



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, September 19, 2008, 1:00 p.m.

Donaghey Student Center A & B

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Chadwick, Clausen, Eshleman, Estes, Giammo, Martin, Ramsey, Vinikas, Webb, Yoder. CB— Brice, , Edison, Nickels, Watts. CE— Garner, Handre, Hayn, Lindsay. CEIT— Chan, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh. LIBRARY— Pine. CPS— Collier-Tenison, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Kosmatov, McMillan, Prince, Sims, Tarasenko, Wiscaver. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Ford, Williams, Davis, Lyn-Cook.

Absent: CAHSS— Bunch, Levernier. CB— Holland. CE— Pack. CEIT — Jovanovich, Patangia. LAW— Foster. CPS— Robinson. CSM—Perkins, Yanoviak.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Ford declared it to be 1:00 p.m. and called the meeting to order. He welcomed the Senate, and particularly newly elected senators, to the first meeting of academic year 2008-09. In lieu of the usual roll call by the secretary, Ford asked that each senator introduce himself or herself, name the college represented, and say how long she or he has served in the body.

II. Orientation

Past Assembly President Fred Williams gave a very brief history of the University Assembly and the Faculty Senate.

Williams reviewed the Senate's rules of order, and suggested that members take a look at the Faculty Handbook, since most of these procedural matters are set out there. Acknowledging the size of the body and the number of new members, Williams asked that we observe the tradition of standing and giving your name when you address the body. Williams spoke of how motions and information items get on the agenda: by submitting them to the executive committee in sufficient time for the committee to send a completed agenda out seven days in advance of a Senate meeting. He clarified the matter of elected alternates: they cannot simply stand in for a senator who must miss a meeting, but rather are there to step in should a senator be unable to serve. He described the difference between "move the question," a motion, requiring a second, to end debate that is itself not debatable, and "call the

question,” an indication a member thinks debate has proceeded long enough, that may be recognized informally by the chair’s asking the body if it is ready to vote.

Williams also named the Faculty’s areas of primary responsibility, reminding the Senate that any action initiated elsewhere in regard to these areas must be approved here, as well. He also reminded the body that the University Assembly remains the final authority on these questions.

III. Election of Senate officers

President Ford, before beginning the election, called the Senate’s attention to “The List” of committees and councils of the Assembly and Senate available. He asked senators to review it, and to see if there are any empty slots either designated for their colleges or for which there is someone in the senator college who would like to serve, please be in touch with Ford.

Ford reminded the Senate of the composition of the executive committee: president of the Assembly and the Senate (elected by the Assembly); immediate past president of the Assembly and Senate; vice-president, secretary, and parliamentarian (elected by the Senate from among their number); documents officer (appointed by the executive committee to its service); and the provost (ex officio). He underscored the amount of work required of the executives committee, who have for the past several years met weekly to tend to the Senate’s business and make sure it’s moving along between meetings.

Lindsay nominated Early Ramsey for the office of vice president. **Moved Watts, seconded Tschumi, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

Robertson nominated Laura Smith-Olinde for the office of parliamentarian. **Moved Watts, seconded Tschumi, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

Rhodes nominated Judith Faust for the office of secretary. **Aiyetoro moved, Tschumi seconded, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

IV. Review of minutes

Ford explained that he will, in the absence of objection from the body, postpone consideration of the minutes of the last meeting until we later take up the matter of the motion from the Tenure Committee. The extensive coverage in the minutes of line-by-line formal and friendly amendments to and failed efforts to amend that motion suggests that it would be wise to consider the minutes in close proximity to our consideration of the old business of tenure-and-promotions policy. There was no objection from the body.

V. Announcements

Ford reminded the Senate that the public phase of the comprehensive campaign has begun, and that members of the campaign committee will be coming around to the colleges soliciting participation. He encouraged senators to promote such participation, since our own giving is an important factor in being successful with other prospective donors.

Ford also brought up the motion passed in the spring in regard to midterm grades. He distributed a copy of the motion as passed. He said there have been misinterpretations of the content, and he encouraged senators to read it with care. He said that if there are differing interpretations, the Senate—as always—has the right to interpret its own legislation.

Anson said he had heard many different accounts of what was passed, and asked the chair for his interpretation of the sentence. Some present believed we had not passed a requirement for midterm grades at all. Robertson, Tschumi, and others said their memories matched the account in the minutes. The president suggested we hold this discussion until the postponed review and approval of the minutes.

VI. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor greeted the Senate in its first meeting of the academic year.

He began with a comment on the T & P document, praising the work so far in the committee and in this body. He hopes we'll get done today, and reminded us that it doesn't stop here: it comes to him, and ultimately must pass muster with the president of the System.

He had a meeting recently with the Senate's executive committee to talk about a number of things, including his request that the Senate move forward with developing a simple and straightforward statement on civility in the classroom.

He gave big thanks to everyone who participated in the kick-off of the Campus Campaign. We are, he said, approaching \$51M on a \$75M campaign. His announcement that 47% of the people who work here have already contributed drew great applause, and he seconded the president's assertion that the level of faculty and staff participation is an important factor in our ability to raise money from others in the community.

The chancellor stressed once again the value and importance of the *Access to Success* report. The more of us there are on campus who understand the state perspective on these issues, the better position we're in to accomplish what we want to accomplish. He read the paragraph about reaching the SREB average of citizens holding bachelor's degrees. Each of the next six years, we'd need significant increases in our production of graduates with bachelor's degrees to reach that benchmark. He thinks the efforts we're currently putting into retention and the pilot project on transfer of credit will be strategies that pay off well for us. Some of the recommendations in the report will be strong medicine for us and other schools in the state, but he believes they will be good medicine.

On the budget front, there is bad news and good news. He feels no need to comment on the turmoil and challenges of the national economy. At the state level, we started \$2M down from what we thought we'd have because of a take-back directed by the governor. The governor has also asked that all state agencies develop three budget proposals: one with a modest increase, one level, and one reflecting a seven percent reduction.

The outcome is not clear; there are a number of things in play out there, and most merit a conflicted reaction. A grocery tax reduction is a case in point. There are three cents remaining, and we don't know what the governor will do, but imagine he will do something. We'd all like to see that tax fall to zero, but with it will go significant state revenue in uncertain times.

