

**Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of New Hampshire
Promotion and Tenure Committee Procedures, Guidelines and Expectations
July 2016**

The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure are outlined in this document. The Department adheres to the general guidelines agreed to as part of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the USNH Trustees and the AAUP-UNH Chapter, as outlined in Article 13. In addition, the Department adheres to the Instructions for Preparing the Promotion and Tenure Statement and the Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure issued annually by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. These Procedures, Guidelines and Expectations criteria conform to the By-Laws of and have been approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences. It is understood that this document needs to be reviewed and revised whenever those aforementioned documents are revised and/or at a minimum of every three years.

I. Composition of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

The CEE Promotion and Tenure Committee (CEPAT) consists of a two tiered membership of tenured faculty within the Department. The Department Chair is a non-voting ex officio member of the Committee. Untenured and non FTE faculty are not members of the CEPAT Committee as per university criteria. The Department Chair appoints the CEPAT Committee Chair.

A. CEPAT Chair

The CEPAT Chair is a senior CEE faculty member appointed annually by the Department Chair. The CEPAT Chair establishes subcommittees and assigns responsibilities primarily for preparing and assembling reviews and cases that are going forward. The CEPAT Chair submits draft evaluations and reviews to the CEPAT membership for their review and endorsement. There is no limit to the number of annual terms an individual may be CEPAT Chair.

B. Two-Tiered CEPAT Committee Membership

The CEPAT Tier I committee membership consists of two groups of faculty. The committee that considers the promotion of FTE faculty to Associate Professor with tenure, the promotion of research faculty to Research Associate Professor without tenure, and the annual reviews of Assistant Professors, and the post tenure reviews of Associate Professors consist of all departmental tenured faculty and the Department Chair as an ex officio nonvoting member.

The CEPAT Tier II committee membership that considers the promotion of FTE Associate Professors and Research Associate Professors to Full Professor and

Research Full Professor and post tenure reviews of Full Professors consist of all departmental tenured Full Professors and the Department Chair as an ex officio nonvoting member.

II. Faculty Review Procedures

A. Assistant Professor Review Process

All untenured faculty members are required to maintain an up-to-date promotion and tenure-like package consistent with the current P&T University format in use that year. This helps facilitate the annual review and the very important third year review process. Keeping a current promotion-like file also exposes new faculty members to the important aspects of Scholarship, Teaching and Service and what is expected of them when they are considered for promotion and, if applicable tenure. At a minimum, information required in the file consists of the following:

- A professional resume that meets the specific guidelines for P&T resume (see example in the appendix) listing all of the faculty member's publications and professional reports, employment record, Service at the Department, College, University, State, Federal and Community level, courses taught and any other facts which could bear on the P&T decision.
- Copies of all faculty annual reports (FAR).
- Copies of all proposals submitted, funded and unfunded.
- Copies of all appropriate publications and reports authored or co-authored by the candidate including any "in press". (Manuscripts in preparation do not count in the evaluation, though they may be listed in the package). Notation should be included as to whether each document is peer-reviewed and copies of the peer reviewer comments must be kept.
- Copies of all submitted publications currently under review.
- Copies of the written student evaluations and the numerical summary sheets for all courses taught at UNH and for faculty with records at other colleges/universities, evaluations from those courses.
- A self-appraisal of the faculty member's teaching, research and service record. Faculty members are encouraged to make use of and include results from input to their teaching from the UNH Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning in their self-evaluation of teaching.
- A chronological compilation of tables showing:

1. Proposals sent, funded, pending (noting agency), amount and level of effort (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Consultant)
 2. Service activities for the Department, College, University, State, and National Professional Associations.
 3. Teaching summary of all courses listing the numerical scores for the following categories: overall rating, well prepared for class, presented material effectively and enthusiastic about subject.
 4. Graduate student information (i.e., name, degrees pursued, funding source, matriculation date, expected graduation date and current status (active, inactive, in-la, writing thesis, etc.)
- Any other materials the faculty member wishes to submit.

