merit
document revisions approved by College of Nursing Faculty September 2012.