Enrollment is down 146 students, though it is still over the 12,000 mark. With our new enrollment standards, we deferred more than 300 students, which means we're down about \$400K in tuition for the fall, but the loss is acceptable. Health insurance, however, is a bleaker picture. We have an \$8M deficit in the System, and there will most certainly be increases in premiums, copays, deductibles, some of the above, or all of the above. He will be surprised if dealing with this were postponed until July. January is more likely.

The good news is that state revenues are holding up better than expected. One possible explanation is that the Fayetteville shale activity is paying off, and if it is, we can expect it to persist for some while. Another factor frequently cited

is the historic experience of Arkansas lagging the nation in economic downtowns: we go in later and we come out later.

The chancellor concluded with what he hopes are appropriately encouraging words: we're not going to progress in some areas as fast as we'd like to—might not be able to buy some things we want, could face a hiring freeze—but none of these are things we haven't dealt with before, and we're moving on toward our goals. He urged us to remember UALR is here for the long haul, doing the good work that is both our place and our pleasure to do.

Q from Ramsey: Will there be any chance for this body to deliberate what might happen in connection with insurance? *A:* Don't know, given that this is a Systemwide issue. He hopes it would be the case, and did observe that we have good representation on the System fringe benefits committee in the person of Professor Emeritus Doug Buffalo.

B. Provost Belcher

The provost congratulated the new officers, especially the "wise president."

He saluted the work of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Senate as a whole. He underscored the process of approval, and wanted to be sure senators understand there's virtually no likelihood that this document could become policy this academic year.

He observed that all our plates were full to overflowing before we even looked outside our own borders, yet there are two issues of real concern to us in *Access to Success: The Final Report of the Arkansas Task Force on Higher Education*. One is the standards for degree production. Current standards are three graduates per year averaged over five years in bachelor's degree programs, two in master's programs, and one in doctoral programs. The task force's proposed standards are an average of six undergraduate, four graduate, and two doctoral degrees' over three, not five, years. Belcher pointed out that it's tough to apply such a policy to the idiosyncratic range of degree programs we offer. Cognate programs are an example; a proposal might be something like defining cognate as sharing seventy percent of content. It looks like we could count embedded certificates and degrees both as completions as long as we don't count the same graduate twice. There are also issues about consortial doctoral programs, and new degree programs. The task force recommendations will be voted on in mid-October. If they pass, all schools will have about two years to get their houses in order. Those who don't meet the standards by June 2010 will have another two years of "probationary" period. The hidden stick is that as of 2010, ADHE will withhold SSCH credit from programs that don't meet the standard when the schools forward information for funding allocations.

How are we currently doing? The provost has asked Jim Lynch to study our performance. Our programs not already meeting the proposed standards seem to fall into three categories: brand new programs, a second set of programs extremely close to meeting the standards, and a small list of programs that will be challenged to meet the productivity standards. This may spark some new and creative work, and that's his hope. He will report to the Senate on this matter again in October.

A second issue in the *Access to Success* report is a provision regarding program review. If it passes, there will be a new pattern. Those with national external accreditation will continue to use it as program review, but every nonaccredited program must have a self-study every seven to ten years (our

choice), and employ at least two out-of-state reviewers who will prepare and send a report to ADHE a report. We don't yet know how we'll fund these external reviewers, but the process looks basically healthy to us.

Q from Eshleman: Will there be designated delays for new programs before the number-of-graduates standard kicks in? *A:* Yes, there will be grace periods set, but we don't know what they'll be.

Q from Ramsey: Any possibility of linking these two initiatives together, so that we could use the program review process to help support programs that might not meet the degree-productivity standards? *A:* There has been a suggestion of an appeal process, about which Dr. Purcell is not excited, so it might be possible.

Q from Robertson: About interdisciplinary degree programs, which often are administered very cost-effectively, he's concerned that the new numbers might cost us valuable programs. *A:* Our colleagues at Fayetteville have raised this issue, and we all realize how complex the discussion really is, and ultimately, the devil's in the details, and the details still need work .

C. Reports of Standing Committees

Ford noted that there will be reports from the Councils at each Senate meeting until we have worked out effective, timely, and consistent ways to communicate their work to the faculty.

1. Graduate Council, Anne Lindsay, Chair

Lindsay summarized the Graduate Council's charge for the Senate. She asked for communication from senators about what they'd like to hear the Council report to the Senate.

The council has received three charges from Ford: to propose communication procedures between the Council and the Senate and communication to the faculty as a whole, to review jurisdiction in general, and to review working processes to streamline them where possible and to be able to communicate those procedures clearly to newcomers, for example.

She again invited communication: aclindsay@ualr.edu.

2. Undergraduate Council. Jeanette Clausen, Chair

Clausen said Lindsay just gave her report: Ford brought Undergraduate Council basically the same three charges. She added they're pretty clear they'd like to be able to do good work with fewer meetings. They're already about the business of considering these issues of communication, jurisdiction, and procedural streamlining.

Clausen invited the same feedback from senators to her about what they'd like to have regularly reported on: jxclausen@ualr.edu.

3. Academic Calendar and Scheduling Committee, Amy Oliver Barnes, Chair.

Barnes noted that all the slots on the committee weren't filled until just this week, so she apologized for springing this on them before a first meeting. She said the executive committee has asked the committee to bring forward templates for the scheduling of final exams, in the hope that administrative staff can set up the schedules easily and accurately every semester. She

thanked Rosalie Cheatham for her work in putting the templates together, and said she hoped they'd be presented to this body for approval next month.

The committee's also been asked to consider how online courses might affect and be affected by our policies about finals.

Late registration is an issue on their agenda for discussion, and they've been asked to consider general scheduling of time blocks for classes, examining for example the possibility of classes being scheduled for only four weekdays.

Q: Does your committee control the way the finals schedule is presented online? A: No. Records and Registration handles that. Eshleman observed that the current format is very difficult for students to read. Barnes agreed, and said perhaps the committee could communicate.

Nickels noted changes in the final schedule between the draft and the version on the web. Barnes said there had been an error, apparently, in the transfer of information about the final schedule, and the wrong information was posted. We caught it, she said, and got it corrected. Ford spoke to trying not to make a major campus to-do about it; the errors only affected about fifty classes, and those professors will get personal notification of the change.