B. FTE Assistant Professor

Each non-tenured FTE faculty member is reviewed by the Department Chairperson in consultation with pertinent CEPAT Tier I Committee members at the completion of every academic year, with the third year package and review being more detailed. The annual review consists of evaluating the accomplishments in the areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service and preparing a summary. The third year review consists of a complete promotion and tenure package except for the submission of external review letters and is to be reviewed by each member of the CEPAT Tier I Committee. The intent of the third year review is to give the faculty member a detailed evaluation of his/her academic accomplishments and advice on how the candidate should proceed in the interim before going up for promotion and, if applicable, tenure. If the final review is unfavorable, the candidate is made aware of his/her weaknesses and may be given a termination letter stating he/she has no more than one additional year of employment at UNH. During CEPAT committee Tier I review of Assistant Professor promotion and tenure cases, the issue of number of years in rank is discussed and considered. Therefore, when a candidate comes up for promotion sooner than the traditional six years at UNH, his/her case may receive more scrutiny than a candidate who has been in the rank for six years. The P&T "clock" for candidates who have spent time as FTE Assistant Professors at other institutions is addressed on a case-by-case basis and as a function of the individual's UNH appointment letter.

C. Research Assistant Professor

Each Research Assistant Professor is reviewed at the completion of every academic year. The annual review consists of preparing a summary that evaluates his/her contribution to the Teaching mission of the Department (i.e., at the graduate level only, as Research Faculty are not required to teach courses) and his/her accomplishments in the areas of Scholarship and Service. There is no third year review. The intent of the written annual review is to give the research faculty member a detailed evaluation of his/her success and give him/her direction for improving his/her academic accomplishments and contributions, ultimately leading to a successful promotion to Research Associate Professor.

D. Assistant Professor Annual Review Procedures

- The annual review is conducted primarily by the faculty member's mentor(s) (assigned by the Department Chair) with ideally one other tenured faculty member appointed by the Department Chair. The Department Chair provided a written copy of the annual review to the faculty member and meets with s/he to discuss it.
- The reviewers read all of the supplied information and may interview the faculty member and then discuss the faculty member's performance on the basis of the quality of Teaching, Scholarship and Service and prepare a draft review. The review consists of four sections: Teaching (all Research Faculty have the graduate student obligation), Scholarship, Service, and Overall Evaluation.
- The third year detailed review draft is evaluated by the CEPAT Tier I Committee. Once approved, the review is signed by all committee members, and submitted to the Department Chair.
- The Department Chair incorporates this review into the Chair review that is sent to the Dean of the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences. The Department Chair provides a written copy of the review to the faculty member and meets with s/he to discuss it.
- The Dean writes the official letter of evaluation to the faculty member. The review and the Dean's letter becomes a part of the faculty member's promotion and tenure package.
- The faculty member may respond to the Dean, if s/he elects to do so.

E. Associate to Full Promotion

The process for promotion from Associate to Full Professor shall be exercised at the request of the candidate or by the CEPAT Tier II Committee with the permission of the candidate. Once the request is received, the CEPAT Chair calls a meeting of the Tier II Committee to evaluate the information submitted by the candidate relative to his/her accomplishments in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. The CEPAT Tier II Committee makes a recommendation to the candidate through the CEPAT Chair as to whether the candidate should go forward for promotion at that time.

During the CEPAT Tier II Committee review of the Full Professor promotion cases, the issue of number of years in rank is discussed and considered. While there is no time requirement for pursuing promotion to Full Professor, the typical period is approximately six years after promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates who have spent time as

Associate Professor's at other institutions are dealt with on a case-by-case basis and as a function of their UNH appointment letter. The candidate always has the option of going forward independent of advice given by the CEPAT Tier II Committee.

All of the procedures and steps listed for the promotion to Associate Professor are applicable to the Full Professor candidate. The information in the Full Professor Promotion package is also identical to that of the Assistant to Associate Professor Promotion Package. In the event the Department Chair is the candidate for promotion, the role of the Department Chair for these actions, is fulfilled by the CEPAT Chair.

