

**GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH & CREATIVE  
ACTIVITY FOR**

**TENURE, PROMOTION, AND RETENTION FOR  
UAS TRIPARTITE FACULTY MEMBERS**

Effective July 1, 2003

**CONTENTS**

**SECTIONS**

1. Definition of Research, Publication, and Scholarship and the Unit System for Assessing Them
2. General Criteria for Assessing Research and Creative Activity Performance and the Responsibilities and Rights of Faculty Being Evaluated
3. Minimum Criteria for the Granting of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
4. Minimum Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
5. Criteria for Determining Retention of Tripartite Faculty

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A:  
Items and Activities Considered Publication with Unit Values

Appendix B:  
Other Scholarship Not Considered Publication with Unit Values

Appendix C:  
Items and Activities not Considered Research or Scholarship

Appendix D:  
Supplement for Assessing Library Faculty

Appendix E:

Supplement for Assessing Natural Science Faculty

Appendix F:  
Supplement for Assessing Education Faculty

Appendix G:  
Supplement for Assessing Faculty in Creative Writing

Appendix H:  
Supplement for Assessing Faculty in the Visual Arts

Appendix I:  
Supplement for Assessing Faculty in the Performing Arts:  
(I) Music

Appendix J:  
Supplement for Assessing Faculty in the Performing Arts:  
(II) Theater and Dance

Appendix K:  
Supplement for Assessing Faculty in Psychology

## **1. DEFINITION OF RESEARCH, PUBLICATION AND SCHOLARSHIP AND THE UNIT SYSTEM FOR ASSESSING THEM**

### **A NOTE ON THE USE OF TERMS**

In this document the term “Research and Creative Activity” (usually shortened to “Research”) is used as a generic description of the activity required to fulfill the research portion of a tripartite faculty member’s workload. Research is divided into “Publications” and “Other Scholarship” (usually shortened to “Scholarship”). The Fine and Performing Arts, however, do not use this distinction for assessing creative activity. The reason for this variation is explained in Appendices H, I, and J.

### **DEFINITION OF RESEARCH & CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

The definition is as follows:

**Knowledge or evidence of professional competence**, including creative activity in the Fine and Performing Arts, resulting from research, study or other professional skills, **presented in a form**—written, graphical, oral, musical, etc.—**and conveyed through media**—books, articles, research reports, case studies, conference papers, conference proceedings, performances, exhibitions, multi-media presentations, etc.—**generally considered appropriate to a discipline**.

## **ITEMS AND ACTIVITIES CONSTITUTING RESEARCH: PUBLICATIONS & SCHOLARSHIP**

It is necessary to supplement the above definition by delineating (1) what constitutes a publication and its equivalent in the Fine and Performing Arts, (2) what constitutes other appropriate scholarship but is not considered a publication, and (3) what is not considered research or scholarship under the above definition.

It is also necessary to develop a method of quantifying publications and scholarship in order to make an assessment of the extent to which a faculty member has met the criteria of the research part of his/her workload. A unit value or points system will be used whereby various products of research and creative activity are assigned numerical values and a combined minimum number of units of publication and scholarship must be obtained for the awarding of tenure and promotion.

This section sets out the three supplementary definitions, explains the unit system of assessment, and lists the numerical combination of publications and scholarship required for tenure and promotion to Associate and Full Professor. The section is supplemented by Appendices A through K, which set out specific unit values for publications and scholarship and the special circumstances of certain disciplines.

### **Definition of a Publication**

The presentation of research in forms appropriate to the discipline—books, chapters in books, articles, research reports, on-line publications, multi-media products, etc.—that have been subject to a process of **peer review**. In the Fine and Performing Arts the equivalent is **public exposure** of the products of creative activity—such as art exhibitions, workshops, and public performances—that have been subject to **juried or critical review**.

Thus, the essence of this definition involves the process of **refereed**, **juried**, or **critical evaluation** in the accepted academic sense.

It will be the responsibility of the faculty member under review to demonstrate that his/her publications were subject to a peer review process by reviewers, and to peer review, juried and/or critical review in the Fine and Performing Arts.

Appendix A, supplemented by Appendices D through K, sets out the list of items and activities considered to be publications under this definition.

### **Definition of Other Scholarship Not Considered as Publication**

The definition adopted is:

Other scholarship constitutes items and activities resulting from research, study, or other professional knowledge or skills related to a discipline involving some form of peer exposure or consideration but which are not generally considered to be publication within that faculty member's discipline.

Appendix B, supplemented by Appendices D through K, sets out the list of items and activities considered to be other scholarship under this definition.

### **Definition of Items and Activities Not Considered Publication or Scholarship**

The definition adopted is:

Items and activities not considered publication or other scholarship are those not subject to the peer review process or some form of peer exposure. They may be items or activities, primarily organizational or managerial in development and execution, or those that would not generally be viewed as scholarship within the faculty member's discipline. Such items and activities may more appropriately be considered as teaching or developing teaching materials, university or community service, or service to a professional organization.

Appendix C, supplemented by Appendices D through K, sets out a list of items and activities not considered publication or other scholarship under this definition.

## **THE UNIT SYSTEM OF QUANTIFYING PUBLICATIONS AND SCHOLARSHIP**

This unit system is the method of assessment used at most academic institutions in the U.S. and abroad for assessing research performance.

### **Necessity of Having a Combination of Publications and Scholarship**

The granting of tenure and promotion (to both Associate and Full Professor) requires a combination of publication and other scholarship as set out in the sections below. Scholarship without publication will not be considered sufficient to fulfill the research and scholarship portion of a tripartite faculty member's workload or to warrant tenure or promotion.

### **Research Unit Values Required for Tenure and Promotion**

*For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:*

Three (3) units of publication and six (6) units of other scholarship.

Unit criteria alone will not determine the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For additional criteria and rationale, see Section 4, below.

*For promotion to Full Professor:*

Four (4) units of publication and eight (8) units of other scholarship **beyond** the faculty member's record of publication and scholarship when he/she received tenure and/or was promoted to Associate Professor.

Again, unit criteria alone will not determine the awarding of promotion to Full Professor. For additional criteria and rationale, see Section 5, below.