IV. Review of minutes (previously postponed)

Moved Nickels, seconded Tschumi, to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2008. Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

V. Old Business

- A. MOTION. The Tenure and Promotion Committee's motion, beginning with Section 2.

President Ford, in remarks preliminary to discussion of the motion, reminded the Senate that in our extended meeting of April 18 (and April 25, May 2, and May 9), 2008, the Senate went line by line through Section 1 of the Tenure Committee's motion, and passed it with the amendments noted in the minutes. Because of the important of the topic and the sheer volume of discussion and amendments, formal, friendly, and failed, Ford asked the secretary over the summer to incorporate the amendments captured in the minutes into the original document, so we could have a pulled-together draft amended version (pending the approval of the minutes, of course). He then appointed an ad hoc "Purple Bow Panel" (thereby avoiding the stuffiness of a "Blue Ribbon Panel" to vet the draft against the minute record, and spot any errors, contradictions, or other matters that might need attention.

The Purple Bow Panel was comprised of Ed Anson, Charlie Bolton, Jane Brown, Rosalie Cheatham, Andrew Eshleman, Judith Faust, Gary Geissler, Linda Holzer, Earl Ramsey, Pete Tschumi, Fred Williams, and Andrew Wright. Ford thanked them heartily for their help.

Ford asked Holzer and Brown to come forward and sit at the Senate table for the discussion.

There was considerable discussion of whether the document before the Senate had incorporated changes recommended by members of the Purple Bow Panel. The secretary, who had been the recipient of all comments and who

developed the draft with amendments incorporated, said the Panel had found errors in the secretary's transcription of the content of the minutes to the new draft, such as the repetition of a subsection, and mistakes in numbering. She did incorporate those editorial corrections. Members of the panel had also recognized an unresolved issue, and noted what might be internal inconsistencies, but no such changes were made in the document—the comments are merely noted in the draft.

Fitzhugh said the law school wishes the phrase “law reviews and journals” to be added on p. 19, and to the fifth line of the first full paragraph on p. 20, since the current language might otherwise be construed as ruling out those publications as acceptable. **The Tenure Committee accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Robertson moved, Ramsey seconded, the approval of Section 2, as amended, to include the changes requested by law faculty.

In discussion, Clausen asked about the reference to “applicant” in the first paragraph in section VII, and clarification was offered that the committee had agreed that the term “applicant” should be used consistently throughout the document.

Robertson moved, Vinikas seconded, the question. Motion carried. The main motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

Ford requested from the secretary a clean version of the motion as passed

Chin asked if a clean copy could also be sent to department chairs, since so many are revisiting their governance documents. Ford explained that while a clean copy will certainly be available on the Senate web site, the document does not represent policy; it is a recommendation to the chancellor, who must approve it, and will ultimately require approval at the University System level as well.

Robertson, concerned that such a process might turn into a long one, asserted that we need to move with speed rather than extended deliberation. He asked that we urge the administration to move quickly. He said his college has structures that need to change in order to follow the direction set out by this policy, and that waiting years is unacceptable.

Ramsey expressed some concern at yet another example of agreeing with Robertson, but he too believes administration needs to move this matter expeditiously.

Ford says he will transmit the approved motion to the chancellor ten working days from now, and hopes we'll have response from the chancellor this semester.

Ramsey asked that Ford commend as strongly as possible to the chancellor that he acknowledge their concern about moving forward with improvements to the University's policies on tenure and promotion.

Watts expressed some concern about how rapidly we moved through the remainder of the T & P motion. He admitted to not having read section 2 of the document with care, and said he's missing Sen. Jovanovich's presence and careful attention to detail. Bennie Prince, a member of the committee, noted that Jovanovich was here in spirit, since he reviewed every word of the document and sent his detailed comments to the committee.

Anson raised a point he believes remains essentially unclear in the document we approved. Ford asked that if senators have such concerns, they write them out and bring them to the attention of the chancellor and/or provost.

VII. Open Forum

Tschumi asked that the Senate recognize the good work of the secretary, saying very kindly that recruiting her to the executive committee sometimes seems like the most useful thing he did during his term as president. The secretary was abashed and pleased by the vigorous round of applause given her by her colleagues.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

Judith Faust, Secretary

*Tenure Committee's Motion
as Passed by the Faculty Senate, 19 September 08*

Proposed UALR Promotion and Tenure Requirements and Guidelines

The Faculty Senate proposes that the following be included in the UALR Faculty Handbook, under the heading in Section 6, "UALR Criteria and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, and Awarding of Tenure" beginning with III (Roman numeral III under that heading), and replacing the current handbook text at III and IV with the following:

Section 1

The University Committee on Tenure proposes the following Promotion and Tenure Policy, Criteria, Procedures, and Documentation:

III. Policy Statement for Promotion and Awarding of Tenure

- A. The procedures to achieve the ultimate objectives of promotion and tenure policies at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock require:
 - 1. that standards be set for faculty demanding high performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - 2. substantive processes in the faculty and administrative review for promotion and tenure.
- B. The university must establish and maintain high standards of instruction, scholarly discovery, artistic activity, professional service and community outreach, and (in the case of faculty members with nonteaching appointments) professional performance, and promote and tenure only those faculty *members* who meet these criteria.
- C. Tenure requires documented evidence of sustained achievement, as well as evidence of potential for sustained future accomplishment over an entire career.
- D. Promotion in rank is based upon merit. In as much as it is incumbent upon departments to determine what activities and accomplishments constitute satisfactory service in rank, it is expected that promotion to a higher rank requires qualifications or performance of the activities

and accomplishments identified by the department significantly above those required at the applicant's current rank as well as evidence of potential for continued achievement.

- E. The procedure for recommending promotion and tenure begins at the department level [in accordance with Board Policy 405.1, Sections III and IV.A.]. Each department shall establish its own procedure for reviewing promotion or tenure applications to be approved through administrative channels. This procedure must include participation by tenured faculty other than administrators (department chairs, directors, deans, etc.) in the recommendation process.
- F. The evaluation of each promotion and/or tenure application shall be made in relation to written guidelines for performance/achievement as established by the department and approved through administrative channels.
- G. The drafting of departmental or school documents must follow the guidelines established in college, university, and system documents and be consistent with state laws, UA Board policies, and university policies. When there is a conflict, the higher level policy will be enforced.