F. Post Tenure Review Process

Associate Professors are reviewed every 3 years and Full Professors every 5 years. The Department guidelines for the post review process are consistent with the accepted CEPS guidelines as follows:

- The goal of post-tenure review is to optimize each faculty member's contributions to the Department, College and University. It may also result in the Department rethinking what activities it values. The result of a post-tenure review is a summary of the faculty member's contribution, Departmental role, and academic accomplishments in Scholarship, Teaching and Service.
- The Department expectations for Associate Professor and Full Professors are that these faculty members will continue to strive for excellence in teaching, scholarship and service (engagement). Significant flexibility in expectations is normal for any faculty and the importance for each faculty member is to provide balance. For example, a faculty member that has seen a significant decrease in their scholarly contributions can satisfy their professional obligations with an increased contribution to Departmental teaching and service activities. Similarly, a faculty member that has seen a significant decrease in their teaching contributions can satisfy their professional obligations with an increased contribution to Departmental scholarly and service activities.
- Every faculty member must participate in the review process unless he/she has signed a phased retirement agreement of three years or less or has signed another formal agreement for retirement within three years of the year for post-tenure review. The Department Chairperson can use the results of the post tenure review process as a basis for approving a faculty members Departmental academic year workload assignments in teaching and service.
- The post-tenure review is submitted to the Dean who simply passes the list of names of faculty reviewed each year to the Provost.
- Completion and submission of the post-tenure review process is the responsibility of the CEPAT Tier I and II Committees. The CEPAT Chair assigns individual subcommittees to be responsible for the reviews. The Department Chair is also subject to post-tenure review according to the 5-

- year or 3-year schedule, as appropriate. The Chair has no direct role in the review of himself/herself. That role is assumed by the CEPAT Chair.
- The Department Chair forwards the post-tenure review of an individual faculty member to the Dean.
 - In the rare case that a reviewed faculty member believes that the Department process was not correctly followed, or disagrees with the value placed on certain activities, he/she may request a meeting with the CEPAT Tier I or II Committees and the Department Chair. If the reviewed faculty member remains unsatisfied with the review, he/she may request that an ad hoc committee, composed of CEPS faculty who are eligible for the College Post-Tenure Appeals Committee, be convened to address the review.
 - The Dean's Office provides at the end of each academic year, a list of faculty who should undergo post-tenure review during the following academic year. Approximately one third of the Associate Professors and one fifth of the Full Professors are reviewed each year.
 - By December 15 of each academic year, the faculty member being reviewed provides copies of each year's FAR, student evaluation summaries and other supporting material along with a report summing up these activities (Scholarship, Teaching, Service and integration of these activities, where possible) for the relevant time period (most recent three or five years, as appropriate). The documentation covers the previous three years for Associate Professors and five years for Full Professors.
 - Outside letters of evaluation are not required for post-tenure reviews.
 - The Department Chair submits the completed post-tenure review to the Dean by March 15 of the relevant academic year.
 - The post-tenure review consists of a summary of the faculty member's contributions, Departmental role and accomplishments during the time period covered by the review.
 - In a case where significant improvements are needed in the faculty member's performance, the Department Chair and the CEPAT Tier I or II Committee will work with the individual to agree upon a specific improvement program.
 - If an individual makes unsatisfactory progress, in the opinion of the CEPAT Tier I or II Committee and the Department Chair, in improvement or refuses to participate in the post-tenure review program, then that faculty member is subjected to sanctions including, but not limited to, recommendation of the Department Chairperson to the CEPS Dean that sabbatical leave requests be denied.

G. Post Tenure Review Procedures

1. A subcommittee consisting of two CEPAT members is selected by the CEPAT Chair. Only Full Professors participate in the review of a Full Professor. Any tenured faculty member may participate in an Associate Professor review. The appointed subcommittee, consisting of a primary lead and a secondary member, conducts the review of the faculty member. The primary member serves as the Chair of the subcommittee, and will be responsible for the review.