### **Option of Substituting Publications for Scholarship but No Substitution of Scholarship for Publications**

In determining whether or not a faculty member has met the research requirement, the combination of publications and scholarship is

flexible in that additional publications above the minimum can be substituted for scholarship in the proportion of one unit of publication equivalent to two units of scholarship. However, items of scholarship **cannot** be substituted for publications. The rationale is that a publication is considered to be greater evidence of research than an item of scholarship by itself because the peer review process is more extensive.

## **2. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY PERFORMANCE AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS OF FACULTY BEING EVALUATED**

The following are general criteria for assessing performance for the purposes of granting tenure and promotion. Elements of these general criteria are also applicable for assessing faculty for three-year retention and for granting and assessing performance with regard to summer research stipends. Also included in this section is a statement about the responsibilities and rights of faculty being evaluated.

### **GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATORS**

#### **The Specific Criteria are Minimum Criteria**

The combinations of publication and scholarship units as set out below in sections 4 through 7 are minimums. A faculty member achieving less than the minimum will have failed to fulfill the research part of his/her workload. Additional research performance can be required of faculty who receive more than a one part (of a five-part workload) research release for one or more semesters. This higher level of evaluation will be for the dean and/or chair of the division/department to determine in conjunction with the faculty member when his/her original contract is signed or as part of his/her yearly workload.

Review committees should evaluate an application as a whole, granting promotion and/or tenure only to candidates who meet and preferably exceed the minimum number of units outlined below **and** whose record indicates excellence in research and scholarship. However, meeting or even exceeding the required minimum number of units does not guarantee tenure or promotion in regard to the research component of a faculty member's workload. Additional consideration will be given to the quality of publication and scholarship activity as judged by a

consistent pattern of accomplishment noted in peer-reviewed venues. Similarly, reviewers should consider the extent to which the applicant has advanced the body of knowledge in addition to applying previous research results in his/her field. Promotion and/or tenure should be denied if an applicant's record does not include a clear pattern of quality, peer reviewed products.

Quality journals are defined as any refereed journals in the faculty member's field or a related field.

Review committees should also recognize that publication standards differ by discipline and they should apply the criteria in these guidelines accordingly. For example, credit should be given for the effort expended on research and scholarship as reflected in author order in multi-authored publications and scholarship. If author order is not indicative of effort, the actual effort should be made clear by the applicant and considered by the committee.

For each publication, it is to the advantage of the applicant to provide a brief paragraph in his/her file summarizing the importance of the work, his/her percentage of contribution to the publication (if co-authored), and relative ranking of the journal (or other venue) within his/her discipline. This provision is repeated below under "Responsibilities of Faculty Being Evaluated."

### **The Importance of the Judgment of the Evaluators in Achieving the Ultimate Goal of this Evaluation Process**

Although the guidelines in this section, and the more specific ones set out in the following sections and appendices, provide a more objective basis for assessing publications and scholarship than currently exist at UAS, no set of guidelines can apply to all situations equally or are appropriate for all circumstances. Ultimately, whether someone should or should not be considered to have met the research requirement is a judgment call. Particularly in borderline cases, the success of this evaluation process relies upon individual evaluators, and particularly specialists in each discipline involved in the evaluation process. Thus, the process depends upon the willingness of all evaluators to interpret these guidelines in the spirit in which they are intended. This is:

To provide a more or less objective means for evaluating whether or not a particular faculty member has the commitment to undertake and produce research and scholarship considered appropriate for this institution in fulfillment of one fifth (or more as the case may be) of his/her workload.

The judgment of evaluators, particularly specialists in

disciplines, is important in this process for another reason. These suggested UAS guidelines define **publication** and **scholarship** broadly and, for the most part, do not specify a hierarchy of journals, publishers, other publication outlets, conferences, or venues to exhibit or perform. Therefore, the evaluators and specialists in disciplines are given added responsibility to make judgments on what is and what is not a legitimate publication or item of scholarship and what serves as an acceptable medium for its publication or presentation.

### **Need for Discipline Specialists on Evaluation Committees Or the Obligation to Consult Such Specialists**

It is absolutely incumbent upon the UAS administration and the evaluation committees at all levels to ensure that there is a member of the discipline of all faculty being evaluated at each level of the evaluation process, or that a specialist be consulted by the Committees and the administration. This requirement is repeated below under the subsection “Responsibilities and Rights of Faculty Being Evaluated.”

### **Special Requirements and Variation in Particular Disciplines**

Although it is the goal of this Committee to provide general guidelines for evaluating faculty across disciplines and to minimize exceptions, the Committee is very aware of the need to make some special provisions for certain disciplines. Accordingly, these general guidelines are supplemented with information in Appendices D through K, which set out the special circumstances, and in some cases specific unit values, for publications and scholarship for some disciplines. Specific appendices explain in their introductory statement the extent to which these general guidelines and Appendices A, B, and C (setting out unit values) do or do not apply to that discipline.

Evaluators should consult the appropriate appendix for those being evaluated in the following disciplines:

Library Science	Appendix D
Education	Appendix E
Natural Science	Appendix F
Creative Writing	Appendix G
The Visual Arts	Appendix H

Music	Appendix I
Theater and Dance	Appendix J
Psychology	Appendix K

### **Demonstrating an On-going and Serious Commitment to Research and Scholarship and the Clear Expectation of Future Productivity**

A faculty member must demonstrate an on-going and serious commitment to publication and scholarship throughout the period for which he/she is under review (three years for retention review, six years for tenure and/or the period in rank required before applying for promotion to Associate or Full Professor). Tripartite faculty members must clearly demonstrate that they have used the research portion of their workload to engage in research and scholarly activity.

The granting of promotion and tenure in regard to research will be based, in part, on the belief by evaluators that the faculty member's past performance and on-going commitment to research is such that he/she can be expected to continue this activity at least at the same level required for tenure and promotion after being granted tenure and/or promotion.

The evaluators will take into consideration any significant interruption of a semester or more in a faculty member's time to tenure and promotion (to Associate and Full Professor) due to illness or other circumstances. However, the faculty member is responsible for securing written confirmation from his/her chair, director, or dean of such an interruption with a clear statement that this period does not count toward tenure and promotion. This requirement is repeated below under the subsection "Responsibilities and Rights of Faculty Being Evaluated."