Whenever a substantive change in a higher level policy occurs or whenever a change in university, college, school, or academic unit mission occurs, the lower level document(s) governing promotion and tenure must be modified to address the change in a reasonable time by an appropriate faculty process, consistent with the administrative approval defined in Board Policy 405.1 section III (promotion) and section IV. A. 6 (tenure). If no changes in college, school, or academic unit criteria, policies, and procedures have occurred within seven years, a mandatory review by the faculty of the college, school, or academic unit is required. The college Dean will be responsible for notifying college faculty or academic units of such changes and expediting the process to address the changes.
- H. The evaluation of applicants shall be performed by a faculty and administrative process at the department, college, and university levels.

[See note following section K., below, on a matter of concern to the Senate regarding sections I. and K.]

- I. According to Board Policy 405.1 IV. A. 4, the probationary period may not extend beyond seven years, except as specifically provided herein. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period.

- J. The process shall allow for faculty application for tenure prior to the end of the probationary period as well as mandatory review if earlier application has not occurred.
- K. During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request, for reasons set forth below, that the probationary period be suspended by one (1) year. The reasons for such a request are the same as required under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and are as follows:
 - (a) the birth of a child to the faculty member or his spouse and its care during the first year; (b) the adoption of a child by the faculty member or placement in the faculty member's home of a foster child; (c) the care of the faculty member's spouse, child, or parent with a serious health condition; (d) the serious health condition of the faculty member. A request to suspend the probationary period for these reasons shall first be directed in writing to the department chair for approval and must also be approved by the dean (or approved through other established administrative channels), the vice chancellor for academic affairs, the chancellor, and the president.

[The following is an excerpt from the minutes of the Senate:

Friendly amendment proposed by Nickels to add to III.I the sentence "The university will comply with the FMLA of 1993," and to delete Section K. Not accepted by the Tenure Committee.

Robertson reminded the Senate about our capacity to make a record in these minutes of our concerns which will accompany our recommendations to the chancellor about tenure and promotions policy.

*Robertson moved, Ramsey seconded, that it is the sense of the Senate that there is concern about the language in section III.K. **Motion carried on voice vote.***

Note should be made of this matter either by the chancellor when the action moves forward, or by the Tenure Committee's seeking Senate approval of a resolution to the concern.]

- L. The applicant shall be informed in writing of progress throughout the formal application procedure. At each stage of review, documentation of the outcome of the review, including the reasons for a positive or negative recommendation, shall be provided.
- M. The applicant retains the rights of appeal, without fear of retaliation for exercising those rights. At the same time, the review process protects the confidentiality of both faculty and administrators who participate so that the evaluation process can be as thorough and incisive as possible.
- N. Tenure may *also* be denied because of the following conduct:

(a) incompetence in those areas of endeavor required for earning tenure; (b) neglect of duty (failure/refusal to perform duties appropriate to his or her assignment); (c) intellectual dishonesty (plagiarism and theft of other's intellectual property; falsification of research; falsification of documentation concerning grant and other funds, or misappropriation of grant and other funds); (d) criminal behavior involving moral turpitude; or (e) consistent, egregious, and offensive behavior in job-related activity not sanctioned by academic freedom or other legal rights that reflects negatively and substantially on the reputation of the university.

- O. The rules and standards regarding promotion and/or tenure decisions shall permit and encourage faculty members to develop and express different ideas and divergent views. Mere expressions of opinions, however strongly expressed, however controversial such opinions may be, shall not constitute cause for denial of promotion and tenure. Similarly, decisions on promotion and tenure shall not be based on other inappropriate factors such as life-style, philosophical and/or political and/or religious belief, and expression of views. Disagreement is essential for intellectual, academic, and social growth; however, the fair exchange of ideas must involve respectful stating and consideration of multiple points of view.

IV. Criteria for Promotion and Awarding of Tenure

- A. Each department/school ("department") shall set its own specific written, substantive criteria for tenure and/or promotion; however all departmental policies must meet the following objectives and requirements.¹
1. Departmental, college, university and system-wide written criteria for promotion and tenure decisions shall be presented to the faculty member at the beginning of the employment.
 2. In the event of a mission change for any of these units, notice must be given in writing to the probationary applicant of a change in any of the criteria. An applicant is subject to the written criteria in effect at the time of hire unless the application for tenure includes a written request to be evaluated according to newer approved criteria. Regardless, the applicable written criteria shall be included in the application.
 3. These written criteria shall constitute the ~~sole~~ *primary* criteria for promotion and tenure that shall be applied by all persons

¹ "Criteria" are the professional activities on which the evaluations are based.

in the process. Unwritten “criteria” shall not be considered in evaluating promotion and/or tenure.

4. Although there should be balance in teaching, scholarship, and service, not all faculty members will contribute equally in each area due to personal strengths, opportunities, ~~or~~ the stage of their career, or the nature of their appointment. All probationary faculty members must strive for some achievements across the three categories; however, tenured faculty may choose to emphasize a given area at different stages of their careers with the approval of a chair or director and dean. A faculty member with a non-teaching appointment or an appointment with diminished teaching duties shall be judged according to *the relevant* measures of professional performance.

The university recognizes that the arc of an academic career must be viewed with a long lens. An Assistant Professor who is preparing for tenure review will normally focus on teaching and scholarship. An Associate Professor in mid-career may devote more time to service—both to the community and professional organizations. A Professor, late in a career, may shift focus from scholarship to administration or mentoring young faculty. While the university wishes to nurture the careers of individual faculty, it also recognizes that the faculty must develop within a department, college, and discipline. As faculty members develop their careers, they must also contribute to the UALR community.

The university also realizes that the contributions of individual faculty members to the mission of the university will vary depending on the faculty member’s talents, the needs of departments and colleges, and the character of diverse academic disciplines. Faculty members, thus, need to negotiate responsibilities—teaching loads, scholarship agenda, and service commitments—with the chairs or directors. It is the responsibility of chairs and directors to mediate the needs of departments with the university mission and trends in disciplines.

5. Detailed and specific evidence of teaching effectiveness (or professional performance for faculty members with non-teaching appointments) shall be included in the dossiers of faculty members being recommended for promotion or tenure.
6. Student evaluations, if considered, shall not serve as the sole measure of teaching quality.