2. The faculty member being evaluated must supply, at a minimum, the following:
 - a. Annual reports since last review or promotion
 - b. Teaching evaluations and summary sheets
 - c. A current resume.
 - d. All publications submitted, published or accepted for publication since the previous review, and whether they are peer-reviewed.
3. The subcommittee reads all of the supplied information and interviews the faculty member. The subcommittee discusses the faculty member's performance on the basis of the quality of Teaching, Scholarship and Service and prepares a draft review. The review consists of four sections: Scholarship, Teaching, Service and an Overall Evaluation. After approval by the subcommittee, the review is forwarded to the appropriate CEPAT Committee for review, discussion and edits.
4. The Department Chair sends a copy of the review to the evaluated faculty, along with his/her comments. The evaluated faculty may respond if he/she elects to do so.
5. The Department Chair sends the review to the Dean. The Dean writes the official letter of evaluation to the faculty member. The letter becomes part of the faculty member's promotion package (Associate Professors only).
6. The faculty member may respond to the Dean, if he/she elects to do so.

III. Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Packages

The promotion and tenure process can be initiated by the faculty member and/or the appropriate CEPAT Committee in the ways outlined in the University's Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (e.g., permanent tenure must be obtained by Assistant Professors at the completion of six years of service as a full-time member of the University's faculty).

- The CEPAT Chair appoints a subcommittee of tenured faculty members who prepare the draft of the candidate's Promotion and Tenure package.
- The candidate must supply, at a minimum, all the information listed above in Section A. Assistant Professor Review Process.
- The subcommittee interviews the faculty member for whom the Promotion and Tenure package is being prepared.
- The subcommittee solicits reviews and other documentation of the candidate's Teaching, Scholarship and Service. For Research Faculty, teaching is evaluated at the graduate level only, unless the faculty member has a record of undergraduate teaching.

a. Teaching

The documentation of teaching effectiveness is compiled at both the undergraduate and graduate levels from reviewing:

- All of the candidate's student evaluations and summary sheets.
- Letters solicited from former students,
- Letters solicited from faculty with whom the candidate may have worked in a teaching capacity (if applicable).
- Any other documentation the candidate may wish to provide.

Letters of solicitation are sent to a minimum of 60 former students who have taken the candidate's courses during the period since the last promotion and/or tenure was obtained. In the case of Research Faculty whose experience only involves graduate student mentoring, all mentees shall be contacted. One third of those students are chosen by the candidate, one third chosen jointly by the candidate and the appropriate CEPAT committee, and one third by the CEPAT Committee alone. The students who are chosen shall have received a spectrum of grades given in each of the courses the candidate has taught since the last promotion and/or tenure was received. Students are chosen to be representative of the distribution of graduate and undergraduate students in the classes the candidate has taught. In addition, several of the students shall have also been the candidate's undergraduate advisees. Letters are also requested from all of the faculty member's graduate students who have graduated since the candidate's last promotion and/or tenure. The students selected may not be currently enrolled in the Department.

b. Scholarship

The appropriate CEPAT Committee solicits letters of evaluation from a minimum of six reviewers outside the University who are nationally and/or internationally recognized experts in the candidate's area(s) of research. The CEPAT Committee will insure that the selected reviewers do not feel any conflict of interest in writing a review for the candidate by calling each reviewer to discuss Department expectations and requirements. One third of the reviewers are chosen by the candidate, one third jointly by the candidate and the CEPAT committee and one third by the CEPAT committee alone.

Reviewers are given a copy of the candidate's current resume; his/her refereed publications; a copy of the Department P&T guidelines and other relevant material since the last promotion and/or tenure was obtained.

c. Service

The appropriate CEPAT Committee requests evaluation letters from individuals who have worked with the candidate in major service roles within and outside the University, as appropriate.