### **A Faculty Member with Existing Publications When Hired at UAS**

When hired at UAS a faculty member can bring in publications and scholarship to count in full towards tenure and promotion to Associate and Full Professor. However, to demonstrate that a faculty member has a serious and on-going commitment to research, it is required that he/she produce at least 1.5 units of publication and 3 units of other scholarship while at UAS to receive tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. If a faculty member is hired at the Associate level, it is required that he/she produce at least 2 units of publication and 4 units

of scholarship while at UAS to be promoted from Associate to Full Professor.

### **Faculty Who Move from a Tripartite to a Bipartite Workload**

The Committee strongly recommends against faculty members alternating between a tripartite and bipartite contract or tripartite faculty moving to a permanent bipartite contract as this detracts from UAS developing into a higher quality university. However, realizing that this does occur, the following should apply with regard to evaluation of the research component:

#### **(I) Faculty Who Alternate Between a Tripartite and a Bipartite Workload**

Tripartite faculty **who are designated as tripartite by their contracts** but who opt for a bipartite workload for a period of time will be subject to the same criteria for tenure and promotion (to Associate or Full Professor) in regard to the specific combination of publications and scholarship required of faculty who have been entirely tripartite. In other words, no other activities can be substituted for the research component or any allowances made for the fact that for a period of time the faculty member chose not to conduct research. If this situation continues for more than one or two years, it is recommended the faculty member request a permanent change to a bipartite workload.

#### **(II) Tripartite Faculty Who Switch to a Permanent Bipartite Contract**

Faculty being evaluated for tenure and promotion (to Associate or Full Professor) who were tripartite for some period but moved to a permanent bipartite contract will be evaluated on the research component in proportion to the time that they were tripartite. For example, in the six years to tenure, if a faculty member was tripartite for three years and bipartite for the other three years, he/she will be expected to have secured half the required research units; and a faculty member standing for Full Professor after being in rank as an Associate for eight years who has spent two years as a tripartite faculty and six as bipartite will be required to have produced one quarter of the research units for promotion to Full Professor.

## **Tripartite Faculty Who Substitute Other Activities for the Research Component of their Permanent Tripartite Workload**

Similarly, those faculty who remain permanently on a tripartite track but choose to substitute other activities for the research component, or who negotiate such as part of their workload, will also be subject to the same specific combination of publications and scholarship for promotion and tenure. No other activity can be substituted for research.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS OF FACULTY BEING EVALUATED**

Given the fact that UAS often has only one or two faculty per discipline, it is essential that a faculty member present an evaluation file, particularly the part relating to his/her research component, in a way that facilitates the evaluators' determination of the extent to which the faculty member has met the research requirements set out in these guidelines.

The most important thing for faculty to bear in mind in putting together an evaluation file is that there is likely to be only one person on the evaluation committee at the peer review and campus level within the faculty member's department or discipline, and in many cases this will not be someone in the specific discipline but in a broader area, such as social science or communications. Often at the campus level there are no faculty in the same discipline (but see the provision regarding this under "Rights" below). Therefore, the faculty member should bear in mind the following responsibilities and rights, all of which are intended to place the faculty member in the most positive light in regard to the evaluation of his/her research component.

### **Responsibilities**

The faculty member is responsible for providing clear evidence that all publications and scholarship meet the criteria set out in these guidelines. This is particularly important with items not yet published or presented but which have been accepted for publication, presentation, etc. It cannot be assumed that the evaluators will know of pending publications, scholarship, exhibitions or performances, especially as most of them will be outside of the faculty member's discipline.

The faculty member is also responsible for indicating how the evaluators can obtain or examine items of publication and scholarship or secure evidence of creative activity. These items and this evidence need

not all be submitted with the file, but some indication of where and when they can be easily accessed should be provided.

For each of their publications, it is to the advantage of applicants to provide in their file a brief paragraph summarizing the importance of the work, their percentage of contribution to the publication (if co-authored), and relative ranking of the journal (or other venue) within their discipline.

The faculty member should provide a short statement about his/her research agenda as conducted in the period under evaluation to aid the evaluators in determining that the faculty member (1) has a serious and on-going commitment to research; (2) has some form of research plan or agenda past, present and future; and (3) is likely to continue to be a productive researcher after being granted tenure and/or promotion.

The faculty member is responsible for securing **written confirmation** from his/her chair, director, or dean of any significant interruption of a semester or more in the time required for tenure or promotion to Associate or Full Professor due to illness or other circumstances. Without this the evaluators cannot make exceptions to the mandatory six-year time limit required for tenure and promotion or make any exception to the criteria for assessing the on-going and serious commitment to research of the faculty member being evaluated.

## **Rights**

The faculty member has the right to provide information to show that he/she deserves more units for a publication or piece of scholarship than assigned by Appendices A and B. This may be particularly necessary in joint research and co-authored work for which the faculty member performed more than the share of the work indicated by the number of researchers or authors.

The faculty member also has the right to request a meeting with the evaluation committee to explain or present additional information. However, it should be noted that it is to the faculty member's distinct advantage to provide a written summary of this oral presentation for future reference by the Committee.

The UAS Provost and the Evaluation Committee chairs at all levels must ensure that either there is a member of the discipline of all faculty being evaluated on a committee at each level of the evaluation process, or a discipline specialist from another University of Alaska campus or other

institution is available for consultation by the committees and the administration.

In the future UAS may institute a system of “Faculty Mentors” whereby senior faculty (Full Professors) will be assigned to new faculty members to help them become oriented to UAS, including helping them compile evaluation files for retention, tenure and promotion. If this comes to fruition, each new faculty member would have access to this support system.

### **3. MINIMUM RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must meet all four of the following criteria:

1. Have at least three (3) units of publication.
2. Have at least six (6) units of other scholarship.
3. Provide clear and verifiable evidence that criteria 1 and 2 above were met by the deadline of the period for which the faculty member is being evaluated. This evidence could be in the form of either existing publications and other scholarship set out on the faculty member’s vita, or letters or other **written** confirmation that show the **complete acceptance** of publications and other scholarship prior to the deadline.
4. Demonstrate an on-going and serious commitment to research and scholarship for the period for which the faculty member is being evaluated that leads the evaluators to believe that he/she will continue this beyond the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Faculty members will be evaluated in relation to their workload assignment. Criteria 1 and 2 above apply only to those faculty with a regular workload configuration of three (3) parts teaching, one (1) part research, and one (1) part university/community service. Those faculty who are allocated a larger portion of their workload for research will be held to a higher standard of performance. This higher standard should be determined by the evaluators on a case-by-case basis.