7. Academic units are responsible for evaluating teaching effectiveness in on-line courses and team-taught courses.
8. Teaching performance shall be evaluated no less than each year according to the department's plan. Teaching in the first year shall not be weighed as heavily as in subsequent years.
9. Scholarship or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty at UALR, as well as all research faculty members.
10. In those fields in which scholarly research is primarily comprised of publication in journals, the quality of the journal shall be considered in evaluating scholarship.
11. Upon employment, faculty shall be informed in writing of the relative importance of the various possible and feasible research/creative activities to the determination of promotion and/or tenure decisions. While departments may take various approaches to research and scholarly activity, such latitude is not designed to supplant the requirement.

11. As a metropolitan university, UALR has greater expectations of its faculty in the area of service than many other universities. Faculty members are expected to be active in one or more areas—service to the university, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Department of Art 6/24/08 1:53 PM
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

12. Departments or schools shall develop criteria that allow all faculty members performing at a high level to be rewarded for their accomplishments.

Department of Art 6/24/08 1:53 PM
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

V. Procedures for Promotion and Awarding of Tenure

- A. At the time of hire, notice of appointment shall have in writing such issues as the possibility of early decision, rank, and other understandings for the individual appointed.
- B. A mid-tenure review by the departmental promotion and tenure review committee (DRC), the department chair or director (or dean, if the college does not have a department structure), and the dean shall be mandatory. The mid-tenure review shall be completed before May 15 and communicated to the faculty member. Failure to conduct the review shall be grounds for appeal from a negative tenure decision.

- C. The applicant shall submit a dossier of professional activities to the chair of the departmental (or college if there is no departmental structure in the college) review committee.

- D. Departmental Review Committee (DRC)

All academic units shall have a department-level promotion and tenure review committee (DRC). It is imperative that a DRC have at least half its membership from its own academic unit faculty. If there are only one or two tenured faculty members within the academic unit eligible to serve on the DRC (see section V. I), then only one outside member shall be selected. Otherwise, the DRC shall have a minimum of three members. In the event that there are insufficient qualified faculty members to serve on a DRC, the academic unit governance process should define a mechanism for replacement. If there is no mechanism for replacement, the academic unit faculty, in consultation with the academic unit chair, will provide the college Dean with a list of at least four names, from which the college Dean will select the remaining members. If possible, the chair of the DRC must be a member of the academic unit.

- E. College Review Committee (CRC)

A college or school may develop written criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion and tenure through its governance structure. Such criteria may include a college-level promotion and tenure review committee (CRC), which will advise the college Dean on recommendations about reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure. Such a committee must have a minimum of three members, each of which must represent a different academic unit within the college. If the college procedures provide for more committee members than the college has academic units, any academic unit may have more than one representative. The CRC shall elect its chair from its members. In the event that there are insufficient, qualified faculty members (see section V. I) to serve on a CRC, the college or school governance process should define a mechanism for replacement. If there is not mechanism for replacement, the college or school faculty will provide the college Dean with a list of at least four names, from which the college Dean will select the remaining members.

Colleges shall have procedures ensuring that a faculty member abstain from vote on a CRC if a candidate from his or her own academic unit is undergoing review and the faculty member on the CRC has served on the DRC in reviewing or providing recommendations about non-reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure for the candidate. No faculty member may vote in the same case as a member of both the DRC and the CRC.

- F. Eligibility to serve on promotion and tenure review.

Only tenured faculty members and administrators who hold tenure shall serve on a DRC or CRC in the tenure review process. Only faculty who hold a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the applicant shall participate in the

promotion review process. No administrator, such as an academic unit chair, academic unit director, college dean, associate dean, or assistant dean, may serve on a DRC or CRC in reviewing any case for which he or she has or had responsibility for participating in administrative review within a given academic year.

And this excerpt from the Senate minutes notes another point that may need attention:

“One issue remained unresolved since it was not specifically contemplated by the Tenure Committee in their original document: it is not clear whether someone who was an administrator participating in an administrative review and later steps down could participate as a faculty member on either DRCs or CRCs once she or he had stepped down.”

- G. The department (or college if there is no departmental structure in the college) review committee will forward the original recommendation to the applicant and department chair or director (or dean). The chair (or dean) shall not be involved in any of the deliberations of the committee prior to the forwarding of this recommendation.
- H. All levels of committees that act on promotion or tenure shall report the decision (recommend or not recommend), which is then forwarded to the next level of review. The report shall include the names of the committee members, with a notation of who are absent for the decision or who are required to abstain from the vote.
- I. The applicant shall be provided with an outcome letter at each committee and administrative review level. If the outcome letter is negative, the administrator for the appropriate level of review shall meet with the faculty member to explain the faculty member's opportunity for rebuttal. (See **Documentation for Promotion and Awarding of Tenure** below.)
- J. Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members and administrators at every review level must assume personal responsibility to ensure that confidentiality is not violated.

VI. Documentation for Promotion and Awarding of Tenure

- A. Beginning at the date of employment, ~~both the faculty member and the~~ department chair or director (or college dean in the event that the college does not have a departmental structure, e.g., the William H. Bowen School of Law) shall maintain complete documentation for all aspects of that faculty member's promotion and/or tenure applications.

B. Documentation shall include, but not be limited to, letters of understanding at the time of hire; mid-tenure reviews; previous annual reviews; committee assignments and results; proposals written and grants received; published articles; and other scholarly/creative activities.

C. The applicant for review is responsible for compiling a complete and accurate dossier of his or her professional activities, according to the format specified by the department or college.

D. Report of the Department Review Committee (DRC):

An analysis of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses and the resulting recommendation shall be prepared by the Department Review Committee and addressed to the department chair or director (who will not serve on this committee), with a copy to the applicant. It shall indicate the decision of the committee on the recommendation and be signed by all members to indicate that they have reviewed the report. Significant minority opinions should be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as attachments to the report of the committee.

E. Recommendation of the Department Chair or Director:

An analysis of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses and the resulting recommendation shall be prepared by the department chair or director and addressed to the dean. If the recommendation is positive, a copy is given to the ~~candidate~~ *applicant* when it is forwarded to the dean. If it is negative, the department chair or director shall meet with the faculty member to provide the faculty member with a copy of the determination and its rationale, and to explain the faculty member's opportunity for rebuttal. Within ten days after this meeting, the faculty member may submit to the dean and the chair his or her written rebuttal to the chair's determination. Upon receipt of the faculty member's rebuttal, or at the end of ten days after the chair meets with the faculty member if the faculty member does not submit a rebuttal, the chair shall submit his or her determinations and rationales, together with the recommendations and rationales of the DRC, to the dean of the college.

