

Preparing Tenure and Promotion Dossiers

I. A Quick Overview

The packet you will submit in support of your candidacy is similar for tenure and promotion proceedings, but there are differences between the two as well. As differences arise, we will explain them via an information box divided into two sections.

Your packet will consist of approximately 6 to 8 subdivisions, depending on what you decide is the most effective organization. A well-organized and well-presented packet will make the reviewers' jobs much easier and will reflect well on you. Write your statements in a professional tone, but without jargon. Some external reviewers and many evaluators within your college will not be familiar with specific terms used in your area of research. A standard packet usually includes the following sections:

- Section (1): Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Section (2): Research statement
- Section (3): Teaching statement
- Section (4): Summary of funding
- Section (5): Service to the department, college, and community
- Section (6): Selected publications

Provide a table of contents and label your sections clearly with dividers. (You may wish to color code the tabs for each section.) Compile the final product in a binder large enough to comfortably fit all sections. Overstuffed binders are irritating.

Provide your materials both as hard copies and as electronic copies. By attaching a clearly labeled and organized CD that duplicates the hard copy, you give reviewers options and allow them easily to reproduce any section.

Provide a citation and link to your website on your CV or at the bottom of your table of contents. Make sure that your website is updated and well organized. In addition to providing easy access to information about your professional activities, a well constructed website shows that you understand the importance of making your work publicly available. A website can include information that does not fit easily within your official packet. For example, you can post course descriptions, syllabi, and course assignments. If you work with students, you can include their photographs and information about them on your website. Although some faculty include personal photographs on their website, consider carefully whether you wish to do that.

II. Your Curriculum Vitae (CV)

A. The basics

You will probably want to have your CV in two formats, one which is suitable for outside reviewers and one which uses the Hunter College official format. For tenure and promotion, you

DRAFT

must use the official format. For reference, see Appendix C, page 60, for the format or follow the linked pdf file below.

<http://hr.hunter.cuny.edu/forms/CV%20Guide.pdf>

In your packet you may first include a copy of your CV in the Hunter format and then append another copy of your CV in your desired format directly following. This is especially helpful for outside reviewers. Separate the two with a labeled sheet of paper but keep both copies in the same (first) section of your packet. Speak to your chair about whether you need to indicate your salary to outside reviewers.

B. Writing a good CV

There is no clear set of rules across all disciplines. Each department puts different weight on certain accomplishments. Look at the CVs of your peers and of successful professors in your field as a guide for your own CV. We provide general tips on how to create an effective CV and on what to avoid. In each section, we list sample accomplishments that you could include. Do not get discouraged if you have not accomplished many of the examples listed below. People vary, especially in the early stages of a career. The examples we provide are intended to help you.

Do not pad your vita! A skilled reader will perceive the padding and evaluate you negatively. For example, if you wrote a paper which has been reprinted, do not treat the reprint as if it were a different article. Instead, put the reprint information in the same entry as the original publication entry. Do not put work in progress, work submitted for publication, reviews, in-house reports, or technical reports under the heading "Publications". Only refereed journal articles or refereed book chapters belong under that heading. Create separate headings for working manuscripts or other categories.

Make sure your CV does not present you as someone you are not. While it is important not to sell yourself short, you must also make no claims that you cannot substantiate. For example, do not claim to have a firm grasp on matters with which you are merely familiar. New faculty members are often asked to teach service courses (such as large introductory courses). If you claim to have a solid understanding and ability to teach a such a class, but have poor peer or student evaluations, you undercut your credibility. Highlight your skills and abilities, but do not exaggerate.

General organization and other tips. Though the most important part of your CV is its contents, it is helpful both to reviewers and to yourself to construct your CV in an organized and clearly labeled manner. The Hunter CV template designates specific sections in which to divide your CV. If you have an alternately formatted CV on file, be sure that all of your highlighted sections (e.g., personal information, publications) are in fact separated under the specified headings. Make sure the headings are clearly identifiable for easy referral for reviewers and easy editing for you.

DRAFT

Ask others, including peers and those well established within your field, to read over your CV and give you feedback. Make sure there are **no** typographical or grammatical errors on your CV or your other materials and no inconsistencies. Nothing shouts carelessness and lack of professionalism like easily-corrected mistakes.

Personal Information. Hunter has a set list of personal information which must be included on the Hunter CV. But you do not need to include any personal information (e.g., social security number, age, marital status, military service, current salary) on your non-Hunter CV.

Your educational history and professional experience should appear at the top of the first page of the vita. The usual practice is reverse chronological order for both and for publications and presentations, but chronological order is also acceptable. Include the institutions at which you received each degree, the year in which you received each degree, and the field. Also include any minor fields and honors.

Account for every year after graduation from college. If there are years in which you did not engage in official education, scholarly activity, or paid employment, use a phrase to indicate how you spent your time. For example, "independent research on X", "child care and community activities", "volunteer work on X".

Publications. If you are using reverse chronological order, use it for your publications as well. Depending on how many publications you have, you may want to separate them by type: peer reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters, reviews, and so on. Some scholars highlight their name in bold on papers with collaborators and star (*) names of students. Provide a key at the beginning of your publications if you use special fonts or symbols (e.g., “* marks names of students”). Don’t confuse reviewers by having a lot of fonts or symbols. If you are in a field where authors' names are in alphabetical order, indicate that at the beginning of the publications section.

List articles that are in press. You can have a separate section for working manuscripts. Be sure that there *is* a working manuscript for everything under that heading. Consider carefully whether you want to list articles that are under review; it can backfire if the article is rejected.

A list of courses you have taught is not part of the Hunter format. For your non-Hunter CV, you should include the names of the courses you have taught and are currently teaching, perhaps with a sentence describing each course. These may be listed under a separate heading entitled “Courses Taught” or “Teaching”.

Grants. List any external or internal grants received: list the title, the funding agency, the duration of the award, the amount of the award, your role on the project, and the names of collaborators. If you are a young investigator, list internal as well as external awards in separate sections. As you become more experienced and accomplished, consider listing only recent or current external funding. Use an appropriate heading that informs readers that the list is not comprehensive.