Meeting these minimum criteria alone does not guarantee the awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

#### **4. MINIMUM RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

A faculty member seeking promotion to Full Professor must meet all four of the following criteria:

1. Have at least four (4) units of publication **in addition to** the three (3) units required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
2. Have at least eight (8) units of other scholarship **in addition to** the six (6) units required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Note that this requirement of 4 and 8 units respectively for promotion to Full Professor is higher than that required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. There are compelling reasons for this: (1) Most institutions have a higher standard for promotion to Full Professor than to Associate Professor; (2) Promotion to Full Professor is evidence of outstanding performance and should be granted only to those who are outstanding; and (3) Once granted tenure, faculty have fewer pressures on them to perform other tasks and are free to focus more on research.

Also note that these four units of publication and eight units of other scholarship are **in addition to** the record of publications and scholarship required for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. Thus, a career total of twenty-one (21) units of research and creative activity—seven (7) units of publication and fourteen (14) of scholarship—are required for promotion to Full Professor. These totals may be higher for faculty bringing in publications and scholarship to UAS. This is due to the limit on the number of units of research and creative activity that can be transferred into UAS (see above, page 10, for the rationale and units allowed).

3. Provide clear and verifiable evidence that criteria 1 and 2 above were met by the deadline of the period for which the faculty member is being evaluated. This evidence could be in the form of either existing publications and other scholarship set out on the faculty member's vita, letters, or other **written** confirmation that show the **complete acceptance** of publications and other scholarship prior to the deadline.

4. Demonstrate an on-going and serious commitment to research and scholarship for the period for which the faculty member is being evaluated that leads the evaluators to believe that he/she will continue this beyond the granting of promotion to Full Professor.

Faculty members will be evaluated in relation to their workload assignment. Criteria 1 and 2 above apply only to those faculty with a regular workload configuration of three (3) parts teaching, one (1) part research, and one (1) part university/community service. Those faculty who are allocated a larger portion of their workload for research will be held to a higher standard of performance. This higher standard should be determined by the evaluators on a case-by-case basis.

Meeting these minimum criteria alone does not guarantee the awarding of promotion to Full Professor.

## **5. RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING RETENTION OF TRIPARTITE FACULTY**

The purpose of the three-year retention review of faculty with regard to their research component is twofold:

1. To evaluate whether the faculty member's progress warrants his/her being retained as a tripartite faculty member. If not, to determine if it should be recommended that he/she be placed on a bipartite track or that he/she be terminated.

2. If the faculty member is making progress, to make specific recommendations as to what is required in his/her performance over the next three years in order to secure tenure and promotion.

Together, these two components speak to the essence of what the

evaluators at all stages of the process of a three-year retention are attempting to determine. This can be encapsulated in the following question:

In the first three years at UAS, has this faculty member demonstrated an on-going and serious commitment to research and scholarship and an adequate level of performance that can be expected to continue during the next three years so that it can be expected that he/she will be granted tenure and will continue to produce research afterwards?

There are two elements to evaluate in answering this question: (1) The extent to which the faculty member demonstrates an on-going and serious commitment; and (2) The extent to which he/she has achieved an adequate level of performance. The following guidelines are ways of judging the adequacy of these two elements.

### **An On-going and Serious Commitment to Research**

An on-going and serious commitment is important because it demonstrates that the faculty member is serious about research and scholarship and sees it as an integral part of his/her professional responsibilities.

However, there is a more quantifiable reason for taking this on-going and serious commitment into consideration. Three years is a short time in which to secure publications, and a faculty member may have several projects in progress and/or under review that will result in publication during the next three years. Thus, by evaluating the consistency and seriousness of the faculty member's previous endeavors, the evaluators are able to assess whether or not he/she is likely to achieve the requirement for tenure.

Ways to evaluate this include, but are not limited to:

Submitting articles, research reports, attempting to show artwork or give performances as evidenced by letters of submission, rejection, or "revise and re-submit" letters.

Attempting to publish all or part of a dissertation or publish a book as evidenced in book contracts, correspondence with publishers, etc.

Editing books, special issues of journals, or annual review publications.

Attempting to write book reviews, reviewing book manuscripts or journal articles.

Submitting proposals for papers and poster sessions at academic conferences.

Other scholarly conference participation such as acting as a panel discussant, member of a round-table, etc.

Writing grants that will eventually lead to publication and scholarship. This does not include bidding on contracts for the purpose of consulting unless it can be reasonably determined that the project will result in data, information, an exhibition, or performance that will meet the UAS definition of research.

Involvement in collaborative research projects, exhibitions, performances, etc.

### **An Adequate Level of Performance**

By itself, an on-going and serious commitment to research is not enough to warrant a recommendation for a faculty member under three-year retention to be continued on a tripartite track. This must be accompanied by a level of performance, as measured in units secured or soon to be secured through up-coming publications or scholarly activity, that will ensure that over the next three years the minimum requirement for tenure will be attained.

Obviously, the level of performance will vary from case to case. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the evaluators to make this judgment and to make recommendations to the faculty member. The faculty member should be informed of the specific actions, units of publication, and other scholarship that are needed in order to be granted tenure.

### **Higher Standard for Faculty Given Additional Research Components**

All faculty members standing for retention should be evaluated in relation to their workload assignment. Those faculty who are allocated a larger portion of their workload for research will be held to a higher standard of performance for retention. This higher standard should be determined by the evaluators on a case-by-case basis.

## **APPENDIX A: ITEMS AND ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED PUBLICATION WITH UNIT VALUES**

### **Definition of a Publication**

The presentation of research in forms appropriate to the discipline—books, chapters in books, articles, research reports, on-line publications, multi-media products, etc.—that have been subject to a process of **peer review**. In the Fine and Performing Arts the equivalent is **public exposure** of the products of creative activity—such as art exhibitions, workshops, and public performances—that have been subject to **juried or critical review**.