F. Report of the College Review Committee (CRC):

An analysis of the ~~candidate's~~ *applicant's* strengths and weaknesses and the resulting recommendation shall be prepared by the College Review Committee and addressed to the dean (who will not serve on this committee), with a copy to the applicant. It shall indicate the decision of the committee on the recommendation and be signed by all members to indicate that they have reviewed the report. Significant minority opinions should be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may

be written and submitted as an attachment to the report of the committee.

G. Recommendation of the Dean:

An analysis of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses and the resulting recommendation shall be prepared by the dean and addressed to the provost. If the recommendation is positive, a copy is given to the applicant when it is forwarded to the provost. If the recommendation is negative, he or she shall meet with the faculty member to provide the faculty member with a copy of that determination and its rationale, and to explain the faculty member's right of rebuttal. Within ten days after this meeting, the faculty member may submit to the provost and the dean his or her written rebuttal to the dean's determination. Upon receipt of the faculty member's rebuttal, or at the end of ten days after the dean meets with the faculty member if the faculty member does not submit a rebuttal, the dean shall submit his or her determinations and rationales, together with the recommendations and rationales of the CRC and the DRC, the determinations and rationales of the department chair or director, and the faculty member's rebuttal(s), if any, to the provost.

H. Recommendations and Documentation Reviewed by the Provost:

Positive Recommendation. The documents submitted to the provost for review shall include the summary materials, including the applicant's completed application forms, the applicant's statement, curriculum vita, letters of evaluation (annual reviews, peer reviews, letters from external evaluators if appropriate) with the reports and recommendations of all prior review levels. The remainder of the applicant's dossier shall be retained in the dean's office for access by the provost or chancellor should they request it.

Negative Decisions. The entire dossier shall be submitted to the provost in cases where the recommendation of the dean is negative. This should include any rebuttal letters by the faculty member to the department chair or director, or the dean.

I. Recommendations and Documentation Reviewed by the Chancellor

The same documents that are submitted to the provost are submitted to the Chancellor. If a negative review by the provost constitutes the third negative consecutive review, the review process is terminated (see **Termination of Review** below).

J. Review by the President and the Board of Trustees

The combined recommendations from the provost and the chancellor are sent to the University of Arkansas System President.

According to Board Policy 405.1, Section IV (7). A, The President will not consider awarding tenure to a faculty member in a probationary status without the prior recommendation of the faculty member's departmental faculty, chairperson, dean, chief academic officer, and the chief executive officer of the campus concerned.

According to Board Policy 405.1, Section IV (10). A, each year at the meeting at which promotions are considered by the Board of Trustees, the president shall inform the board of the names of each person awarded tenure during the preceding twelve months, and shall indicate for each such individual the rank and date of appointment to the university faculty.

K. Termination of Review:

Throughout the promotion and tenure review process, three negative consecutive reviews (e.g., by the departmental committee, department chair or director, college committee, or dean; or for the Law School – by the committee, the dean, and the provost) effectively terminates the review process. However, the applicant may then initiate an appeals procedure for reconsideration of a negative recommendation, in accordance with provisions stated in the university's governance document.

Section 2

The University Committee on Tenure proposes that the following guidelines for productivity and documentation shall be used by colleges and departments in developing and revising their governance documents with regard to promotion and tenure:

VII. Guidelines for Productivity in Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Professional Performance

Each department (or college in the event that the college does not have a departmental structure) shall foster faculty development and active engagement suitable to the discipline. ~~Candidates~~ *Applicants* should be made aware of departmental and campus-wide resources related to the promotion and tenure review process, such as new faculty orientation materials, and faculty development workshops. Also, departments should support and fully cooperate with tenure-track faculty in providing the opportunity to review recent successful tenure applications and other helpful documents with the permission of previous applicants.

Expectations for promotion and tenure must be clearly communicated in writing and orally on an ongoing basis (e.g., faculty orientation, annual reviews, mid-tenure reviews). As part of their annual reviews and mid-tenure reviews, tenure-track faculty shall be informed about their progress toward tenure in writing and encouraged to ask questions and to seek

clarification, when needed. Expectations for productivity include the following:

A. Teaching

The documentation of excellence in teaching takes many forms. One approach is through the preparation of a teaching portfolio. The content and format may vary by discipline and individual philosophy, but information about both teaching effort and teaching quality over time should be included. Standard products for the promotion and tenure dossier may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical strategies
2. Teaching history including teaching loads, summary of courses taught and modes and settings of instruction in each course
3. Materials from individual courses – syllabi, exercises, projects, exams, websites, multimedia products, video of lectures
4. Summary of advising, consultation, and supervision of students at all levels – pre-college, undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral
5. Curriculum design, development, and administration
6. Measuring student learning and instructional effectiveness through course, program, and core assessment activities and outcomes
7. Professional development activities related to teaching
8. Student course evaluations, compiled and interpreted to give the data contextual meaning
9. Peer evaluations
10. Self-evaluations
11. Recognition and awards

Evidence of specific curriculum design and development, where appropriate, shall be included in the dossier of faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure. Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use), and how they conform to or extend principles of “best practices.”

The nature of effective teaching may vary across disciplines, but certain qualities are universal: respect for students, faith in student abilities, a focus on student learning, and a commitment to student success. Equally important, faculty should view themselves as role models who convey the values of their disciplines and initiate students into their professions. In the pursuit of excellence in teaching, faculty members must remain current in their disciplines and in pedagogical strategies. They should consider teaching a continual process of improvement and growth.

B. Scholarly activities

To assess excellence in scholarship, faculty accomplishment may be

demonstrated through products appropriate to the discipline which may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

1. Publications
2. Research and/or research project grants
3. Patents
4. Performances
5. Concerts
6. Exhibitions
7. Speeches/presentations to professional meetings if they meet the definition of scholarship below

Scholarship is defined as a systematic, focused attention on a question, problem, or idea, characterized by expertise, originality, analysis and significance. Scholarship results in products that are shared with appropriate audiences within the academy and the wider community.