Professional activities. For your Hunter CV, include grants under professional activities. Within the same section, but under a new sub-heading, list invited talks or addresses you may have given. Presenting a poster at a conference may also be listed, though as your experience

DRAFT

builds up and your list in this category gets longer, you may begin by removing these, especially if they were at smaller conferences and early on in your career. If you are up for a promotion to full professor, or have been in academia for a long time, it is expected that you have been invited to present at major national and international conferences. Having presented at a few prestigious conferences is generally preferable to having presented at numerous small, unrecognized conferences. Similarly, if you have organized a conference or symposium, you should list it here. Be sure to clearly differentiate conferences where you were a presenter and those where you were an organizer (if applicable).

Include journal reviewing and grant reviewing. Separate journals or funding agencies for which you have been an ad hoc reviewer and those where you have been a member of the editorial board, an editor, or a regular study section member.

If you have served as an advisor to undergraduate, masters, or doctoral, or to post-doctoral researchers, list their names, the title of their theses or articles, and any awards or recognition they may have received as a result of working with you. Consider presenting their names in a chart (a separate one for undergraduate, masters, doctoral, and post-doctoral students), modeled on the following example:

MASTERS STUDENTS

Year	Name	Title of Thesis	Funding	Papers	Additional Comments	Activity Upon Leaving
2002-2004	Anne Smith	“Drug Use in Christian and Muslim Women”	National Institute of Health	2	Received Second Award at XX Conference	Currently in PhD program at UCLA

Outside recognition. Though many other sections of the CV could also fall under “Outside Recognition”, for the Hunter format you should list any professional licenses or certificates within your field that you may have received that you have not listed elsewhere in your CV. You could also list reviews of your work in book chapters or news reports. List the latter under a sub-heading entitled something like “Reports on My Work”. For natural sciences, you should list any patents you have received, again under a new sub-heading entitled “Patents”.

When constructing a non-Hunter CV, consider other headings, such as "Honors and Awards", "Professional Societies", "Keynote and Plenary Talks".

Academic and professional honors. List academic and professional honors acquired after college in reverse chronological order and indicate the year in which you received the award. If you are a junior faculty member, you may list honorable mentions for prestigious awards but do not include them if you are a senior faculty member. To get a good idea of what sorts of awards to include on your CV, ask your colleagues if you may have a look at theirs and look at CVs faculty post on the web. Look at several CVs from people at different levels of seniority.

Membership in professional societies. Membership in professional societies demonstrates that you are an active participant in your field. List all and nationally recognized societies to which

DRAFT

you belong that are pertinent to your research. Include the year you started membership and when (if applicable) you ended membership.

Administrative and other service on behalf of the college. Include any other activities in which you have participated that have served the college community, such as collaborative projects with other departments or outside organizations, or special programs in which you may have been an active participant.

Service to the larger community. List any activities or organizations in which you have participated that have benefited the community. Only list activities that are directly related to your research.

A final note. When composing your Hunter CV, you may be frustrated by its limitations. First, remember that your CV is supposed to be concise; reviewers are irritated by a CV that makes it difficult to focus on the most important features of someone's professional life. Second, in the rest of your packet you will include a statement about your research and a statement about your teaching. Those statements allow you to elaborate on your work (but should still be brief!). When in doubt, ask the members of your circle of advisors, your peers, and your department chair. The latter have not only been in your position but will constitute your first round of reviewers.

In the next subsection, we will take a look at two sample abridged CVs for the same **fictional** individual being considered for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. The first CV is a “good” version, and the second is a “bad” version. The person is fictional and the organizations and institutions mentioned are not in any way affiliated with the fictional research that they are listed as having published.

For additional resources on writing a CV, see the references at the end of this packet (page 46).

Good sample CV

Name: Jane Doe

College: Hunter College

Recommendation for: Promotion

Title: Associate Professor

Department: Psychology

Effective Date: 1 Nov 05 (or Nov 1, 2005)

Salary Rate: \$65,000

Date of Last Promotion: 1 June 96 (or June 1, 1996)

I. HIGHER EDUCATION

A. Degrees

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates Attended</u>	<u>Degrees and Major</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>
University of Pittsburgh	1980 – 1985	Ph.D., Psychology	June, 1985
University of Maryland, College Park	1971 – 1975	BS., Anthropology Cognitive Science	May, 1970

B. Additional Higher Education and/or Education in Progress:

University of Rochester	1986 – 1987	Postdoctoral Fellow, Psychology
New York University	1985 – 1986	(advisor moved from NYU to University of Rochester)

Comment [GEP-21]: By giving this brief explanation, Jane ensures that reviewers know why her post-doc years were split at two universities. Without it, they may think her advisor dropped her.

II. EXPERIENCE

A. Teaching in Other Institutions

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Department</u>
University of Pittsburgh	1987 – 1989	Adjunct Professor	Psychology

B. Other (non teaching)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Title</u>
University of Pittsburgh	1978 – 1980	Research Assistant – Lab Manager
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	1977 – 1978	Research Assistant
AC Nielsen New York, NY	1975 – 1977	Market Research Analyst

III. PUBLICATIONS

(1 – 22, 25-30 were completed at Hunter College; *signifies articles that were written with doctoral students as co-authors, # signifies articles that were written with masters students as co-authors, ^ signifies articles that were written with undergraduate students as co-authors.)

Comment [VV2]: This small list of publications does not reflect what is expected for promotion to Full Professor.

Peer Reviewed Journal Articles

1. Johnson, P., **Doe, J.**, & Danforth, I. (2005). The effects of self-esteem on romantic relationships involving mixed nationalities: A case study on French/American partners. *Cross Cultural Research*, 12, 52-70.^
2. **Doe, J.**, & Weiland, P. (2004). Miscommunication or misogyny? An exploration of linguistic and cultural barriers as potential predictors of inequity between romantic partners in mixed nationality relationships. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 37, 98-124.*
3. **Doe, J.**, Johnson, P., Watson, A., & Rogue, M. M. (2004). Cultural values as a predictor self-esteem and partner choice in Spanish/American mixed nationality couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 128-140.*

Comment [GEP-23]: By preceding her publications with this key, Jane gives specific information about her publications without cluttering up her references. Her key is concise enough not to cause confusion; it is clearly defined; it is placed so that reviewers may easily refer back to it.