### **Items and Activities with Unit Values**

***The first edition of authored books of all types*** (e.g., monographs, textbooks, dissertations turned into a book, book-length works of creative writing)--3 units.

***For subsequent and revised editions of textbooks and other books***—2 units for each new edition (e.g. second edition, third edition, etc.), 1 unit for revised editions (i.e., less extensive changes such as adding a supplement). Evidence must be provided that these new or revised editions were peer reviewed.

***Editing a book with no contribution in it by the editor***--1 unit. Editing a book with one or more contributions by the editor—2 units. Note: An edited book should not be equivalent to an authored book.

***Peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research notes, conference proceedings, case studies or multi-media products***—1 unit. This includes those published electronically if peer reviewed.

Note: A paper presented at a conference and subsequently included in the conference proceedings will be counted **once only**. That is, it cannot be counted under the category of scholarship as well as under the category of publications.

***Peer-reviewed, collaboratively written articles, books, or chapters***—divide the possible total number of units by the number of authors. Note: If a faculty member can provide evidence that

he/she was the lead author, the point value may be raised accordingly.

NOTE: For variations in Unit Values for publications in Creative Writing, Education, Natural Science, the Visual Arts, the Performing Arts, Library Science and Psychology, see the appropriate appendix below.

## **APPENDIX B: OTHER SCHOLARSHIP NOT CONSIDERED PUBLICATION WITH UNIT VALUES**

### **Definition of Other Scholarship**

Other scholarship constitutes items and activities resulting from research, study, or other professional knowledge or skills related to a discipline involving some form of peer exposure or consideration but which are not generally considered to be publication within that faculty member's discipline.

### **Items and Activities with Unit Values**

***Papers and poster sessions presented at national and international conferences at which a paper is required***—1.5 units. This includes other forms of presentation equivalent to a paper or poster presentation when they are the accepted form of conference presentation within a discipline, such as in library science and education (see Appendices D and F for the practice in these disciplines). **Where a paper is not required at a poster session**—0.75 units.

***Papers and poster sessions presented at regional and local conferences where a paper is required and other accepted forms of conference presentations within a discipline***—1 unit. **Where a paper is not required at a poster session**—0.5 units.

Note: A paper presentation at a conference that is subsequently included in the conference proceedings can be counted **once only**.

**Works published by a third party but not peer reviewed:** book reviews, reference book articles, research notes, co-authored articles, case studies, bibliographies, and other scholarly publications—1 unit.

**Acting as a discussant or respondent** on a conference panel—0.5 unit.

**Securing Grants:** This provision applies to grants awarded on a **competitive basis** of an amount above \$1,000. Thus, automatically awarded grants, such as UAS summer stipends, are excluded from this provision. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to demonstrate that the grant was competitively awarded and preferably peer-reviewed. The unit values allowed are as follows:

If the grant is a University of Alaska grant—0.5 units per grant (an additional award for the same grant will **not** be considered as a separate grant and will not receive additional points).

External grants—1 unit (similarly, a supplementary award for the same grant will **not** be considered as a separate grant and will not receive additional points).

A maximum of 2 units of scholarship is allowed for securing grants for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor and a maximum of 2 units for promotion to Full Professor.

See Appendix E for a different allocation of points for grants award in Natural Science.

**Unpublished articles and manuscripts**—0.5 units if evidence can be shown that the faculty member is actively working toward publication (e.g., a “revise and resubmit” letter from an editor). A maximum of 1 unit of scholarship is allowed for this category for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Full Professor.

**Editing a journal or annual review for at least one year**—1 unit. Editing a journal or annual review **for at least two or more years**—2 units.

**Membership on the editorial board of a journal or annual review**—0.5 units.

**Reviewing manuscripts** for journals, publishers and for conference proceedings—0.5 units. A maximum of 1 unit of scholarship is allowed for this category for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and 1 unit for promotion to Full Professor.

**Newspaper articles:** but only if evidence can be provided that they were commissioned based on the faculty member's discipline and expertise broadly defined—0.25 units.

**Unpaid consulting:** 0.5 units per project. But only if the faculty member obtains acceptance from his/her faculty group (e.g., Social Sciences, Natural Science) of the value of the project to the faculty member's academic advancement. A maximum of 1 unit of scholarship is allowed for this category for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Full Professor. However, this provision does not preclude the faculty member from obtaining data/information from the project that can be used for publications or scholarship.

**Unpaid or paid applied research/collaborative research with a government or non-profit agency.** 0.5 units per project. Similar to consulting, faculty members must obtain acceptance from their faculty group of the value of the project to their academic advancement. A maximum of 1 unit of scholarship is allowed for this category for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Full Professor. Again, this provision does not preclude the faculty member from obtaining data/information from the project that can be used for other scholarship or publications.

NOTE: For variations in Unit Values for Other Scholarship in Creative Writing, Education, Natural Science, the Visual Arts, the Performing Arts, Library Science, and Psychology, see the appropriate appendix, below.

## **APPENDIX C: ITEMS AND ACTIVITIES NOT CONSIDERED RESEARCH OR SCHOLARSHIP**

**Explanation/Definition**

Items and activities not considered publication or other scholarship are those not subject to the peer review process or some form of peer exposure. They may be items or activities, primarily organizational or managerial in development and execution, or those that would not generally be viewed as scholarship within the faculty member's discipline. Such items and activities may more appropriately be considered as teaching or developing teaching materials, university or community service, or service to a professional organization.

**These items include:**

***Paid consulting and applied/collaborative research***, unless the results of this are presented in a form and through a medium appropriate to the faculty member's discipline. This provision does not apply to performances in the performing arts.

***An identical or very similar piece of research*** published in a second outlet or presented in a second forum. In other words, the same piece of work cannot be counted twice. This provision does not apply to the Fine and Performing Arts where the same piece of art, music or performance may be displayed/given in several venues.

***Books, articles, works of creative writing, and collections which are not peer reviewed.***

***Self-published*** books, articles, reports, etc.

***Publications and scholarship not related to a faculty member's discipline broadly defined.*** This provision should not discourage interdisciplinary work and interdisciplinary collaboration if the faculty member is using his/her discipline or the substantive knowledge from that discipline in the research or creative activity. The provision is meant to apply to products that are outside the faculty member's field (such as a science faculty member writing a novel or a math specialist in education producing a landscape painting) that cannot be reasonably considered as publication or scholarship by applying the tools of his/her discipline.