Scholarship is evaluated externally. The character of evaluation is unique to disciplines, but scholarship and creative activities must be reviewed by methods accepted by the appropriate discipline. Scholarship may be defined in ways that do not neatly fit into traditional categories, but application of a clear method of review to such work is essential. Scholarship is a broad term that embraces a range of contributions that faculty members might make to their respective disciplines: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Creativity, Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Teaching.

Scholarship of Discovery is systematic inquiry or investigation designed to validate and refine existing knowledge and to generate new knowledge. At its core, this scholarship involves studies that use quantitative or qualitative methodologies to make significant contributions to knowledge. Primary empirical research, historical research, theory development, methodological studies and philosophical inquiry are all representative of this form. Typically this scholarship is documented through peer-reviewed publication of articles or books; publication in law reviews or journals; papers presented at state, regional, national, or international meetings; grant awards; or recognition by professional organizations as a scholar in a particular area.

The Scholarship of Creativity entails the creation of or performance of original works of art, literature, music, film and theater. It may also include the creation of new forms of electronic or digital media. Typical examples are production or scenic design of plays; writing, directing, or acting in plays; choreography and dance performance; creation and exhibition of visual arts such as painting, sculpture, and photography; musical composition and performance; direction or production of film and video; creative writing; and creation of websites, virtual reality programs, kiosks, and multimedia communication tools. In all cases, however, there are accepted forms of peer review to determine the quality and

significance of faculty work, from juried or invitational art shows to publication. These conventional procedures must be part of evaluation.

The Scholarship of Application is the use of professional expertise or information in the process of solving social or community problems. It should not be confused with service or citizenship. Service activities typically benefit a particular group, organization, or community. The Scholarship of Application should include a mechanism whereby the quality and influence of the contribution can be evaluated. This is most easily demonstrated when an artifact is created encompassing the work e.g. a report, a training manual, a program evaluation, a video, or a website. Some activities include peer review; for example, the report written for a taskforce is reviewed by members of the taskforce as well as other agencies and institutions. In cases where this is not so, the department or school should initiate an alternative review process, such as sending the work to experts in the field to evaluate its significance, rigor, and impact. In all cases, the product of the scholarship of application must be subject to some form of peer review.

Scholarship of Integration involves synthesis across theories or across academic fields. As academics tackle social, economic, and technical problems, a need often exists for faculty members with broad and multidisciplinary perspectives to see connections across the unique perspectives of a theory or discipline. The Scholarship of Integration may result in a traditional academic product such as an article, book or presentation. It also may take the form of a product or patent. As in other areas, appropriate forms of external review must be used to determine the merit of such products.

The Scholarship of Teaching is not the same as “best teaching practices.” Tenure track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall engage in publication appropriate to development and evaluation of teaching, teaching technique, curriculum development and related topics, including peer-reviewed publications, law reviews and journals, conference presentations, workshops, or teacher handbooks that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning. Thus, the Scholarship of Teaching is more than being an excellent teacher. It involves systematic inquiry about teaching, dissemination of the results, and peer review. Appropriate external funding should be sought to support these efforts, as in many other scholarly pursuits.

Increasingly, research, scholarship, or creative activity involves collaboration. The academic unit shall determine if such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Applicants must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work. They should make clear their individual role (e.g., conception of work; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data;

writing, revisions, and other communication; administrative and material support) in such collective activity.

C. Service activities (internal and external)

Service to the university is an essential part of each faculty member's responsibility. Typically, such service means significant participation in department or school, college, or university activities. Such involvement is critical to the carrying out of the university's mission. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership and leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, labs, and technical support; and recruitment. Faculty should recognize that being actively involved in collegial governance is to their benefit.

Service to the profession is also expected, especially as the faculty member's career develops. Professional service includes, although not exclusively, activities such as serving as an officer and committee membership in a professional organization; conference or event planning, coordination, or other active participation; editing or otherwise contributing to the publication of a professional journal; and reviewing manuscripts, grants, programs, and textbooks.

Particularly important to a university such as UALR is discipline-related service to the community. Such activity necessarily incorporates a wide variety of efforts but is defined by the application of the faculty member's professional expertise to help the community at every level—local, state, regional, national, or international. Typical examples of community service at UALR have included involvement in task forces seeking to solve community problems; consulting with governmental, business, and non-profit organizations; training and presentations; and program review, coordination, and development.

Exemplary service in these areas should be considered as particularly worthy of reward. Each unit of the university will have its unique ideas concerning the character of service in these three areas. Each unit and discipline also will provide varying opportunities for service. It is important, therefore, that each unit clearly define what is meant by service and what service is expected of faculty members. An essential component in the assessment of service is that the faculty member's participation contributes to securing the goals of the activity. Documentation of the significance of the faculty member's service is an essential part of the process, and each unit should provide appropriate guidelines for its demonstration.

To assess excellence in service, faculty accomplishment may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. *Administrative duties such as chair, director, and program coordinator.*

[Friendly amendment.]

2. Committee/special project participation (department, college, university, system; for example, assessment and recruitment projects)
3. Discipline-related community involvement
4. Working in and with professional organizations
5. Relating discipline to the community
6. Development of cooperative ventures between the university and community
7. Student advising – if not already listed under “Teaching”
8. Speeches/presentations to professional meetings

Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:

1. the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
2. the profession or discipline;
3. the campus and university

D. Professional Performance (in the case of faculty with non-teaching appointments):

Evaluation may include but is not limited to evidence of the following: performance in the areas of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties; ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility and/or leadership; cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels; efforts at self-improvement; innovations in program implementation; development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties; initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems; ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing. Evidence used to evaluate professional performance generally includes supervisors' evaluations, clientele evaluation, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and other materials.