Comment [GEP-24]: Separating publications by type is a good organizational strategy. Clearly labeling each section helps the reviewers focus on each type without frustration.

Comment [GEP-25]: By highlighting her name, Jane allows reviewers to easily find articles where she was first author or a single author.

Peer Reviewed Book Sections

25. Bausch, P., Brown, S. S., & **Doe, J.** (2005). Meeting the parents: The role of cultural values, norms, and traditions in interpersonal relationships. In F. W. Henderson (Ed.), *Intimate Relationships* (pp. 76-110). New York: University Press.

Formatted: German (Germany)

Deleted: P

Comment [GEP-26]: All of Jane's publications are listed in the official formatting of her field. Do the same.

Books

30. **Doe, J.**, & Blake, J. (2003). *Crossing that bridge: The social implications of cross-nationality romantic relationships*. Chicago: University Press.

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. Grant Activities

1. 2003 **National Institute of Health**: “Cultural exploration through mixed romantic pairs in Spain and France”, \$100,000 (2 years). Lead PI: Jane Doe; Co-PI: Paul Johnson.

Pending

1. 2006 **National Science Foundation**: “Cultural background as a predictor of depression symptoms in mixed nationality romantic pairs”, \$150,000 (1 year). Lead PI: Paul Johnson. Co-PIs: Juan José Goya, Susana Gote, Jane Doe.

Comment [GEP-27]: Like Jane, you can use bold typeface to highlight what you think is the most important part of your grants (e.g., the agency, the amount). If you collaborate with many other individuals on grants, you may wish to highlight your name instead. Indicate your role: if you are lead PI, say so; if you are a co-PI, say so.

B. Selected Presentations (National/International)

Speaker/Presenter

1. 4 May 05 **“Cultural Influence on self-perception and partner-perception in mixed nationality couples”**. Psychology Research Symposium, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.

2. 28 Jan 05 **“Cultural Influence on self-perception and partner-perception in mixed nationality couples”**. Barnard College Psychology Department, New York, NY.

3. 8 Aug 04 **“Relationships between culture and self-esteem on partner selection and relationship satisfaction in Spanish/American mixed romantic pairs”**. Harvard University Psychology Department, Cambridge, MA.

Comment [GEP-28]: Using the word “Selected” lets the reader know that this is a selective list, and that Jane has given other presentations that she did not list.

Comment [VV9]: It is not necessary to include the date. If you do include it, make sure that Europeans as well as North Americans can decode it.

Comment [GEP-210]: As Jane has done here, you can highlight a specific section to give it more emphasis (e.g., title, school, or conference or symposium) at which you presented.

Organizer

1. 1 July 04 **Second Annual Conference on Cross Cultural Psychology**, Palo Alto, CA. (Co-organizer with Dr. Susana Gote, Stanford University).

Comment [GEP-211]: Jane has nicely listed the conferences in which she was a presenter and those in which she was a coordinator or organizer under separate headings. This form of organization gives information in a neat, concise manner.

C. Editorial/Review Work

Journals

2002 – 2004 **Member, Editorial Board, Close Relationships**, a publication of the **American Psychological Society**.

2002 Ad-hoc reviewer, **Journal of Interpersonal Relationships**, a publication of the American Psychological Association.

Comment [GEP-212]: Stating your role or title will give more information to the reviewers.

Comment [GEP-213]: Giving publisher information may amplify the reputability of the journal if the organization is highly respected.

Books

2003 Invited reviewer, Princeton University Press.

Comment [VV14]: Do not include the title of the book you reviewed; that is confidential information.

Agencies

2004 – present Member, Editorial Board, Northeast Psychological Society.

D. Students Advised

PhD students

2001 – Present Weiland, Paul. “**Intimate relationships and depression in Middle Eastern subcultures in the United States**”. Additional funding provided by National Institute of Health. Due to defend dissertation May 2006.

Comment [GEP-215]: This is one good way to display information about students Jane has advised.

Masters students

1994 – 1996 Andrews, Beth. “Greek family values: The role of interpersonal relationships in Greek populations in Athens, Greece and in immigrant Greek families in Queens, New York”. Unpublished master’s thesis.

Comment [GEP-216]: Jane has advised all of her students at Hunter College and not at her previous schools. If you have advised students at different universities, be sure to list the name of the school as well.

Undergraduate students

Year	Name	Thesis Topic	Papers	Additional Comments	Activity Upon Leaving
2004	Isabella Danforth	Separation in first generation mixed pairs	1	Received Second Place Award at Undergraduate Symposium	Currently in a Ph.D program at University of Rochester

Comment [GEP-217]: Another method is to create a visual organizational scheme. Choose a format you like, but **stay consistent – make sure you report all of your students (graduate, undergraduate) in the same way.** These two formats are displayed to provide examples.

V. OUTSIDE RECOGNITION

Recent Media Coverage

4 Sept 05 [USA Today](http://www.article.com). A first generation of sadness. By Sam Smith. Available at <http://www.article.com>

Comment [GEP-218]: Jane gives a brief citation and a link to the online article where she and her work were mentioned. This makes it easy for reviewers to look at the extent of this coverage, if they so desire.

VI. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL HONORS

2004 CAREER Award from the National Science Foundation

2002 Psi Chi National Psychology Honor Society Research Award

Comment [GEP-219]: Jane lists only recent and high honors which pertain to her field.

VII. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

1995 – Present American Psychological Association
1994 – 2001 Society for Relationships Research
1980 – Present Psi Chi National Psychology Honor Society

Comment [GEP-220]: Jane only lists professional societies that matter in her field and only those in which she participated or is still participating as a professor (and not as a graduate student, for example). Typically, the list of professional societies would be longer; one would not double-space between them because there would be too many.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE COLLEGE

2005 **Research Abroad Initiative.** I am a founder of an initiative to help undergraduate and graduate students get involved in scientific research abroad. I have partnered with the study abroad office, and have spoken with study-abroad agencies to assist us in getting universities abroad involved. The project should be fully established by the end of Spring 2006; it will send its first cohort of students in Fall 2006.