***Newspaper articles*** which are not commissioned and/or not based on the faculty member's discipline and expertise.

***Letters to the editor.***

***Chairing conference panels.***

***Supervising students on research projects or mentoring faculty on research and scholarly projects.***

***Presenting seminars, delivering speeches, etc.***

***Materials placed on a personal or other Internet website*** including academic websites unless these materials have been subject to peer review. In this case they would be considered as a publication or as scholarship as indicated in Appendices A or B.

NOTE: For other items not considered publication or scholarship in the disciplines with special provision, see the appropriate appendix.

## **APPENDIX D: SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING LIBRARY FACULTY**

Currently all library faculty at UAS have bipartite workloads. This library supplement provides for the possibility of a tripartite option for UAS library faculty and for future needs of UAS library services.

The minimum eligibility criteria for appointment and promotion of library faculty appear in the 1999 UAS *Faculty Handbook* (pages 21-23 and <http://www.uas.alaska.edu/faculty/handbook99>). For the teaching component in most faculty workloads, librarians substitute library responsibilities (i.e., technical services, library instruction, outreach/distance education, and reference/public service); other than this, the evaluation criteria are the same as for other faculty. Library faculty appointments at UAA and UAF vary between bipartite and tripartite.

With few exceptions, the evaluation criteria for the research component of tripartite workloads set out in this document would also apply to library faculty who were placed on a tri-partite contract. However, conference presentations are comparable to the provisions for Education Faculty set out in Appendix F.

Generally, library conference presentations do not involve a formal paper. Materials submitted for consideration by the conference selection panel include a brief abstract or description of the presentation. Emphasis is placed on interaction between the presenter and the

audience as well as on the effectiveness of communication. There are often written summaries distributed to the audience and sometimes links to websites containing additional material. A brief description of the presentation is included in the conference program. The process for acceptance of conference presentations for national and international conferences is rigorous, includes a review by peers, and should be given the same scholarship unit credit as those for national conferences in other disciplines. If research credit were limited to conference presentations requiring a paper, presentations at most national library conferences would be excluded. The rigor of the acceptance and the review process of presentations at regional and local library conferences varies and should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis by consulting faculty at UAA or UAF, or at other institutions.

## **APPENDIX E: SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING NATURAL SCIENCE FACULTY**

The general provisions of these guidelines regarding faculty performance and evaluation in the research component apply to the natural sciences. However, evaluators should be aware of the following general and specific supplementary information.

### **GENERAL GUIDELINES**

In the sciences, accomplishments in research are evidenced by successful grantsmanship, publication, and professional presentations. In all cases, standards are set by peer review. Grant proposals, publications, or presentations that are not peer reviewed, in most cases, cannot serve as reliable indications of success as a researcher.

The faculty and administrative reviewers must exercise appropriate judgments based on the total record to determine whether a faculty member's research performance is deserving of tenure and/or promotion. The guidelines presented in this document are meant to provide a set of minimal requirements in research performance that should be met as a condition of tenure and/or promotion.

The unit values below place the highest value on peer-reviewed publications as they give the best external assessment of research accomplishments. Recognition is also given, however, to research results that are reported to non-professional audiences either through agency reports or popular publications.

## **SPECIFIC UNIT VALUES**

### **Publications**

See Appendix A for unit values for books and articles including co-authored publications. In addition, the following apply:

***Co-authored publication of more than two authors in “gray” literature*** (government reports and other documents not peer reviewed)—0.5 units for first author or major author with the remaining 0.5 units to be divided equally between the other authors.

***Scientific publication for lay audience*** (publications that interpret science for the public, e.g., *Discover*, *Natural History*, *Scientific American*)—0.5 units.

### **Scholarship**

#### ***Conference and Other Presentations***

Presentations of research results as spoken addresses or poster sessions are an important avenue of scientific communication, although peer review often is minimal. Such presentations in a professional setting are, nonetheless, important in scientific discourse.

See Appendix B for unit values for presentations requiring a written paper. In addition, the following apply:

***Single authored spoken presentation at a scientific conference***--0.5 units.

***Co-authored spoken presentation at a scientific conference***--0.25 units. For a co-authored paper, the presenter should receive equal credit with the major author even if he/she is not the major author.

**Single authored poster presentation at a scientific conference**--0.25 units.

**Co-authored poster presentation at a scientific conference**--0.25 for main author and/or for the presenter only.

### **Items Not Considered Scholarship**

The junior author(s) on a poster presentation if they are not the presenter.

### **Securing Grants**

Securing grants is considered scholarship in the natural sciences because, unlike in some disciplines, securing a grant is often a necessary prerequisite to conducting original research.

Funded proposals should be weighted more highly when the research is aimed at advancing the body of knowledge (basic research) than when the research is strictly applying previous knowledge (applied research). Often the distinction between basic research and applied research is not exact and research projects can include aspects of both (hybrid). Applicants should include sufficient information so that the committee can assess the degree to which a funded proposal represents basic and/or applied research. Applicants should also present information specifying the extent of peer review the proposal received.

The distinctions between basic research (e.g., an investigation of sensory modalities used in homing by anadromous fish) and applied research (e.g., estimating the sustainable yield of a fish stock) and research that has both basic and applied components (e.g., predator-prey dynamics of a fish stock and determining effects of harvest on natural predation rates) will require careful consideration by reviewers. Applicants for review, tenure, and promotion should make clear how and why they categorize their research as basic, applied, or hybrid.

Research proposals that are funded should be credited as follows when the applicant is the principal investigator:

	<u>Under \$50,000</u>	<u>Over \$50,000</u>
Basic research	0.5 units	1.0 unit

Applied research	0.25	0.5
Hybrid	0.25-0.5	0.5-1.0

A maximum of 2 units of scholarship is allowed for securing grants for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor and a maximum of 2 units for promotion to Full Professor.

**Items Not Considered Publications or Scholarship**

*Junior author on publication in “gray” literature.*

*Junior author poster presentation at scientific conference.*

*Presentations to lay audiences.*

**APPENDIX F:  
SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING EDUCATION FACULTY**

In general, the provisions in this document apply to education faculty. However, note the following exception regarding conference papers.

Conference presentations in the field of education generally do not require a formal paper. In order for a faculty member to appear on the conference program as a presenter, materials submitted to the conference selection panel include a brief abstract or description, goals of the presentation, a general outline, and a description of the presentation process. Emphasis is placed on interaction between the presenter and the audience as well as on the effectiveness of communication. A brief description of the presentation is included in the conference program. If research credit were limited to conference presentations that require a paper, presentations at most education conferences would be excluded. A presentation at an education conference that meets the description in this Appendix receives the same number of units of scholarship as a conference paper in other disciplines.

**APPENDIX G:  
SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING FACULTY IN  
CREATIVE WRITING**

## **DEFINITION OF PUBLICATION AND SCHOLARSHIP**

In the field of creative writing, forms of publication and scholarship do not always conform to the general criteria listed in Section 2 of this document. Therefore, separate criteria for awarding credit for creative writing publications and scholarship are outlined in this appendix.

### **Publication**

Creative writing faculty must achieve the same number of units of publication as outlined in Section 2 of this document. The publication of books and chapbooks (short books of poems) of creative writing follow the same criteria as any other academic publication. That is, they must be reviewed by the editorial board of an established publishing company. Since the peer review process is generally not applied to works of creative writing published in periodicals, faculty in this area must instead provide evidence that the journal is selective (as defined below). In certain circumstances (as outlined below) less selective creative writing publications can count as scholarship.

### **Scholarship**

Scholarship in the field of creative writing takes a slightly different form than is required in most academic disciplines (see unit values listed below).

## **UNIT VALUES FOR CREATIVE WRITING FACULTY**

Note: These unit values are intended to supplement, not replace, those listed in Appendices A, B and C.

### **Publication**

***Book-length works of poetry, creative non-fiction, plays, or fiction***--3 units.

***Poetry, fiction, creative non-fiction, and drama journal publications***--1 unit. More than one poem or story published in a single issue of a journal or periodical will count as one publication unit only. Publications do not have to be reviewed by a jury of peers, but the journal must be considered selective. The selectivity of a journal should be determined in consultation with faculty in

the field of creative writing. This might include consulting with creative writing faculty on other University of Alaska campuses.

***Creative writing publications in less selective journals***—0.5 units. As above, the selectivity of a journal should be determined in consultation with faculty in the field of creative writing. And again, more than one poem or story published in a single issue of a journal or periodical will count as one publication unit only.

***Plays or screenplays published individually by an established press***—1.5 units.

***Poetry chapbooks*** (short books that include approximately 12 to 25 poems) ***published by an established press***—1.5 units.

## Scholarship

***Creative writing residency with a writing symposium, university, or institute when it has been selectively awarded***—1.5 units. A residency is awarded based on a collection of the writer's work. As part of the residency, the writer is sometimes required to give public lectures or workshops.

***Individual public readings at venues with national or regional significance where the faculty member is an invited guest***—1.0 unit.

***Local readings where the faculty member is an invited guest***—0.5 units. This does not include open-microphone readings, which are general invitations for writers to come to a venue and read their work.

***Unpublished works of creative writing***—0.5 units if evidence can be shown that the faculty member is actively working toward publication (i.e., letter from an editor). A maximum of 1 unit of scholarship can be obtained by this means for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and 1 unit for promotion to Full Professor.

***Facilitating a workshop at a national or regional creative writing conference***—1.0 unit. In workshop settings, creative writing faculty members are invited to read and respond to works of creative writing submitted by conference attendees.

***National or regional creative writing contests where the award is based on samples of the writer's work—0.5 unit.***

### **Activities Not Considered Publication or Scholarship**

***Private or open-microphone readings of creative writing.***

***Books or works of creative writing published by vanity presses or journals.***

***Self-published books or chapbooks.***

## **APPENDIX H: SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING FACULTY IN THE VISUAL ARTS**

The intent of the guidelines in this document apply to Visual Arts faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion in that faculty should have fulfilled the fourth part of their workload and demonstrated an on-going and serious commitments to creative activity. However, with the possible exception of art historians, the Visual Arts are such that many of the specific provisions in the main body of this document do not apply or need special consideration. For example, the distinction between publications and scholarship is not appropriate. Therefore, to aid evaluators unfamiliar with the Visual Arts as an academic discipline, this supplement first provides a general overview of the role of the artist in academia and then sets out specific criteria for evaluation including a unit value system for specific activities.

### **THE VISUAL ART FACULTY MEMBER AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

The equivalent to publication in the fine arts is public exposure of the product of creative activity, such as art exhibitions, workshops and public performances, which have been subject to juried or critical review. This is more or less equivalent to the peer review process in many disciplines, but because of the public exposure element of evaluation this introduces some unique aspects to the evaluation process.

An artist makes artifacts, facts in material form. Either by painting, sculpture or architecture, the methods and materials that an

artist uses are the direct results of his/her efforts at making the idea material. All art has to express some idea and uses various techniques to bring the idea to fruition.

Early in their education, artists are made aware of the role that the public exposure of their work will play in their art careers. Public exposure can be minimal or extensive resulting from great effort by the artist to promote and even market his/her artwork.

There are many venues for the public display of art, from the most mundane decorative displays of interior design to highly competitive international competitions, where artists are judged by an expert as to the worth of the artwork given the multitude of works available for exhibition. Artists can also be commissioned by private or public entities to execute and display works that will be exclusively public in their audience. These venues all come with a distinct set of criteria for the evaluation and selection of the art.

In a university setting, an artist hired as a teacher needs to be technically proficient and have a clearly articulated philosophy of the meaning of art. The arena for the display of the technical and conceptual abilities of a teaching artist is the public exhibition, either in the form of a competition or invitational showing of art. Although important in teaching, in terms of the creative activity component of his/her workload, the speaking and writing skills of a visual artist are peripheral to the displaying of artwork. As communication, visual art conveys ideas of a visual nature, with a language that is visually derived, rather than language that uses words to convey ideas.

### **USE OF THE TERM CREATIVE ACTIVITY INSTEAD OF THE TERMS RESEARCH, PUBLICATION, AND SCHOLARSHIP**

As indicated above, the distinction made throughout this document between publications and scholarship does not apply to the Visual Arts. The visual artist creates artwork, and this is displayed in public venues and therefore it is more appropriate to make distinctions on the level or competitiveness of these venues. Thus, the term creative activity is more appropriate and is used here.

### **UNITS REQUIRED FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION AND SPECIFIC UNIT VALUES OF VARIOUS ACTIVITIES**

#### **Units Required for Tenure and Promotion**

Because the distinction between publications and scholarship does not apply to the visual arts, a total combination of units in creative activity is required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor equivalent to the number of total publication and scholarship units required in most other disciplines. The units would be as follows:

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**—9 units.

All other criteria set out in Section 4 of these guidelines apply in determining the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

**Promotion to Full Professor**—12 units. This is in addition to the 9 units required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Thus, a faculty member will need a career total of 21 units to be promoted to Full Professor (9 for tenure and promotion to Associate, and 12 more for Full Professor).

All other criteria set out in Section 5 of these guidelines apply to the granting of promotion to Full Professor.

## **Specific Unit Values**

### ***Exhibitions***

Note: there are a regularly occurring array of exhibitions, but most are privately funded and may not be scheduled every year. In addition, in some disciplines such as sculpture, there may be only a few (three or four) juried exhibitions of sculpture in all of the categories below, whereas in printmaking there are sometimes 10-15 per year.

#### Juried:

Four Categories--International, National, Regional, Statewide

International--2.0 units

National--1.0 unit

Statewide and Regional—0.5 units

The rationale for this grouping is that despite the fact that there are few statewide and regional exhibitions, the entry process is not as competitive as it is for national and international exhibitions.

### Non-Juried or Invitational Exhibitions

One person gallery show--2.0 units.

Group show--1.0 unit.

### ***Other Activities***

Residency with a university, institute or foundation when it has been selectively awarded. A residency is awarded based on a review a body of the artist's work—1.5 units.

Making a presentation at a conference (such as the College Art Association (CAA) or other discipline-related annual conference such as the National Council on the Education of Ceramic Arts, NCECA)--1.0 unit.

A workshop or public lecture that is directly related to the particular artistic discipline--1.0 unit.

Public commission and installation of an artwork--1.5 units.

If the individual wishes to publish in a journal, then the rules of academic scholarship apply. This obviously relates more to art historians than to studio artists.

### **Activities Not Warranting Units Towards Tenure and Promotion**

Artwork that is (1) not subject to public exposure, such as a piece in a private collection that does not circulate; (2) displayed for the purpose of sale, such as that placed in a restaurant for sale; and (3) exhibited in a public place, such as a office building, a shopping mall or other venue, that has not been commissioned or placed there by invitation.

## **APPENDIX I: SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING FACULTY IN THE PERFORMING ARTS: (I) MUSIC**

Although there are currently no tenure track faculty in music at UAS there is discussion of hiring a person in this field soon. Therefore, the committee wanted to develop a separate appendix for the evaluation of music faculty but was unable to do so because of lack of a qualified faculty to aid in this process. However, the Committee did consult with the Music Director of the Juneau Symphony, Kyle Wiley Pickett, for guidance and recommendations to the UAS administration when a music faculty member is hired.

Kyle Wiley Pickett holds a B.A. from Stanford University, an M.A. California State University, Chico, and a D.M.A. from the Peabody Institute of Johns Hopkins University. He is currently an Adjunct Assistant Professor of Music, California State University, Chico.

Dr. Pickett identified the following four areas of music specialization and their evaluation criteria:

- 1. Music History:** The evaluation criteria is be the same criteria used for humanities professors.
- 2. Music Education:** The criteria are similar to those for psychology and other social science fields with research components.
- 3. Composition and Music Theory:** Criteria are similar to criteria for the Visual Arts.
- 4. Performance:** Performances can be both juried and non juried. The evaluation criteria are also similar to criteria for the Visual Arts. For performance-track faculty there is no real distinction between publications and scholarship.

The equivalent to an article for a performer would be a regional performance and the equivalent to a book would be a national performance. Local performances are more or less considered “scholarship.”

A music faculty member whose workload combines the above four tracks in some fashion should be evaluated by the guidelines used to evaluate humanities faculty.

Based on their consultations with Dr. Pickett, the Committee strongly recommends to the UAS administration that when it is decided to hire a music faculty member, steps be taken to develop specific guidelines for the research/creative activity component for this

discipline. This could be achieved by consulting with music faculty and departments at other institutions.

**APPENDIX J:  
SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING FACULTY  
IN THE PERFORMING ARTS:  
(II) THEATER AND DANCE**

Although courses are offered at UAS in these disciplines, it is unlikely that in the near future a tenure track faculty member will be hired in the areas of either theater or dance. Therefore, the Committee did not develop an appendix for these disciplines. However, the Committee makes similar recommendations to the administration regarding these as it made for music. That is, in the event of a pending hire in either or both disciplines, a set of guidelines should be developed by consulting with theater/dance faculty and departments in other institutions.

**APPENDIX K:  
SUPPLEMENT FOR ASSESSING FACULTY IN PSYCHOLOGY**

The general provisions of these guidelines regarding faculty performance and evaluation in the research component apply to the field of psychology. However, evaluators should apply the following values to co-authored publications.

For peer-reviewed, collaborative articles, books and book chapters:

Publications with two authors, 50 percent of the unit value for each author (adjusted accordingly for articles, authored and edited books—see Appendix A for unit values).

Publications with three or more authors, 50 percent of the unit value for the first author, 0.25 percent of the units for the second author, and 0.25 percent of the units to be divided among the remaining authors (adjusted accordingly for articles, authored and edited books—see Appendix A for unit values).

As is the right of all faculty, psychology faculty who believe that their contribution to a collaborative work exceeds the unit value set out above should obtain a letter or letters from their co-authors specifically

addressing the extent of their contribution and why they should be given greater credit than the standard unit values.

EFFECTIVE: May 2, 2003

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Janet Dye, President, UAS Faculty Senate

APPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
John Pugh, Chancellor

DISAPPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
John Pugh, Chancellor