

TO: Faculty Contemplating a Personnel Review  
FROM: Todd T. Gleeson, Associate Vice Chancellor  
SUBJECT: Advice on Curriculum Vita Construction for Personnel Reviews  
DATE: May 26, 1999

The curriculum vita (CV) is arguably the most important component of a faculty member's reappointment or promotion dossier. It is also the least standardized document in the dossier. Most junior faculty assemble their CV based upon one or a few examples; often the example is that of their doctoral or masters degree mentor. In many cases faculty will assume that if the CV was sufficient in style and format to be hired into a department, it must also be sufficient for reappointment and promotion purposes. This is often not the case.

Faculty approaching a personnel review should consider reformatting their vita for the internal audiences represented by department, college or school, and University personnel committees. These committees expect to see vitae that are easily read by scholars outside the discipline, and most importantly, that are absolutely accurate and free of exaggerated entries. Alumni of college and University personnel committees will readily recall instances where a poorly constructed CV triggered suspicious scrutiny of the entire dossier. This is usually more injurious to the faculty member's and the department's reputations than it is to the outcome of the case, but it is easily avoided by constructing a clearly read and accurate document of one's accomplishments. Below I list some general guidelines and a few observations that you might contemplate as you prepare your own CV for review, or discuss with a colleague the construction of their own CV.

- All CV's have some discipline-specific aspects. This is not a problem to review committees. Clarity and accuracy can be achieved while retaining the disciplinary-uniqueness of the CV. Most CVs have major sections dealing with

- |                                |                                   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. educational background      | 4. research and/or creative works |
| 2. academic employment history | 5. teaching accomplishments       |
| 3. grants/awards/honors        | 6. service activities.            |

Making these sections distinct makes the curriculum vita easier to read. There is no set format, however, so if other or additional sections make sense to you, please go ahead and utilize them.

- Listings of scholarly publications and creative works and performances are scrutinized by review committees. Completeness and accuracy are of paramount importance in this section. You can anticipate that a reviewer will look up at least an occasional citation.
- A common error in vitae is the mixing of refereed or juried work with similar work that is not peer-reviewed. No single error erodes the credibility of a candidate's dossier more. Candidates for reappointment or promotion and tenure are encouraged to subdivide this section into as many sub-sections as required in order to list each type of scholarly or creative work separately. Alternatively, peer reviewed work within a single listing of publications or performances should be identified by asterisks, footnoting, or similar identifiers.
- Recent review committees have asked that venues for performances, shows, or other creative works be subdivided into those that the primary unit considers to be of national and international importance, versus those of local and regional significance. This seems to work to the advantage of candidates, and I endorse this practice.
- Candidates should seek guidance as to what performances, shows, or popular writings should be listed under "service", and which should be listed under headings of scholarly work. Multiple

listing of activities under both scholarly and service activities is discouraged unless it is truly appropriate to do so. Inappropriate duplication sends a negative message to a reviewer.

- Some disciplines commonly list jointly authored works as "with Jane Doe and John Doe." For purposes of personnel reviews, this tradition is problematic since it disguises senior and junior authorship. A preferred citation style lists each author, in order of authorship. If authorship order does not reflect relative contribution, it can be discussed somewhere in the dossier.
- Some disciplines commonly omit inclusive page numbers from their citations. For purposes of personnel reviews, inclusive page citations (p112-116) is preferred as it allows reviewers to assess the relative magnitude and comprehensive nature of the several citations in the record.
- Written work not yet accepted for publication should be clearly identified as such. Written work not yet submitted for publication should also be clearly identified. Separate sub-sections for this work might be considered.
- Electronic publications should be fully cited in their own section, with some indication of size or length included. If you have information on the number of visits to a scholarly Web site, include it. If the site was anonymously peer-reviewed, it is to the candidate's advantage to include that information. Please provide the complete URL so that reviewers may evaluate the quality and significance of the electronic document.
- In some disciplines, publishing in conference proceedings is an important, peer-reviewed venue. In others, conference proceedings are not reviewed, or only superficially reviewed for purposes of organizing a conference into sessions. Conference proceeding should be distinguished as being peer-reviewed or not peer-reviewed with the same clarity as journal articles and monographs.
- Listings of teaching accomplishments should also indicate faculty involvement in individualized instruction at the graduate and undergraduate levels. It is an important part of the teaching responsibilities for some faculty, and it should not be overlooked. Faculty commonly list the names and completion dates (with degrees or honors) of the students that they have served as primary mentor. Some candidates underline the names of their student coauthors in their listing of publications. This is also a good idea, since coauthoring with students can be a positive attribute of a teaching and mentoring record. Listing courses taught or FCQ ratings as part of the CV is also sometimes observed, although this same information already appears in another section of the dossier.
- Participation in FTEP workshops might be listed under a section heading for teaching. Any study guides, manuals, workbooks, or electronic media produced for student or class use should also be listed.
- Service to professional organizations, government agencies, department, college or school, and University should be detailed. Document outreach activities to the community undertaken on behalf of the University. Listings can be annotated when some explanation is required.
- If you have a colleague in a discipline distant to your own, ask them to review for clarity a draft of your reappointment/promotion/tenure CV. The Office of Faculty Affairs will also be happy to arrange an outside reading of your CV by a review committee alum if you wish to have one.