5. The subcommittee reads all of the supplied information and all of the teaching and scholarship documentation. If there is a diversity of opinion about the quality of the candidate's Teaching, Scholarship and/or Service, the subcommittee meets and discusses the case with the appropriate CEPAT Committee. Based on these discussions, the subcommittee prepares a draft of the Promotion and Tenure package. In cases where there is overwhelmingly positive documentation of the candidate's performance with respect to Teaching, Scholarship and Service, the subcommittee prepares a draft report of the Promotion and Tenure package without first meeting with the CEPAT Committee.
6. A draft of the Promotion and Tenure package containing all sections as outlined in the Instructions for Preparing the Promotion and Tenure Statement and the Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure issued by the Provost is prepared by the subcommittee. The appropriate CEPAT Committee meets and discusses the draft package. Changes are made by the subcommittee, as suggested by the CEPAT Committee. In addition, the CEPAT Committee's Recommendation Letter is drafted, discussed and reviewed. The CEPAT Committee votes on the Promotion and Tenure package (Yes, No, Abstentions), the tally is recorded, and all members sign the final copy. The package, as approved and signed by the CEPAT Committee members, is forwarded to the Department Chair.
7. The Department Chair undertakes an independent evaluation of the candidate's Promotion and Tenure case after discussions (individually and/or in groups) with faculty who are not on the CEPAT Committee and summarizes their opinions in the Chair's recommendation letter.
8. The candidate's complete Promotion and Tenure package including the CEPAT Committee's Recommendation and the Chair's Recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
9. The Chair and the CEPAT Tier I or II Committees are responsible for seeing that the assembly of the documentation and the evaluation are accomplished in a thorough and professional manner. Only those materials that specifically bear on the candidate's achievements, qualifications, prospects for the future and relevance to the program are included in the Promotion and Tenure process.

10. With respect to letters of recommendation and other personal evaluations of the candidate, each evaluation will be accompanied by a statement indicating whether the evaluation was solicited or not solicited and, if solicited, the process used to determine from whom the evaluation was requested, in what manner an evaluation was requested and other pertinent facts are provided.
11. Any material received after the CEPAT Committee has forwarded the case to the Department Chair and/or the Dean will be handled in accordance with the University's guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.
12. At any step, the candidate may request a summary of the confidential materials which will be prepared by the Department Chair, Dean of the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences, or member of the faculty acceptable to both the Dean and the candidate. This summary will include the names of the individuals whose evaluations are in the file. Candidates shall be entitled to submit a rebuttal to the summary statement of the confidential material.
13. Any material in the file which the candidate can demonstrate to the University to be inaccurate or untrue is immediately removed.

IV. Department Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

A. Assistant to Associate Professor

The basis for the expectations of new faculty members is well defined in his/her employment appointment letter. His/her areas of interest are explicitly defined and appropriate statements are made relative to what is expected in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service. The logical programmatic development of the Department's strategic plan is critically considered in the hiring of a new faculty. The Department's strategic plan identifies expectations that FTE faculty members will typically devote 45% of their time to Teaching, 40% of their time to Scholarship and 15% of their time to Service. The Department's success in achieving its strategic plan is therefore extremely dependent upon the success of the new faculty member in these areas.

A senior faculty member is selected by the Department Chair to mentor each new faculty to assure he/she stays on track in achieving his/her goals which aids in his/her successful promotion to the level of Associate Professor. The mentor works closely with the new faculty member to assure he/she has an explicit understanding of the process to be successfully promoted and, as appropriate, tenured. The candidate is expected to be successful in:

- Developing sustainable, external funding in a primary research area and demonstration of strong potential for developing a secondary research area.
- Publishing in his/her primary area and if possible in a secondary research area in peer reviewed journals appropriate to his/her areas of interest.

- Financially supporting and mentoring graduate students at the MS and Ph.D. levels.
- Successfully, teaching three courses per year as agreed upon by the faculty within his/her area of interest and as assigned by the Department Chair. (Note: teaching requirements may not apply to Research Faculty)
- Effectively advising undergraduate students assigned to the faculty member by the Department Chair. (Note: may not apply to Research Faculty)
- Developing new course(s) explicitly within his/her area(s) of expertise. (Note: may not apply to Research Faculty)
- Obtaining PE Licensure within a reasonable period of time after being appointed (Note: may be waived in cases where faculty are not eligible to sit for the PE exam).
- Serving at the Department, College and/or University levels as assigned by the Department Chair.