IX. SERVICE TO THE LARGER COMMUNITY

2004 **Psychology in Grade School.** I am working with over 20 local public schools to design and implement a curriculum beginning in the 9th grade that will include psychology and social/personality relations throughout high school. What began as an attempt to include a core social psychology course in high schools grew into a project to redesign already existing core classes (e.g., history) to include themes of psychology and social relations.

X. RECORD AT HUNTER COLLEGE

Dates: 1989 – present
Rank: Associate Professor, 1996 – present Salary Rate: \$65,000
Assistant Professor, 1989 – 1996 \$56,000

Personal Data:
Address: 88 Avenue A, Brooklyn, NY 10088
Telephone No: (917) 555-8888 Military Status: NA
Social Security No: 888-88-8888 Date of Birth: 8 Aug 54
References: See outside reviews.

4.24 Bad sample CV

Name: Jane Doe

College: Hunter College

Recommendation for: Promotion

Title: Associate Professor

Department: Psychology

Effective Date: 6/1/05

Salary Rate: \$65,000

Comment [VV21]: Europeans will not be able to read this date as intended. Jane should spell out the dates.

Date of Last Promotion: 6/1/96

I. HIGHER EDUCATION

A. Degrees

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates Attended</u>	<u>Degrees and Major</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>
University of Pittsburgh	1980 – 1985	Psychology	June, 1977
University of Maryland, College Park	1971 – 1975	Anthropology, Cognitive Science	May, 1970

Comment [GEP-222]: Jane has not listed what type of degree she received at these institutions. Though it may seem obvious to a reader, reviewers want to distinguish immediately where someone received a BA and where she received a PhD.

B. Additional Higher Education and/or Education in Progress:

University of Rochester Psychology	1986 – 1987	Postdoctoral Fellow,
New York University Psychology	1985 – 1986	Postdoctoral Fellow,

Comment [GEP-223]: Two schools are listed because Jane's advisor switched schools, but the reason is not obvious to reviewers who are not familiar with her record. They may think that she terminated her fellowship and then restarted another one elsewhere. Or they may think her first advisor was unhappy with her and asked her to leave.

II. EXPERIENCE

A. Teaching in Other Institutions

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Department</u>
University of Pittsburgh	1987 – 1989	Adjunct Professor	Psychology

B. Other (non teaching)

University of Pittsburgh, 1978 – 1980, Research Assistant – Lab Manager
 University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1977 – 1978, Research Assistant
 AC Nielsen, New York, NY, 1975 – 1977, Market Research Analyst

Comment [GEP-224]: Jane's spacing and organization become inconsistent from the rest of her Education and Experience sections here. The section also looks cluttered because it lacks proper spacing.

III. PUBLICATIONS

1. Johnson, P., **Doe, J.**, & Danforth, I. (2005). The effects of self-esteem on romantic relationships involving mixed nationalities: A case study on French/American partners. *Cross Cultural Research*, 12, 52-70. This article was written with an undergraduate student.

Comment [GEP-225]: Jane did not separate her publications by type, making it difficult for reviewers to know how many journal articles she has published. It tends to look like padding.

2. Bausch, P., Brown, S. S., & **Doe, J.** (2005). Meeting the parents: The role of cultural values, norms, and traditions in interpersonal relationships. In F. W. Henderson (Ed.), *Intimate Relationships* (pp. 76-110). New York: University Press.

Comment [GEP-226]: By not providing a key, Jane has to keep repeating herself for each publication she completed with a graduate student. This makes citations longer and makes the section look cluttered.

Formatted: German (Germany)

3. **Doe, J.**, & Weiland, P. (2004). Miscommunication or misogyny? An exploration of linguistic and cultural barriers as potential predictors of inequity between romantic partners in mixed nationality relationships. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 37, 98-124. This article was written with a doctorate student.

4. **Doe, J.**, Johnson, P., Watson, A., & Rogue, M. M. (2004). Cultural values as a predictor self-esteem and partner choice in Spanish/American mixed nationality couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 128-140. This article was written with a doctorate student.

5. **Doe, J.**, & Blake, J. (2003). *Crossing that bridge: The social implications of cross-nationality romantic relationships*. Chicago: University Press.

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. Grant Activities

1. Effective 01/01/06 – 12/31/07 **National Science Foundation:** “Cultural background as a predictor of depression symptoms in mixed nationality romantic pairs”, \$150,000. PI: Paul Johnson. Co-Is: Juan José Goya, Susana Gote, Jane Doe,

Comment [GEP-227]: Jane has not indicated the status of this grant – for all we know, it has not been submitted yet.

2. 2003 **National Institute of Health:** “Cultural exploration through mixed romantic pairs in Spain and France”, \$100,000 (2 years). Co – PIs: Jane Doe, Paul Johnson.

Comment [VV28]: We do not know whether Jane is lead PI or not.

3. 1980 **Society for Relationship Research.** Dissertation Support Grant, \$5,000.

Comment [GEP-229]: Jane should not be listing grants she got as a graduate student on her CV for promotion to Full Professor.

Selected Presentations (National/International)

Invited Talks

1. 05/04/05 “**Cultural influence on self-perception and partner-perception in mixed nationality couples**”. Psychology Research Symposium, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.

2. 01/28/05 “Cultural influence on self-perception and partner-perception in mixed nationality couples”. Barnard College Psychology Department, New York, NY.

3. 08/08/04 “Relationships between culture and self-esteem on partner selection and relationship satisfaction in Spanish/American mixed romantic pairs” (translated title). La Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

4. 07/04/04 “Relationships between culture and self-esteem on partner selection and relationship satisfaction in Spanish/American mixed romantic pairs”. Harvard University Psychology Department, Cambridge, MA.

Comment [GEP-230]: Listing a presentation at a small, unknown school or department may not be appropriate for promotion to Full Professor, but it does indicate an international standing, which is desirable.

Poster Presentation

1. 09/28/05 “Preliminary analysis of cultural values as predictors of self esteem and depression symptoms in South American/North American mixed nationality romantic partners”. University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Comment [GEP-231]: For promotion to Full Professor, Jane could consider omitting this section. (For promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure, it would definitely be retained).

Organizer

1. 07/01/04 **Second Annual Conference on Cross Cultural Psychology**, Palo Alto, CA. (Co-organizer with Dr. Susana Gote, Stanford University).

C. Editorial/Review Work

2002 – 2004 **Close Relationships**
2002 Journal of Interpersonal Relationships
2003 B. C. Clark’s “Global Relationships”, University Press.
2004 – present Northeast Psychological Society

Comment [GEP-232]: By mixing all forms of her editorial work together, and not describing them in her list, Jane is exhibiting poor organizational skills.

Comment [GEP-233]: There is little information provided about Jane’s role as a reviewer and the type of publication this is (journal? book?).

Comment [VV34]: Confidential information should not be included: a book’s author and title are confidential.

D. Students Advised

2001 – Present Weiland, Paul. (Ph.D candidate) “Intimate relationships and depression in Middle Eastern subcultures in the United States”. Additional funding provided by National Institute of Health. Due to defend dissertation May 2006.

Comment [GEP-235]: Jane should have separated her students by level (e.g., masters).

2003-2004 Danforth, Isabella. (Undergraduate honor’s student) “Separation in first generation mixed pairs”. Unpublished undergraduate thesis.

Comment [GEP-236]: By not highlighting any parts, impressive information (such as the funding agency or thesis title) becomes lost in longer descriptions such as this.

1994 – 1996 Andrews, Beth. (Masters student) “Greek family values: The role of interpersonal relationships in Greek populations in Athens, Greece and in immigrant Greek families in Queens, New York”. Unpublished master’s thesis.

Comment [GEP-237]: Jane did not list any of the awards or recognition her undergraduate advisee received. Having a successful undergraduate student reflects well on the advisor, especially if success continues after graduation.

V. OUTSIDE RECOGNITION

Recent Media Coverage

09/04/05 Mentioned in an article in *USA Today*.

Comment [GEP-238]: A minor note: Jane should have placed these lines on the next page for clearer organization. But since Jane has only one mention, an entire section is not called for.

Comment [GEP-239]: By not giving any information about the article, Jane makes her recognition appear iffy; reviewers may question the importance of the mention.

VI. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL HONORS

2004 CAREER Award from the National Science Foundation

2002 Psi Chi National Psychology Honor Society Research Award

1995 Psychology Department Student Choice Teaching Award

1984 Higher Education Research Award, First Prize

Comment [GEP-240]: Jane shouldn't list an award with little scholarly merit. It's nice that students in the psych department voted her best teacher that year, but it doesn't bear on Jane's scholarship. The inclusion may make it appear as though she's desperate to put something on her CV.

Comment [GEP-241]: An award won during graduate school could be omitted for promotion to Full Professor, but if it was followed by other awards it does show a nice pattern.

VII. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

1995 – Present American Psychological Association

1994 – 2001 Society for Relationships Research

1980 – Present Psi Chi National Psychology Honor Society

1980 – 1985 Society for Women Psychologists

Comment [GEP-242]: Jane should not list any societies to which she belonged as a graduate student.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE COLLEGE

2005 **Research Abroad Initiative.** Program encouraging students to do research abroad.

Comment [GEP-243]: Jane should have given more information about her specific role in this project, its future directions, etc.

IX. SERVICE TO THE LARGER COMMUNITY

2004 **Psychology in Grade School.** Initiative for psychology curriculum in early education.

Comment [GEP-244]: This is vague and uninformative.

1984 – 1989 **Volunteer Work and Behavioral Observations.** I have volunteered at a homeless shelter almost every Sunday for 5 years. While distributing food and water, and helping out with clerical duties, I have been making observations on the behavioral patterns of the homeless inhabitants of the shelter, especially in their (possibly romantic) interactions with each other. I keep these notes on file, and plan to perhaps pursue a study in the future building on my observations in the shelter.

Comment [GEP-245]: Though Jane does manage to put a research-related spin on this piece of community service, she should not have included it on her CV. She was volunteering at a homeless shelter and was neither using her research to help the community nor expanding her research throughout the community.

X. RECORD AT HUNTER COLLEGE

Dates: 1989 – present

Rank: Associate Professor, 1996 – present
Assistant Professor, 1989 – 1996

Salary Rate: \$65,000
\$56,000

Personal Data:

Address: 88 Avenue A, Brooklyn, NY 10088

Telephone No: (917) 555-8888

Social Security No: 888-88-8888

References: See outside reviews.

Military Status: NA

Date of Birth: 08/08/54

III. Research statement

Your research productivity is the most important component of your consideration for promotion and is very important for tenure. Your research statement is accordingly important: it is your opportunity to describe your research projects and interests in depth. Describe your current research projects and future directions. If it is appropriate to your field (e.g., molecular structures, visual models of theories or hypotheses), consider providing graphs or models in your statement.

<p>If you are being considered for promotion, concentrate on projects you have pursued since your last promotion or since your initial hiring.</p>	<p>If you are being considered for tenure, emphasize what you have achieved as well as the potential and promise of your research.</p>
---	---

Focus on your current line of research but summarize your earlier accomplishments as well. Your research statement should tell a coherent story.

Both quantity and quality of publications are relevant to your case. Though quantity can easily be measured, quality is defined a number of ways. An index known as *impact factor* is a good measure of the importance of a journal and the extent to which articles in it are cited. Learn about the impact factors of the journals in your field. You should not expect that all reviewers are aware of the prestige of the journals where you are publishing. When coming up for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, indicate the impact factor of the journals in which you publish. If you have fewer publications than is desirable, but they are in high-impact journals, highlight that fact. If you publish in low impact journals, do not call attention to that fact.

As you mature, your citation rate becomes increasingly relevant. Different fields have different methods of keeping track of citations. The ISI Web of Science is commonly used, is available at Hunter College, and can be accessed at library.wexler.hunter.cuny.edu. If your citation rates are low, and you have a choice, don't report them. Check with your department about the norms of your discipline.

<p>During the time from your initial hire until your first promotion, or during the time between promotions, aim for a consistent publication rate. You will have "good" and "bad" years but your record should demonstrate sustained productivity.</p>	<p>If you come up for tenure in your 4th year and have spent the majority of your time setting up a laboratory and establishing a foundation for your research, publishing significantly more towards the end of your tenure clock is acceptable (but should be explained in writing).</p>
--	---

Aim for consistent productivity. If you only begin publishing right before you go up for tenure, you risk being seen as disorganized or not committed to research. If that is your situation, you

should provide a brief explanation (e.g., perhaps you had a few long-term studies which ended around the same time), so you do not appear to be productive only when your academic future is on the line. If you spent most of your time obtaining grants to create your research facility, or organizing your laboratory, you should explain the importance of that focus and its consequences for your productivity. Aim for an explanation, not an excuse. Indicate what you are now positioned to accomplish. That will not help with promotion but might help with tenure.

To brainstorm and organize your thoughts about your research, ask yourself the following questions, since they will be the main focus of your research statement.

Why is your research important in your field? What are the theoretical implications of your research within your field? In general, how does this research benefit others in your discipline? Can other researchers build upon your research? Do your findings offer answers to any other researchers within your field? Demonstrate the theoretical importance of your work or its ability to move your field forward.

How has your research progressed? Good researchers are focused and consistent. Even if you have worked in a number of different areas, you need to tie them together conceptually in your research statement. You want to avoid appearing scattered. Pursuing many unrelated projects does not reflect well on your scholarly impact in a specific field. Displaying a progression of thought in a specific area of research through building on your past studies shows your commitment and dedication to making a scholarly contribution in your field. It is fine – often desirable – to have more than one research interest, as long as you are doing significant work in each of them.

If you stay within one area of research, you should still branch out from your dissertation. It is important to show that you have grown as a scholar and have moved beyond your dissertation.

Have you published work as a single author? Have you collaborated with others? Being a single author on a publication naturally reflects well on you, as it displays your ability to be the primary driving force behind a project from its initial stages to its final form as a published piece. It indicates that you are hard working and independent, and are able to produce without having to share the load with others. At the same time, in many disciplines today it is also desirable to have collaborations with other researchers: most research involves teamwork. Being a co-author on a paper or book demonstrates your ability to lead a team. Check with your department *early on in your career* to learn what is more valued within your discipline. If your research is not in the preferred style, focus on other selling points of your work, such as the impact factor of the journals in which you publish, the importance of the subject matter, and the implications of the research. There are many ways to highlight the importance of your research.

Make sure that you have taken a leading role in the papers and projects that you mention in your statement. Do not spend time on collaborations where your contribution was minor, such as providing a specific program with which to analyze data.

Interdisciplinary collaborations, or those which have been done with researchers from other institutions, display your ability to make partnerships and give your work national and possibly international breadth.

What are the broader impacts of your research? Think outside of your field. Is your research interdisciplinary? Has it spawned research projects in other fields or added to a broader knowledge base? Is your research related to public policy, such as a social or health issue? Do you have a partnership or collaborative effort with outside organizations, such as the Department of Education? If so, mention that in your research statement and refer reviewers to your Service section, where you will describe it in greater depth. You want to highlight ways in which your work, and thus Hunter College, receives more attention from a wider public.

When writing about your research projects, be sure to mention any recognition your projects have received. Were you invited to a conference to present your work or to be a discussant? Were you a guest speaker at a university event? Has your work been mentioned in non-academic, intellectually respected publications (e.g., major newspapers and news magazines)? These are merely a few examples. Within each discipline there exist different hallmarks of recognition. Be selective – include everything that is important but don't list every minimal mention you may have had. Having presented a poster 20 years ago at a small conference will be of little interest to your reviewers, and may actually hurt your case, as they may assume that you have not done much else (why *else* would you have listed it?). Seek the advice of senior colleagues and your circle of advisors if you are unsure about what to include and exclude.

Keep track of and report any reviews of your work. These may take the form of excerpts of grant or paper reviews, follow-up studies by others or reports or mentions in books or news sources. By showing that other researchers are paying attention to your work you demonstrate its importance.

What effect has your research had on students? You can address this in the Research Statement, the Teaching Statement, or both. Tailor the information regarding your effect on students in the research statement to results of your research (and not your teaching, or co-curricular activities). What sort of opportunities has your research given students? Do you advise students at an undergraduate, masters, or doctoral level? Have you published papers with them? Have they received any awards or improved their futures based on the work they have done with you? Do you hire research assistants in your lab? Where have they gone from there (e.g., graduate school, other jobs)? If you have not advised any PhD students, that will not be a major issue in achieving tenure. Hunter stresses the importance of educating and mentoring undergraduate and masters students, rather than PhD students. Furthermore, heavy involvement in the Graduate Center can sometimes hurt your candidacy.

Thinking about these questions will help you get started on writing your research statement. **No one is expected to have done everything.** We have described the ideal candidate, which few people are. When in doubt about whether to include something, or how to phrase a certain accomplishment, ask the members of your circle of advisors, your peers, and your chair. Advice from "gatekeepers" (those who are in positions to make decisions about candidates) is particularly useful, as is advice from those who have recently received a promotion or have been

granted tenure. The latter may be willing to share their research statement or other materials they submitted. Ask for comments on your statement from a number of people, including your chair, if you trust him or her. The more feedback you get, the more likely it is that you will be on the right track with your research statement.

IV. Teaching Statement

Your research statement and productivity are of highest importance in your promotion packet. Your teaching statement matters, but less so.	Though research is the primary focus of your packet, teaching is an essential factor, especially in recommending tenure .
---	--

Faculty are sometimes frustrated by what appears to be insufficient emphasis on teaching excellence during the tenure and promotion processes. It is true that research productivity receives extremely high priority during these reviews, but teaching is one of the most important, and often times most rewarding, parts of academic life. At a teaching-intensive institution like Hunter, faculty have a special responsibility to reach students: it is the mission of Hunter faculty to educate undergraduate and masters students. The teaching statement is your opportunity to describe what your goals in teaching are and the extent to which you think you have met those goals.

Students are not the only ones learning in the classroom; many research projects are sparked by ideas that arise in the classroom. Faculty often do not spot a hole in their own reasoning until they try to explain their research to students. The research-teaching connection also benefits students, who might be inspired to collaborate and continue their education with the faculty member because of this connection.

There are various ways in which to demonstrate your contributions through teaching or to the teaching environment of your department. You might want to start your teaching statement with your overall approach to teaching and mentoring and the place they hold in your professional career. In addition, ask yourself the following questions. You may be unable to answer “yes” to every question. As with the research statement, your goal is to highlight your positive contributions.

Are you teaching courses that your department needs someone to teach? Evaluate your courses from the point of view of the department. Are they courses that are *essential* to the department? For example, you may be teaching a class that is a prerequisite for many other classes, or teaching a course of skills and methods that are fundamental to a broad range of sub-disciplines within your department. You may have special expertise or knowledge, making you a particularly valuable teacher who is not easily replaced. Your department chair may have specifically asked you to teach a course for reasons that reflect highly on your abilities as a teacher.

Have you participated in course development? Though teaching core courses is extremely beneficial, course innovation and new course development (e.g. an internet course) show creativity, leadership, and a desire to help the department grow. This is especially important for tenure, since such qualities are highly desirable in a permanent department member. Have you helped design a completely new course? If so, has the course been well received by both faculty and students?

Do you teach courses in any special programs? Are you teaching classes that are part of an honors program or a specific program targeted towards students with advanced creative or academic interests?

What is your class dynamic like? If you teach seminars or small classes, is there active discussion between the students and the teacher and among the students themselves? Is there usually a waitlist for your class that cannot be attributed to students needing to take your course for a requirement? Do you have students from various departments in your classes?

How are your student and faculty ratings? Attaching a summary (average) sheet of your student evaluations for each class in your packet shows how effective your students find your teaching style. After all, they are the ones who see you every class. As faculty evaluations are automatically sent by the evaluators to your chair, who then sends them to the Department Personnel and Budget Committee, you do not need to incorporate any peer evaluations in your packet. If your evaluations are of exceptional quality, you could include a few samples, though peer evaluations are expected to include constructive criticism. If your reviews have not been generally positive, do not draw attention to them and do not provide excuses for them. It is better to simply focus on stronger aspects of your case for tenure or promotion, such as your research.

Student letters are generally not presented in a tenure or promotion packet. If, however, you have received an *extremely* appreciative letter from a student, which is detailed, thoughtful, highlights the unique aspects of your teaching, and demonstrates the impact you made on him or her, you may append it to this section.

Are you taking on students as advisees? If you have addressed this in your Research Statement section, you may simply write a short reminder and direct reviewers to the specific page and section where you describe supervision in depth. You should also comment on other types of student mentoring in which you may be involved (e.g., Intel high school students, Mellon Mays national minority program).

Do you make time for your students? Do you hold regular office hours, or make an effort to make yourself available to students? Are you easy to get in touch with (e.g., via e-mail, telephone, after class)?

No one is the perfect teacher. You will not be expected to have excelled in every category, but the categories will help you think about what to include in your teaching statement.

V. Summary of Funding

In many disciplines, candidates who have received external funding for their research have a strong case when they are considered for tenure or promotion. Because competition for funds is high, success in obtaining external funds is one sign of excellence. In addition, external funds are a way of supporting your institution, especially if you support students as research assistants. Summarize all grants and monetary awards, including internal funding, in this section.

The grant information should include a) the funding agency, b) the amount of the award (and indicate whether it is the total amount or direct costs only), c) the dates of the award, d) the title of the proposal, e) your role on the project (e.g., lead Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI), and f) other collaborators and their roles on the project. Create an organized chart or list. If you decide to provide a paragraph's description of each award, you can provide the page number at which each grant summary may be found.

If you have not received any external funding, do not include such a heading. If you have not any internal funding, do not include such a heading. Receiving grants is always desirable, but having enough to fill up an extensive list is not common, even at higher levels of promotion. If your field has few grants available, make sure that your evaluators know that. Discuss your funding status with members of your circle of advisor and trusted department members to find out how best to represent it. If you have applied unsuccessfully for a grant, do not list it **unless** you are a junior faculty member and have received a high priority score. In this case, include the grant summary along with its priority score. If you have not received significant amounts of funding, but have applied for a grant, you should describe both the essential details of the grant (i.e., funding agency, monetary amount, time span of grant) as well as the research for which it is proposed.

Consider appending copies of the summaries of grant proposals which have been funded or recommended for funding. If you have received multiple grants, consider separating the summaries with cover sheets, with a simple title and number of each grant on them, to provide clearer visual distinctions.

VI. Service

This section of your packet is given less emphasis than your scholarly productivity (research) and your teaching during the tenure and promotion review processes. Nevertheless, a strong record in service is desirable. The service section should focus on your service to your discipline, department, college, university, and community.

Begin your service statement with a list of the societies or organizations within your field that you participate in or belong to. Include societies which are general in your field (e.g., American Psychological Association, American Chemical Society) as well as those that are more specific to your research (e.g., Endocrine Society, Center for Gay and Lesbian Studies). If you are currently or were at one point a member of a society that required selection and nomination (and not simply payment of a fee), you may wish to state this in your service section. For all

DRAFT

societies, mention the year in which you were inducted and the year in which your membership was terminated, if applicable. If you were an active member, describe your role (e.g., Secretary, President) and how you contributed to the organization and ultimately to the field as a whole.

Include other service activities that have benefited your field. Have you served as an external advisor or consultant to a company within the industry of your field? Are you coordinating a project or involved in an inter-university initiative to help promote your field? Have you been a member of an editorial review panel?

Include administrative roles that you may have assumed in service to your department, to Hunter College, or to CUNY. List all committees you have served on as well as departmental or college-wide projects or special programs. For example, you may have served on a faculty hiring committee or a program designed to improve faculty teaching. You may have participated in mentoring other faculty mentoring or served as the chair of your department. State your role, the duration of the position, and how your participation benefited Hunter College. If you have advised undergraduate or graduate students or sponsored any post-doctoral fellows, mention that briefly and direct the reader to the specific section and page number where you describe advisement and supervision in detail.

Describe service in your community that is relevant to your research. Were you part of an organization that was specifically focused on outreach and education within a specific community? Did you volunteer your time at organizations and on projects within the community that were directly related to your research? State your role and contributions. Justify your participation by explaining its connection to your research – being involved in unrelated projects may be seen as a poor expenditure of your time.

In each section (service to field, department, college or university), emphasize any leadership position you may have held or leadership qualities you displayed. Were you the founder or co-director of any committee or program? Did you help spark the initial ideas to a now well-established project? If you have been a member in any organization for a number of consecutive years, highlight your consistent membership. If your service work has ever been reviewed in a reputable non-academic publication, you may want to include a copy of the article at the end of this section.

If your service record is not strong, simply say little about it. It is generally less important than your research productivity, your teaching, and your promise. The service section is sometimes omitted altogether in promotion packets (with mentions as appropriate in the CV). This section must, however, be included in a tenure packet. .

VII. Selected Publications

This section is a collection of usually no more than 10 selected reprints that best display the nature, scope, and impact of your research. When choosing which articles to include in this section, pick those that have appeared in high impact journals and those where you have played an essential role in the project. Pick articles which reflect the main focus or foci of your

DRAFT

research, and wherever possible use recent publications. Make sure that most of the papers included are those which were published during your time at Hunter.

The reprints should remain just as they appear in journals. Creating a table of contents that lists the citations of all of the included articles, in appropriate formatting with the page number where they can be found, will help reviewers access articles and information with ease and will reflect well on your presentation.

If you have publications which cannot be reprinted (e.g. books, videos, specials), write a separate detailed account of each of them in an introduction before the reprints. Though the descriptions should be thorough, they should be concise. The introduction as a whole should range from 1-3 pages.

You can also include a subsection on what is currently in press if it appears that you do not have very many published articles to present.

DRAFT

References

For information strictly on Tenure/Promotion:

Abbott, D. A., & Sanders, G. F. (1991). On the road to tenure. *Family Relations*, 40, 106-109.

Baron, D. (2002, November 7). A look at the record. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from Web site: <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/11/2002110701c.htm>

Baron, D. (2003, January 7). External Reviewers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from Web site: <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2003/01/2003010701c.htm>

Baron, D. (2003, February 14). The tenure files: Getting through the college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from Web site: <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2003/02/2003021401c.htm>

Bruner, E. (1990). *Tenure Narratives*. Anthropology Newsletter. Retrieved October 31, 2005 from Web site: <http://websites.usu.edu/advance/FileManager/Download.asp?Parent=6299&FilePath=Tenure+Narrative%2Epdf>

Bugeja, M. J. (2005, August 5). Master (or mistress) of your domain. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from Web site: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i48/48c00101.htm>

Groves, D. L. (1989). Criteria for tenure and promotion decisions. *Education*, 110, 162-201.

Hunter College of the City University of New York. (2005). *Office of the Provost: Schedule of Promotions 2005 – 2006*. (Available from the Office of the Provost or from the Web site: http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/arts_sci/information_for_staff.shtml

Hunter College of the City University of New York. (2005). *Office of the Provost: Schedule for Tenure & CCE*. (Available from the Office of the Provost or from the Web site: http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/arts_sci/information_for_staff.shtml

Hunter College of the City University of New York. (2003). *Faculty Handbook 2003-2004*. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from the Hunter College Website: http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/fda/web/handbook03_04.htm

Report of the Georgia Tech Promotion and Tenure ADVANCE Committee (PTAC). Accessed May 17, 2004 from Web site: <http://www.advance.gatech.edu/ptac/>

DRAFT

University of California at Irvine. (2003). *Advancement and promotion at Irvine*. Retrieved July 30, 2005 from Web site: <http://www.ap.uci.edu/Guides/faculty/TenureHandbook,02.pdf>

University of Hawai'i at Manoa. (2004). *Criteria and guidelines for faculty tenure/promotion application*. Retrieved July 30, 2005 from Web site: <http://homepages.uhwo.hawaii.edu/~senate/tenureguidelines2001.htm>

University of Washington. (2005). *ADVANCE professional development consultants*. Retrieved July 30, 2005 from Web site: http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/resources/development_consultants.html

Utah State University. *ADVANCE: Promotion and Tenure resources*. (2005). Retrieved July 30, 2005 from Web site: <http://websites.usu.edu/advance/Document/index.asp?Parent=6299>

For general advice on academic career planning:

Caplan, Paula J. (1994). *Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide for surviving in the academic world*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Roediger III, H. L., & Balota, D. A. (2004). *Managing your career: The long view*. In J.M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed., pp. 393 – 407). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Taylor, A. E., & Martin, J. (2004). *The academic marathon: Controlling one's career*. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed., pp. 363 – 392). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Toth, Emily. (1997). *Ms. Mentor's impeccable advice for women in academia*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

For information on building a curriculum vitae:

DRAFT

Dietz, J. S., Chompalov, I., Bozeman, D., Lane, E. O., & Park, J. (2000). Using the curriculum vita to study the career paths of scientists and engineers: An exploratory assessment. *Scientometrics*, 49, 419-442.

Hunter College of the City University of New York. (2002). *Office of Personnel Services: Guide for curriculum vitae form*. Retrieved on July 30, 2005, from Web site: <http://hr.hunter.cuny.edu/forms/CV%20Guide.pdf>

Reis, R. M. (2000, March 31). Curriculum vitae – Research emphasis. [Jobs: Catalyst]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 8, 2005, from Web site: http://chronicle.com/jobs/2000/03/2000033102c_research.htm

Reis, R. M. (2000, March 31). Curriculum vitae – Teaching emphasis. [Jobs: Catalyst]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, retrieved October 8, 2005, from http://chronicle.com/jobs/2000/03/2000033102c_teaching.htm

Reis, R. M. (2000, March 31). The basics of science C. V.'s. [Jobs: Catalyst]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 8, 2005, from Web site: <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2000/03/2000033102c.htm>

Roediger, H. L. (2004, January). Vita voyeur. *American Psychological Society Observer*, 17, 26-27.