

### General Mistakes

- Completely ignoring format guidelines
- Exceeding page limits
- Listing old awards from prior evaluation periods

### Publications

- Not clearly indicating dates
- Listing publications dated outside of the evaluation period (calendar years 2014 and 2015 in this case). Including publications which came out too late to be included in your last review is acceptable, but state they were not included last time. If a publication was listed as “in press” in your previous review but has a publication date that fits in the current review period, state that the publication was included in your previous review.
- Not clearly differentiating published, accepted/in press, or submitted. Do not list publications in preparation but not actually submitted.
- Using “et. al” on author listing (we want to know with whom you are working)
- Listing publications as “referred.” This has a different meaning than “refereed” which distinguishes a publication as externally peer-reviewed and accepted by an outlet which doesn’t publish everything submitted to it.

### Grants

- Not listing agency or funding source
- Not indicating your role clearly (PI, co-PI, collaborator)
- Not indicating funding dates
- Listing a grant as nationally competitive when it is not
- Listing agency as USDA-NIFA, rather than identifying granting program (NRI, Special Grants, etc.)
- Failing to indicate total funding amount and/or amount you received as a co-investigator

### Narrative

- Excessive focus on philosophy at the expense of summarizing impact and significance of achievements
- Lack of prioritization of impacts within narrative. Major points are lost or missed.
- No narrative at all

### Teaching Portfolio

- Not putting your name at the top of the Teaching Portfolio
- Not listing teaching evaluations clearly

As a final issue, DOE areas less than 3% are difficult to evaluate meaningfully. In most cases contributions in such areas will be more of an asset in your evaluation if they are included as contributions within your major areas of effort, and not negotiated with your chair as a very small DOE assignment.

For example, a small number of lectures in a graduate class can be claimed as a part of your research activities (where it will be a positive in your major area of DOE), rather than claiming 1% instruction DOE for this (where the evaluation will have essentially no impact on your overall evaluation).