B. Research Assistant to Research Associate Professor

The basis for the expectations of Research Assistant Professors is well defined in his/her employment appointment letter. His/her areas of interest are explicitly defined and appropriate statements are made relative to what is expected in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service. In almost all cases, excellence in Scholarship is the primary focus and expectation of the research faculty member. For promotion, a Research Assistant Professor must be able to show how his or her work collectively has led, or is likely to lead to the advancement of science and engineering knowledge in their discipline. The candidate must demonstrate that they are on a course for national leadership in their discipline. They will have secured peer-reviewed, federal and other sources of funding for research in a Principal Investigator role. Scholarship expectations related to peer reviewed publications and graduate student mentoring and support should be comparable to those defined for tenure track faculty at the same rank. The candidate is expected to contribute to the attainment of the strategic planning objectives and the collective mission of the department. A willingness to participate in teaching and service activities as requested by the Department Chairperson will be included in the evaluation where appropriate.

C. Associate to Full Professor

Full Professor is the highest academic rank, therefore, recommendations for promotion to this rank must be in keeping with that distinction. Particular attention is to be paid to the candidate's professional stature, achievements and contributions, both within the University of New Hampshire and in the academic community at large. In addition, the logical programmatic development of the Department's strategic plan is critically considered in the promotion of faculty. The Department's strategic plan identifies

expectations that faculty members will typically devote 45% of their time to teaching, 40% of their time to scholarship and 15% of their time to service.

The teaching record of the candidate is expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in educating students at the undergraduate and graduate levels consistent with the rank of Full Professor as documented by the items collected in the promotion package preparation (Section III.a.).

The scholarship record of the candidate is expected to demonstrate exemplary professional stature consistent with the rank of Full Professor as documented by the items collected in the promotion package preparation (Section III.b.).

The professional service record of the candidate within the University of New Hampshire and in the academic community at large is expected to be progressive throughout his/her career and consistent with the rank of Full Professor as documented by the items collected in the promotion package preparation (Section III.c.).

D. Research Associate to Research Full Professor

This rank is reserved only for those who have demonstrated sustained achievement and outstanding work. Candidates must have obtained national recognition for their research. They will have secured peer-reviewed, federal or other funding for research as senior, principal investigator. Scholarship expectations related to peer reviewed publications and graduate student mentoring and support should be comparable to those defined for tenure track faculty at the same rank. The candidate is expected to contribute to attainment of the strategic planning objectives and the collective mission of the department. A willingness to participate in teaching and service activities as requested by the Department Chairperson will be included in the evaluation where appropriate.

Appendix

Format for CEE Department P&T Curriculum Vitae

{This CV is to be completed by the candidate prior to the beginning of the P&T external review process (June 1st of the year the candidate is going up for consideration of P&T and not modified thereafter – if provided on an electronic “cloud” site, care will be taken by the Department Chair to insure that the site is read only and not continuously updating revisions to the CV or any other files on that P&T site.)}

Appropriate Header

Name

Title

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of New Hampshire

Durham, NH 03824

{telephone numbers}

{email address}

{website}

1. PERSONAL INFORMATION

A. Educational Background

B. Employment History

C. Professional Registration

2. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Articles in Refereed Journals (UNH student co-authors underlined)

i. Refereed Journal Articles

{Articles in this section must be published and must show full citation of Date, Name of Journal, Volume Number, page numbers. If online publication and open access also please provide link to the article}

ii. Refereed Journal Articles in Review

{Articles in this section must be clearly marked with date submitted, status of review and if the article has been declined please show the date articles was declined and the date it was revised and resubmitted}

iii. The candidate in consultation with her/his mentor(s) should provide some measure of publication effectiveness. As a default the traditional approach of using numbers of citations and the journal impact factors as well as the h-index can be used. Other approaches such as “altmetrics” can also be used as long as the objective of allowing case reviewers to see a candidate’s progress over time is accomplished.