VIII. Guidelines for Documentation

- A. Specifically, the applicant should directly submit a dossier of the following documentation to the Department Review Committee (or to the College Review Committee in the event that the college does not have a departmental structure), including but not limited to:
 1. An up-to-date curriculum vitae (see C. Curriculum Vitae for the recommended format);
 2. Copies of publications;
 3. Copies of any relevant unpublished works (e.g., articles accepted for publication, presentations at conferences);
 4. Proposals written and grants received;
 5. Materials related to other scholarly/creative activities;

6. For faculty with teaching responsibilities -- a teaching portfolio including, but not limited to:
 - a. Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical strategies
 - b. Teaching history including teaching loads, summary of courses taught and modes and settings of instruction in each course
 - c. Materials from individual courses – syllabi, exercises, projects, exams, websites, multimedia products, video of lectures
 - d. Summary of advising, consultation, and supervision of students at all levels – pre-college, undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral
 - e. Curriculum design, development, and administration
 - f. Measuring student learning and instructional effectiveness through course, program, and core assessment activities and outcomes
 - g. Professional development activities related to teaching
 - h. Student course evaluations, compiled and interpreted to give the data contextual meaning
 - i. Peer evaluations
 - j. Self-evaluations
 - k. Recognition and awards
 7. Information related to department, college, and university service, community or public service, professional service, and other relevant forms of service;
 8. A self-assessment of the applicant's performance in each of the major areas for review (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service);
 9. Objective letters of evaluation from reputable individuals in the discipline, when required by the procedures of a given college/department;
 10. Other supporting documents that may be relevant to the decision.
- B.** The dossier may be in the form of multiple binders (a summary binder including the applicant's completed application forms, the applicant's statement, curriculum vita, letters of evaluation (annual reviews, peer reviews, letters from external evaluators if appropriate), teaching load at UALR; and other binders for teaching, scholarship, and service), or may be prepared as an electronic submission containing folders equivalent to the hard copy binders. Label each binder or electronic file folder clearly and include a table of contents in each binder or file folder.

On the front of the hard copy dossier binder, please place a sheet or label that includes the following information:

Name of Faculty Member, Current Rank, School/College,
Department or Unit Affiliation, and nature of the application (e.g.

Application for Promotion and Tenure, or Application for Promotion or Application for Tenure.)

For electronic dossier submission, the equivalent information should be in a file called Title Page.

For dossiers in electronic submission, items like the application form, curriculum vitae, summaries of teaching, research, and service accomplishments, statement of teaching philosophy should be saved as PDF files. A 12-point serif font such as Times New Roman or Palatino, or a 12-point sans serif font such as Arial is preferred. Letters/ documents with letterhead and signatures should be scanned into Adobe Acrobat PDF format for inclusion in an electronic submission dossier.

Material should be clearly organized. In hard copy submission, this means a binder for primary materials with a detailed table of contents and marked tabs, and other binders for supplementary materials, each with a table of contents and marked tabs; in electronic submission this means folders should be labeled accordingly. In the case of electronic submissions, there should be a title page and a table of contents file included in each electronic folder, and each folder should be labeled (e.g. Primary Materials; Teaching; Research/ Creative; Service).

Additional information (e.g., annual and mid-tenure evaluations) may be available or required from the applicant in the dossier by a given college/ department. Also, the department and college review committees, department chair or director, and dean may make a written request for any missing or additional information or clarification needed for the review.

C. Curriculum Vitae

Content and organization of the curriculum vitae may vary somewhat depending on the discipline. The following is the suggested format for the curriculum vitae:

1. Personal Information (Name, department, current rank)
2. Education (including institutions, dates, degrees)
3. Professional Employment (employment background, in reverse chronological order)
4. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities
In each category, published works should be listed first, in reverse chronological order, followed by works not yet published but accepted for publication. Pieces in preparation that are not completed and not reviewed should not appear on

a c.v. (The one exception is working papers, customary in certain fields such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed in k. "Other"). The applicant should distinguish between authored and edited works and between refereed and non-referred outlets, should clarify the status of work accepted but not yet published, and should identify his or her contribution to multi-authored works. Please list all authors, in the order they appear on the publication. Because disciplines differ in the way senior authorship is listed, please indicate the works on which the applicant is the senior author. When the research is published in a foreign language, the translation of the title should be included.

- a. Books. (Please specify whether a completed manuscript has been accepted without the need for further revisions.)
 1. Books or monographs authored. Original or revised edition should be specified.
 2. Books edited.
 3. Chapters in books.
- b. Articles in Refereed Journals or Law Reviews/Journals.
Full citation, inclusive of page numbers, should be provided. Review articles and invited articles should be so identified.
- c. Reports, and Extension Publications.
- d. Book Reviews, Other Articles, Notes.
- e. Patents Received
- f. Talks, Abstracts, and Other Professional Papers Presented.
 1. Invited talks, etc.
 2. Refereed conference proceedings.
 3. Unrefereed conference proceedings.
- g. Films, CDs, Photographs, etc.
Specify the nature of the faculty member's contribution.
- h. Exhibits, Performances, Demonstrations, & Other Creative Activities.
Specify the nature of the faculty member's contribution.
- i. Original Designs, Plans, Inventions, Software.
- j. Contracts and Funded Grants.
List amount awarded, time period, and role (e.g., principal investigator).
- k. Other

5. Teaching, Mentoring, Advising
 - a. Courses during the period under evaluation.
 - b. Course or Curriculum Development.
 - c. Manuals, Notes, Software, Web pages, & Other Contributions to Teaching.
 - d. Advising (other than research direction): Indicate approximate numbers of students per year.
 - i. Undergraduate.
 - ii. Graduate.
 - iii. Other advising & mentoring activities (advising student groups, special assignments, recruiting, faculty mentorship, etc.)
 - e. Advising: Research Direction. The name of student and academic year(s) involved should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s). List completed work first and then in-progress work.
 - i. Undergraduate.
 - ii. Master's.
 - iii. Doctoral.
 - f. Extension Activities. Major programs established, workshops, presentations, media activities, awards, honors, etc., should be indicated.
6. Funded Grants (source, amount, type of grant, role on project, starting and ending dates)
7. Honors, Awards, Fellowships, Prizes
8. Service:
 - a. Professional.
 - i. Offices and committee memberships held in professional organizations (include dates).
 - ii. Reviewing activities for agencies.
 - iii. Other unpaid services to local, state, and federal government.
 - iv. Other non-University committees, commissions, panels, etc.
 - v. International activities not listed above.
 - vi. Paid consultancies (optional).
 - b. Campus.
 - i. Departmental.
 - ii. College.
 - iii. University.
 - iv. Special administrative assignments.
 - v. Other.
 - c. Community, State, National.

Please date the CV in the header, and include numbered pages in the footer so reviewers will know that they have the most recent version and number of pages.

Important Note: CVs should not include age, date of birth, marital status, or social security number (SSN). These items are not relevant and should always be omitted from the CV.