B. Conference Proceedings (UNH co-authors are underlined)

i. Refereed Conference Proceedings

{Articles in this section should indicate in parentheses after the citation the number of peer reviewers and whether they were written or verbal reviews – e.g., (1V),

(2W), (3W) etc.}

- ii. Non-Refereed Conference Proceedings (UNH student co-authors underlined)

C. Monographs, Books, Book Chapters and Reports (UNH student co-authors underlined)

D. Professional Presentations

- i. Invited Seminar Presentations (underline if designated as a keynote)

- ii. Other Presentations (underline if based on an accepted abstract)

E. Grants and Contracts {(a concise detailed table is desirable for each section)}

{All entries in this section should show, personnel and role (e.g., PI), sponsor, title, grant total, share for each key grant person, duration of grant}

- i. Pending {these entries should show expected date of decision and whether or not this grant or contract was a resubmittal or one that had been declined}

- ii. Current

- iii. Completed

F. Honors and Awards

{Include name of honor or award, source or sponsor, date or duration of honor or award}

3. TEACHING AND MENTORING

A. Courses Taught {a concise detailed table is desirable for each section showing course number, course title, years taught, term taught, credits, student enrollment and overall instructor rating and explanation of the number scale (e.g. 1-5 with 5 being best)}

- i. University of New Hampshire

- ii. Other Institutions

B. Development of New Courses or Curriculum Revision

C. Mentoring of Graduate Students {a concise detailed table is desirable for each section}

- i. PhD Students

{Include name of student, dissertation topic, funding source(s), duration of mentoring, current status of student and/or year of graduation. If the student is inactive meaning

they are not enrolled at UNH (graduate continuing education status fee) and the potential for degree completion is uncertain indicate that they are inactive}

ii. MS Students (thesis option)

{Include name of student, thesis topic, funding source(s), duration of mentoring, current status of student and/or year of graduation. If the student is inactive meaning they are not enrolled at UNH (graduate continuing education status fee) and the potential for degree completion is uncertain indicate that they are inactive}

iii. MEng Students (non-thesis option)

{Include name of student,culminating experience topic, duration of mentoring, current status of student and/or year of graduation. If the student is inactive meaning they are not enrolled at UNH (graduate continuing education status fee) and the potential for degree completion is uncertain indicate that they are inactive}

D. Other Graduate Mentoring {a concise detailed table is desirable}

{Include MS thesis committees, PhD examining committees and PhD dissertation committees served upon, name of student, role and duration of mentoring, research topic, current status of student and/or year of graduation.}

E. Non-graduate Student Research Mentoring

i. Undergraduates {Include name of student, undergraduate institution, research topic, funding source(s) if applicable, duration of mentoring, current status of student and/or year of graduation. Indicate if student plans to go on to graduate studies at UNH or elsewhere.}

ii. High School Students {Include name of student, undergraduate institution, research topic, funding source(s) if applicable, duration of mentoring, current status of student and/or year of graduation. Indicate if student plans to go on to undergraduate studies at UNH or elsewhere.}

4. SERVICE

A. Professional

i. Committees {Include professional committees served upon, role on the committee, duration of service on the committee, key contributions to the profession made by the committee (e.g., organized conference, produced key manual of practice, etc.)}

ii. Peer Reviewer Activities {Include names of journals and number of articles reviewed for each journal, name of sponsor and number of proposals reviewed for the sponsor, other peer review activities such as conference technical proceedings, etc.}

B. Academic

i. University {Include service activity name, role, duration of service any key products produced e.g., senate report on course evaluation revisions.}

ii. College {Include service activity name, role, duration of service any key products produced e.g., update of college rules and bylaws.}

iii. Department {Include service activity name, role, duration of service any key products produced e.g., provided faculty meeting minutes.}

5. ADDITIONAL NOTEWORTHY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES {Include items which are felt to be important in scholarship, teaching and/or service but do not seem to fit elsewhere such as being featured on NPR or in the NY Times or key webinars presented for ASCE, etc.}

{Include an ending certification statement, your signature and the date}

I certify that this curriculum vitae is a current and accurate statement of my professional record.

Signature:

Date: