



*Salmon P. Chase College of Law*

*Compiled Faculty  
Policies*

*(Updated 2025)*

## COMPILED CHASE FACULTY POLICIES

The Chase Faculty approved a revised Faculty Policies and Procedures Handbook on May 3, 1995. This Handbook was approved by the Board of Regents on September 20, 1995. Since this Handbook is printed and distributed separately, it is not reproduced here. The provisions of the Revised Handbook may differ from those set forth in this section of the Compiled Chase Faculty Policies. [Ed.]

### 6.1 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

**[adopted September 26, 1990;  
amended April 13, 2005, September 27, 2011, December 15, 2011, and April 19, 2012]**

#### I. Introduction A. Charge

The Appointments Committee (Committee) is charged with the duty of administering the faculty recruitment process at Salmon P. Chase College of Law (College of Law). To fulfill that duty and to best serve the College of Law and its goals, the Committee will follow these Policies and Procedures (Procedures).

#### B. Scope

The positions described in this section are as defined in the Chase College of Law - Northern Kentucky University Faculty Policies and Procedures Handbook.

#### 1. These Policies and Procedures of the Appointments Committee apply to:

- a. All searches for entry-level full-time, tenure-track faculty.
- b. Full-time, non-tenure track, renewable faculty positions, including fulltime non-tenure track clinical faculty positions as described in Standard 405 of the American Bar Association Standards for Approval of Law Schools.
- c. All searches for the following positions, except that the Committee may choose to recruit candidates through venues other than the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) Faculty Recruitment Conference (FRC):
  - Lateral full-time, tenure-track faculty, except as described in I.B.2 below.
  - Full-time administrators with academic rank, excepting the Dean and the Associate Dean for Law Library Services & Information Technology, unless the position is to be filled by a current member of the faculty.

- Endowed chairs and named professorships, unless the position is to be filled by a current member of the faculty.
- d. Small Business and Non-Profit Clinic Director position, which is to be a tenure-track position. [added December 15, 2011].

2. These Policies and Procedures of the Appointments Committee do not apply to:

- a. Searches for the position of Dean of the College of Law (the Dean). Searches for this position will be conducted by a Special Committee appointed by the President of the University or the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.
- b. Searches for the Associate Dean for Law Library Services & Information Technology. A Special Committee will be appointed by the Dean to recruit and facilitate the selection of candidates for this position. This Special Committee will be comprised of the Appointments Committee, one member of the current Law Library Faculty, and one member of the current University Library Faculty. The Special Committee will recommend at least three candidates to the tenure-track teaching faculty. The recommended candidates will participate in on-campus interviews as described in Section IV.D., except that the substantive presentation may be on a topic pertaining to library administration. Following the candidates' interviews, the faculty will hold a meeting in executive session and will vote by show of hands whether to recommend each candidate for the position. The faculty will inform the Dean of the vote tally for each candidate. The Dean may then offer the position to any candidate receiving an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of those voting at the meeting.
- c. Searches for full-time, non-tenure track temporary faculty positions such as lecturers, adjunct professors, visiting professors, distinguished practitioners, and distinguished jurists, in which the appointee is expected to hold the position for less than one calendar year on a nonrenewable basis.
- d. Searches for full-time non-tenure track administrators, unless the administrator is expected to teach on a regular basis.
- e. Searches for part-time adjunct faculty. The Dean has sole responsibility for these appointments, and may delegate this authority to the Associate Dean for Academics.
- f. Searches for Law Library Faculty. A Special Committee will be appointed by the Associate Dean for Law Library Services & Information Technology to recruit and facilitate the selection of candidates for these positions. This

Special Committee will contain at least one member of the regular teaching faculty. It will recommend at least two candidates to the Associate Dean for Law Library Services & Information Technology, who then will choose among the recommended candidates.

- g. Retiring faculty who are being considered for emeritus status. See Faculty Handbook, Part One, Sections I.G.1 and III.C.

### C. Candidates

A candidate is a person who is being considered for a position at the College of Law to which these procedures apply pursuant to I.B.1 above.

## II. Appointments Committee

The Appointments Committee shall be appointed by the Dean and shall consist of at least four members of the faculty and one or two students. Faculty members who are temporarily occupying the position to be filled or who are being terminated shall not be appointed to the Committee. The Dean shall be an ex-officio member of the Committee.

[as amended April 19, 2012].

## III. Identification of Available Faculty Positions

In late spring, the Dean will advise the faculty and Committee which positions s/he has determined may become vacant in the coming year. No later than the last faculty meeting of the academic year, the Committee and Dean, in consultation, will then make a recommendation to the faculty of the number and types of positions to be filled. The recommendation will be acted upon by a majority vote of those attending a regular or special faculty meeting called for this purpose. If any additional positions become vacant before the first faculty meeting of the academic year, the Dean will so advise the committee, which, in consultation with the Dean, will make a recommendation to the faculty concerning these positions. This recommendation also will be acted upon by a majority vote of those attending a regular or special faculty meeting called for this purpose.

[as amended April 19, 2012].

## IV. Recruitment Procedures

### A. Advertising of Vacant Position

The Committee must: (1) advertise every vacant position in the AALS Placement Newsletter; (2) send notice of every vacant position to associations of minority and women lawyers; (3) post every vacant position online on the Northern Kentucky University job site; and (4) publicize every vacant position in any other way required by University faculty hiring policies. The Committee may advertise vacant positions in other venues as it deems appropriate.

All advertisements must contain the following statement: “Northern Kentucky University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and encourages the application of minorities, women, and others whose backgrounds will contribute to the diversity of the faculty.”

#### B. Review of Applications

Ordinarily, the Committee will utilize the recruitment facilities of the AALS. The applications of all candidates for a position will be reviewed by at least one faculty member of the Committee and by a student member of the Committee, if possible. Any member of the regular tenure-track faculty may review all applications, copies of which the Chair will make available to the faculty. The Committee will determine, by majority vote, which candidates will be asked to attend an Initial Interview. At the request of four or more regular tenure-track faculty members who are not members of the Committee, the Committee will also invite for an Initial Interview any candidate the Committee has not already invited. The number of candidates which any faculty member who is not on the Committee may request to be invited for an Initial Interview shall be limited to three. Any such requests must be made a sufficient time in advance of the AALS FRC to allow the Committee to make arrangements for the interview. Such requests may be rejected by the Committee if the interview schedule is already full.

Ordinarily, the Committee will conduct the Initial Interview of the candidate at the annual FRC. However, if the Committee or the candidate does not attend the Conference, the Initial Interview may be conducted at the College of Law by members of the Committee. The Committee may, prior to its initial interviews, distribute to the faculty at a faculty meeting prior to the FRC the FAR (Faculty Appointments Register) forms of some or all of the candidates to be interviewed at the FRC.

The Committee may offer on-campus interviews to select candidates at the conclusion of those candidates’ FRC screening interviews. Otherwise, after the Initial Interviews have been completed, the Committee shall, by majority vote, select and rank the candidates who will be invited for an On-Campus interview at the College of Law. The selection and rankings of the Committee must be consistent with the affirmative action and equal opportunity goals of the University. There is no set number of applicants that shall be invited back for on-campus interviews. Ordinarily the Committee should attempt to invite from one to three candidates to campus. The faculty believes that these policies are consistent with those necessary to complete a competitive national search.

Within seven days of the Committee’s return from the FRC, the Chair shall hold a special faculty meeting in Executive Session at which s/he will give complete information about the results of

the interviews, disclose the names and background of the candidates who the Committee has invited for On-Campus interviews, and explain the reasons behind the selection and ranking of these candidates.

[as amended April 19, 2012].

### C. References

Once a selected candidate has agreed to an on-campus interview, the Chair of the Committee or a designated member of the Committee shall contact the candidate's listed references on her/his AALS FAR form or resume. In addition, the Chair may call those current or former employers who the candidate has designated as contacts on her/his FAR form or resume. In addition, the Chair may request permission from the candidate to contact any current or former employers that the candidate had previously withheld permission to contact. If permission to contact current or former employers is not granted, the faculty will consider whether to revoke the candidate's invitation for an on-campus interview. After the candidate is informed of the intent to make reference checks beyond listed references, if a member of the faculty is acquainted with an individual who may be familiar with the candidate's qualifications, the following procedure shall occur before any contact is made regarding the candidate. First, the faculty member shall inform the Committee of the individual s/he wishes to contact. Second, the Committee and the faculty member will coordinate the most appropriate manner and time to make that contact.

### D. On-Campus Interviews

The On-Campus Interviews will be conducted by the faculty, the Dean, and representatives of the student body. Each candidate will deliver a substantive presentation, of approximately one hour in duration (including questions and answers), to the faculty. This presentation will enable faculty to evaluate the candidate's teaching and scholarly potential. Prior to each candidate's On-Campus Interview, the Committee will notify the candidate in writing of the format and purpose of the substantive presentation. This notice also will specify that while students and other members of the law school community may occasionally be present at the presentation, the presentation should be directed to the faculty. This presentation will be open to any member of the law school community.

The following should be communicated to candidates: The faculty presentation should allow the faculty to assess scholarly potential and should consist of open and articulate exchange of ideas. The presentation should last 20-25 minutes followed by 20-25 minutes of questions. Candidates should provide a draft or complete article if available, an abstract of the presentation if a draft is not available.

[as amended September 27, 2011]

#### E. Recommendation by the Faculty

Within twenty-one days of the last On-Campus interviews for a particular position, a meeting of the full faculty shall be held in executive session, at which the Chair shall preside, for the purposes of recommending to the Dean which, if any, of the candidates should receive an offer of the position.

At the meeting, the qualifications of each candidate who had an On-Campus Interview shall be fully discussed. After the discussion of a particular candidate, the faculty shall vote by show of hands whether or not to recommend the candidate for a position at the College of Law. Faculty members who have not interviewed that particular candidate should consider whether they have an adequate basis on which to vote.

If a candidate receives an affirmative vote of two-thirds ( $2/3$ ) of those voting at the meeting, that candidate's name shall be forwarded to the Dean with a positive recommendation. If the candidate receives fewer than two-thirds ( $2/3$ ) vote, that candidate's name shall be forwarded to the Dean with a negative recommendation.

If more than one candidate for a single position receives a positive recommendation, the faculty shall use the following procedure to rank-order the candidates.

First, each faculty member rank-orders the candidates, assigning a "1" to the faculty member's top-ranked candidate, a "2" to the second-ranked candidate, etc.

Second, if all present faculty members vote on all candidates, then the votes are tallied, and the candidate with the lowest vote tally becomes the faculty's top-ranked candidate. If all present faculty members do not vote on all candidates (e.g., a faculty member does not believe s/he is qualified to vote on a particular candidate because the faculty member was absent on the day of that candidate's on-campus visit), then the tally for each candidate must be divided by the number of faculty voting on that candidate. The candidate with the lowest weighted average becomes the faculty's top-ranked candidate.

Third, the faculty takes a second vote, rank-ordering the remaining candidates, and the votes are tabulated as described above in step two. The candidate with the lowest tally or weighted average becomes the faculty's second-ranked candidate.

Fourth, additional votes are taken until all candidates with a positive recommendation have been rank-ordered as described above.

The Dean may then offer the position to the faculty's top-ranked candidate. If that candidate declines the offer, the Dean may then offer the position to the faculty's second-ranked candidate, etc.

As soon as is practical, the Dean shall communicate with every candidate who had an On-Campus interview but who was not offered a position.

[as amended April 19, 2012]

#### **F. Transcripts and Confidentiality**

##### **1. Transcripts**

When the Dean communicates an offer of employment to a candidate, the Dean at that time will require the candidate to forward to the College of Law an official copy of the candidate's law school and undergraduate transcripts. A copy of the candidate's law school transcript will be requested when an invitation for an on-campus interview is made.

##### **2. Confidentiality**

Because many candidates value the confidentiality of their application, no person at Chase may disclose to anyone outside of the University the identity of any candidate except as provided in these Policies and Procedures.

#### **Bibliographic Notes:**

September 26, 1990, as amended April 13, 2005.

Section I.B.1.d added December 15, 2011.

Section II, III, IV.B, and IV.E amended April 19, 2012.

Section IV.D amended September 27, 2011.

## 6.2 RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

[Note: Guidelines for Retention, Promotion and Tenure are contained in the Revised Chase Faculty Policies and Procedures Manual (hereinafter the Faculty Handbook) adopted May 3, 1995 and approved by the Board of Regents on September 20, 1995; these guidelines must be followed. (Ed.)]

### Guidelines

1. With any tenure-track position, the starting date for tenure and promotion purposes is the effective date of the initial tenure-track appointment, unless credit has been given for prior work under policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
2. The letter in the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Notebook shall include a letter which specifies the action sought. The letter should set out the case the candidate seeks to advance in support of the request(s) made. The letter should reference and explain the supporting materials contained in the notebook in making the case for the request(s) made. The letter should pay particular attention to the specific criteria set out in the handbook for the request(s) made in the letter.  

[April 23, 2009; eff. for new faculty, Fall 2009]
3. An unpublished thesis or other unpublished writing does not satisfy the scholarly activity requirement for promotion and tenure. Only writings published or accepted for publication according to the provisions in the Faculty Handbook will satisfy the scholarly activity requirement.

Each work of scholarship to be considered for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure purposes shall be submitted to two outside reviewers. The committee shall solicit names for and compile a list of potential reviewers. The candidate may submit names of potential reviewers. The candidate may reject any potential reviewer for cause. The cover letter to each reviewer should contain the appropriate standard from the Chase Handbook.

The candidate shall submit to the committee chair already accepted works of scholarship by May 1 of the calendar year in which the candidate requests promotion to associate professor, grant of tenure and (if done separately) promotion to full professor. In any event, each work of scholarship should only be submitted for review once. The committee shall then send out submitted works of scholarship for outside review. A copy of each review shall be submitted to the candidate for a response, if any.

If the candidate also intends to submit works of scholarship for acceptance after the May 1 deadline stated above, but before the September due date for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure application notebooks, the candidate shall also submit these works to the committee chair as soon as possible, but no later than August 15. The committee shall then send out such works for outside review.

These outside reviews shall be considered by the committee and by the tenured faculty in their application decisions and may be included by candidates in their notebooks, if received in time for this to be done.

[April 23, 2009; eff. for new faculty. Fall 2009]

4. For entry level tenure-track positions, two law review articles or their substantial equivalent are necessary for consideration for promotion to associate professor, and a total of three law review articles or their substantial equivalent are necessary for consideration for tenure and promotion to full professor. [See Note above.]

5 Interdisciplinary publications substantially related to law may also satisfy these requirements.

It was moved and seconded that these recommendations be sent to the Board of Regents. This motion was tabled until an opinion of University Counsel was obtained.

These policies are to apply to all tenure-track faculty hired on or after, and with contract date on or after, August 15, 1991.

March 25, 1992

The policies adopted at the March 25 meeting shall apply to all present and future tenure-track faculty with the following exceptions:

(a) policy number 3 shall not apply to legal writing professors.

(b) none of these policies shall apply to the Library Director or library faculty.

April 29, 1992

#### Meet With New Professors

The Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee is to meet early with new professors as a group to discuss RPT requirements and to have an information discussion to keep RPT information consistent.

April 24, 1996

*[Compiler's Note: Various changes have been made to the Faculty Handbook to conform with University policy. These changes seemed relatively uneventful, but for more information, see Faculty Minutes from February 19, 2003, August 21, 2002, May 8, 2002, March 30, 2002, and February 20, 2002. Amendments to the Faculty Handbook were adopted May 9, 2001, but are not included in the minutes. Any changes would be reflected in the current Faculty Handbook.]*

### 6.3 TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS

The faculty adopted the below report as a whole during the May 13, 2004 meeting:

#### MEMORANDUM

To: Teaching Faculty and Dean St. Amand  
From: Ljubomir Nacev, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee Date:  
April 26, 2004

Re: **Report of the AHC on Teaching Effectiveness**

The Committee's task was to report on the following issues:

1. How we define good teaching.
2. How we measure teaching, including for RPT purposes.
3. How we engage in continual attempts to improve good teaching.
4. How our institutional posture regarding teaching effectiveness matches up and coordinates with our decision to seek membership in the Order of COIF.
5. How we address any compensation differentials between teaching and scholarship.
6. Prepare a detailed faculty development plan.

The committee's report below address items 1-3 directly. Item 4 is addressed indirectly. Item 5 can only be addressed in conjunction with the committee's deliberation regarding scholarship, a process which will occur next semester. Item 6 is left for the Dean and the Faculty Development Committee to reconsider.

The biggest challenge for the committee (and the faculty) has been the charge to devise a measure for good teaching. I leave it to you to decide how successful the committee has been in addressing and meeting this task. [From my perspective as chair of the committee, it may not be given to teachers to teach and to measure as it is not given to the state to tax and to please.]

#### **Declaration of Best Practices in Teaching at the College of Law**

##### Preamble

The College of Law has established effective teaching as a requirement for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Faculty Policies and Procedures approved by the Board of Regents, and in both the original and revised statement of Principles, Prospects & Perspectives adopted by the faculty. FPP Handbook at 5-6, 13-14, 17-18, 27; PPP Statement at 12, 4. The faculty's compensation policy likewise speaks to the conditions necessary to effective teaching. Compiled Faculty Policies at 240, 243-44, 248-49. The following Declaration builds on these sources.

The College of Law is fully committed to its teaching and sees good teaching as fundamental to its core values and as a primary agent of its mission, which is to train its students to master lawyering skills and functions within the bounds of our professional norms and values. Fundamental to its role as an educational institution, the College of Law also embraces its obligation to socialize its students into the culture and norms of the legal profession.

The College of Law also recognizes as its mission the obligation to prepare its students for admission to the bar.

Consistent with its mission and this educational role, the College of Law sees the result of successful teaching as the acquisition of substantive knowledge, the development of analytical and instrumental skills to apply that knowledge, and the maturation of the ethical and professional judgment with which to imbue this enterprise.

Successful teaching is teaching that exhibits a deep understanding of one's substantive material and the use of teaching techniques that effectively enable a student to attain a clear understanding of the material taught. Successful teaching is informed by consistent scholarly engagement and production.

A good teacher is one who is well-prepared, whose classroom work exhibits a high degree of conceptual organization of the material taught, who encourages classroom discussion, who invites students to share their points of view and to apply concepts to demonstrate their understanding, and who motivates students to do their best work by setting high expectations for the students.

The end result of good teaching is creation of a stimulating intellectual environment for the study of law. Thus, to be a good teacher means to be insightful and provoking. Successful teaching should pose a profound intellectual challenge to the teacher, as well as the student, about the expectations each holds about normative legal thought, about law and its role in society, and about learning itself.

More so than in other academic arenas, best practices in law teaching call for a highly interactive pedagogy. Good teaching practices should encourage active learning, student-faculty contact, and respect for diverse learning approaches. Good learning should be the end-product of good teaching. From this perspective, teaching and learning are two sides of the same process. Accordingly, the College of Law understands that students play a role equally as important as that of the teacher in the learning process through their effort and engagement in the study of law.

The College of Law recognizes that good and effective teaching can flourish only in the context of a rich and varied curriculum. Students must be afforded an opportunity to learn and faculty must be afforded an opportunity to teach in doctrinal courses, in skills courses, in settings outside the traditional classroom, and in fields that include a jurisprudential, empirical and humanistic view of the law. Teaching should not be only about what the law is, but also about what the law could be or ought to be.

Although most law teaching occurs in the traditional classroom informed by the case method, good teaching should not be bound by this tradition and should include alternative pedagogic forums. Diversity of teaching and diversity of pedagogical approaches are encouraged at Chase. Teaching at Chase takes into account the diversity in the learning approaches of our student body,

whether a student is full-time or part-time, at the top of the class or still adjusting to the law school experience.

### **Institutional Support of Good Teaching**

Given its central role in the College's mission, the College encourages its faculty to focus on its teaching. In support of this goal, the College of Law enumerates teaching as a primary factor, among other factors, for purposes of tenure, for purposes of annual evaluations and for purposes of other institutional advancements.

To give its emphasis on teaching further support, the College of Law will endeavor to devote significant resources to assist its faculty to develop its teaching mission and to engage its professional inquiry into its pedagogical direction.

### **Current Practices of Assessment and Evaluation of Effective Teaching**

Assessment is an ongoing process at the College of Law and occurs in a variety of ways and contexts. Assessment takes place both at the individual as well as the institutional level.

#### **Tenured Faculty**

Tenured faculty currently are assessed with use of student evaluations and by the Dean's annual performance evaluation process. Tenured faculty are also subject to the Post-Tenure Review process.

#### **Tenure-Track Probationary Faculty**

The primary tool for the evaluation of probationary faculty is the promotion and tenure process, which includes both student and peer reviews of their teaching. In addition, the probationary faculty are assessed by the Dean's annual performance evaluation process.

#### **Contract Faculty**

Contract faculty are not subject to the promotion and tenure process. However, they are evaluated annually by the Dean. Contract faculty have not been consistently peer reviewed, although student evaluations are administered in their courses.

### **Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment of Student Learning**

Assessment of our students likewise occurs in a variety of ways and settings.

The traditional means for evaluating the progress and success of a student's learning remains faculty grading of the student. The faculty policies address: the definition of grades, the administration of exams, the content of exams, the benefits of mid-term examinations, the distribution of grades, and the process for appealing a grade.

In addition to grading as an assessment tool, the College of Law is able to assess its institutional effectiveness by means of the following output measures. The College of Law fully appreciates that these outcome measures are limited tools for measuring learning effectiveness and that the relationship between these measures and learning effectiveness are complex and nuanced.

1. Bar exam – the success rate of our students on the bar exam
2. Career placement rate
3. Interschool competition rate  
– how our students fare in interschool competitions, including law review placements
4. Attrition rate  
– the rate of attrition due to academic reasons; the success rate of the law school's Academic Support Program

#### **Proposals to Improve Teaching and its Evaluation**

1. Establish and maintain a library of resources on teaching (books, videos, etc.).
2. Broaden the charge of the Faculty Development Committee to include the topic of teaching effectiveness. The Faculty Development Committee should endeavor to hold faculty workshops on teaching effectiveness.
3. Appropriate funding to send all teaching faculty to conferences on teaching effectiveness.
4. The normal teaching load of a non-legal writing tenure-track faculty member is 12 classroom credit hours per academic year. Any faculty member who teaches more than twelve classroom credit hours in an academic year without receiving additional compensation will be entitled to accumulate any credit hours taught in excess of the norm of 12 credit hours. Any faculty member who accumulates excess credits will have such excess credits count toward the norm of 12 credit teaching load in subsequent academic years, with the effect that such faculty's teaching load may be reduced in subsequent years. Such reduction will be coordinated with the Dean's office to ensure full consideration of the law school's staffing needs. Accumulated credits cannot be carried forward for purposes of sabbaticals.
5. Encourage active learning by students throughout their time in law school. Address this issue initially in the Introduction to Legal Studies course and at regular intervals thereafter. Students should understand that good teaching is about helping the student to self-develop. In this regard, significant responsibility rests with the student. The Dean should include this message in his opening charge to students in the Introduction to Legal Studies course.

#### **Proposals to Improve Institutional Assessments of Learning and of Students**

6. The Faculty Development Committee should endeavor to explore, as part of its teaching workshops, different student and teaching assessment techniques.

7. Institute a process to propose a revision of the format and content of student evaluations.

May 13, 2004

These should be implemented immediately:

- more interactive teaching: mandatory mid-terms in all required and core courses, to include mandatory student/teacher review of mid-terms;
- more interactive teaching; writing exercises across the curriculum in required and core courses, a deeper Socratic dialectic; based upon transactional problems (not case notes synthesizing a court decision; to include mandatory student/teacher review; - institute quizzes to keep students engaged and involved.

March 12, 1997

### **6.31 CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT FORM**

#### **CHASE COLLEGE OF LAW**

Please be as specific as possible and give examples where appropriate.

1. Course Name:

2. Instructor:

3. Evaluator:

4. Date of Visit:                      Arrived:                      Departed:

5a. Approximate number of students attending:

5b. Number registered:

6a. Room number:

6b. If you were present at the start of the class, was attendance taken and, if so, by what method:

7a. If you were present at the start of class, did it begin on time?

7b. Did students arrive on time?

8. The general subject matter considered in the class:

9. What technologies were used in course (i.e. handouts, board, screens, etc.)?
10. The method or methods of instruction:
11. Was the class intellectually stimulating and rigorous?
12. Did the instructor appear prepared?
13. Did the students appear prepared and interested in the class?
14. Did the instructor interact with the students and did the class actively participate in the discussion?
15. Did the instructor follow up weak answers by students and press students for more complete answers?
16. To what degree did the class go beyond a superficial consideration of legal questions?
17. Additional strong or weak points concerning the class:
18. Other comments on the class or the classroom:

19. Overall impression of the class on a scale of 1-10 (10 being highest):

[May 10, 2012]

**6.32** Students should be able to evaluate the faculty.

The following policy for online evaluations and the form was adopted on February 17, 2011.

### **ADMINISTRATION**

1. The College of Law administration will provide course, faculty, and student data to the University a minimum of 10 days prior to the evaluation open date.

### **ONLINE AND IN CLASS EVALUATION PERIOD**

2. Evaluation Period: 2 weeks. Students will complete on line evaluations any time during the 2 week open period. Faculty members may invite students to bring lap tops to class during the 2 weeks and reserve 15 minutes of class time to complete the evaluations.
3. Evaluation open and close dates: 2 weeks prior to final Exams per the Chase Academic Calendar.

### **OPTIONAL QUESTIONS DRAFTED BY PROFESSORS**

4. Professors will have the option of drafting open ended questions and/or selecting questions from the questions bank, in addition to the standard multiple choice questions. Optional questions must be submitted via Digital Measures no later than 3 full business days prior to the open date.

### **EMAILS AND REPORTS GENERATED**

5. Email Text to be sent to:
  - a. Students: announcing the open of evaluation period and instructions;
  - b. Students: reminder about last day of evaluation period;

- c. Faculty: announcing availability of Evaluation Reports.
- 6. Faculty access to reports, two weeks after the last day to enter grades.
- 7. Reports will be emailed by Digital Measures to individual faculty and will also be available through Digital Measures.

## CHASE COLLEGE OF LAW – ONLINE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

### INSTRUCTOR

Did the instructor's use of class time further your ability to learn?

- 5 = Very Often
- 4 = Regularly
- 3 = Sometimes
- 2 = Once or Twice
- 1 = Never

The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

Did the instructor make good use of examples and illustrations?

- 5 = Almost Always
- 4 = Often
- 3 = Sometimes
- 2 = Seldom
- 1 = Never

How often did the instructor encourage student-faculty interaction?

- 5 = Very Often
- 4 = Regularly
- 3 = Sometimes
- 2 = Once or Twice
- 1 = Never

The instructor's knowledge of the subject matter was

- 5 = Excellent
- 4 = Above Average
- 3 = Average
- 2 = Below Average
- 1 = Very Poor

The instructor was well prepared for class.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

Did the instructor treat students, their ideas and opinions with respect?

- 5 = Always
- 4 = Most of the Time
- 3 = Sometimes
- 2 = Rarely
- 1 = Never

The instructor made students aware of current issues in the field.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

The instructor's ability to improve students' ability to think critically is

- 5 = Excellent
- 4 = Above Average
- 3 = Average
- 2 = Below Average
- 1 = Very Poor

The instructor encouraged students to learn on their own

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

The instructor motivated me to do my best work.

5 = Very Often

4 = Regularly

3 = Sometimes

2 = Once or Twice

1 = Never

The instructor set high standards

5 = Almost always

4 = Often

3 = Sometimes

2 = Seldom

1 = Never

## COURSE

The objectives of the course were explained well.

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Inclined to Agree

3 = Neither

2 = Inclined to Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

The objectives of the course were met.

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Inclined to Agree

3 = Neither

2 = Inclined to Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

I gained analytical skills in this course that I can apply to other courses.

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Inclined to Agree

3 = Neither

2 = Inclined to Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

I gained knowledge useful to lawyers.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

I developed skills useful to lawyers.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

#### QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY SELECTION POOL (for Faculty to Select)

Five option selection Questions

1. The progression of writing assignments was thoughtfully planned.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

2. My professor's comments on my papers were clear and understandable.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

3. My professor provided sufficiently detailed written feedback on my papers.

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Inclined to Agree
- 3 = Neither
- 2 = Inclined to Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

4. My professor's written critiques of my memos were provided to me no later than the day before our scheduled conferences.

5 = Strongly Agree  
4 = Inclined to Agree  
3 = Neither  
2 = Inclined to Disagree  
1 = Strongly Disagree

5. My professor's written critiques helped me to improve my writing and analysis.

5 = Strongly Agree  
4 = Inclined to Agree  
3 = Neither  
2 = Inclined to Disagree  
1 = Strongly Disagree

6. My scheduled conferences with my professor helped me improve my writing and analysis.

5 = Strongly Agree  
4 = Inclined to Agree  
3 = Neither  
2 = Inclined to Disagree  
1 = Strongly Disagree

#### OPEN ENDED COMMENT QUESTIONS

1. What was the most helpful aspect of how this course was taught?  
(Comment Box)
2. What was the least helpful aspect of how this course was taught?  
(Comment Box)
3. Do you have any suggestions for how to make the simulation project better? (Comment Box)
4. What type of training (general legal knowledge, study in specialty areas, analytical skills, communication skills, strategic thinking) should law school provide? (Comment Box)
5. What type of training did you receive in this course? (Comment Box)

The statistical data compiled from student evaluations of faculty members should be made available to the students. The intent is to distribute the statistical tabulation of responses only, not the comments. Data concerning first year teachers is to be excluded from disclosure.

January 12, 1983

## 6.4 EVALUATION/COMPENSATION POLICY

The faculty adopted the following policy on March 19, 1986, at a special faculty meeting.

### STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES

#### I. Introduction

This Committee was charged with the responsibility of establishing standards for the awarding of performance-based salary increases. We have done so, despite threats of tarring and feathering and worse (and that was just within the Committee).

We had the equivalent of about five full meetings and spent a considerable amount of time outside of the meetings preparing drafts and reviewing the drafts of others. Our discussions, which were intense, led to the proposal that follows, each section of which was drafted and redrafted by different Committee members. This proposal represents a number of compromises. While none of us is entirely happy with the result, all of us find it acceptable, and we unanimously recommend its acceptance by the faculty.

Portions of the text which follows are identical or similar to those of the comparable policy adopted by the University of Kentucky College of Law.

#### II. Performance Expectations: A General Statement of Policy

##### A. Teaching

The primary mission of the College of Law is to provide a high quality legal education for its students. Effective teaching, therefore, is the most important element of an individual's performance as a member of the faculty. It takes substantial time and effort to acquire and maintain a thorough understanding of course materials and the legal literature and to plan for an effective presentation of those materials in the classroom. It takes additional time to meet the educational needs of students outside the classroom.

Undoubtedly, many varying considerations affect the time and effort necessary to fulfill one's teaching responsibilities - the experience of the faculty member generally or with respect to the particular course area, the use of a novel approach or a new book, the

rapidity and/or complexity of new developments in the field, the size of the class and its place within the sequencing of courses, and other comparable factors which are difficult to evaluate. Nevertheless, the faculty expects each of its members to shoulder an equitable share of the institution's obligation to provide quality teaching. Quality teaching includes, by definition, effective classroom instruction, the preparation (including research) necessary for such teaching, the development of professional attitudes and work habits among the students, implementation of attendance policies adopted by the faculty, and the giving and expeditious grading of a rigorous written examination (where applicable) in accordance with the requirements of previously established faculty policy.

B. Scholarship

The existence of an obligation to teach effectively and conscientiously a full load of courses is a matter which is taken for granted by the faculty. The same is true with respect to the existence of an obligation to engage in scholarship. The advancement of legal knowledge, broadly defined, is an obligation of every good law school and of every productive faculty member. Scholarship provides insights and new knowledge which augment teaching effectiveness. Scholarship enhances the reputation of the individual faculty member among the students and his peers and adds measurably to the intellectual vitality of the law school. Furthermore, the quality and quantity of a faculty's published research are frequently important public measures of a law school's worth and reputation. Consequently, every member of the faculty at every rank has a responsibility to engage in scholarship. This responsibility is second in importance only to teaching as a focal element of an individual's performance as a law faculty member.

Scholarship, of course, may take many forms. The most common manifestation of such activity is the law review article. Contributions may, however, be made in numerous other ways (treatises, published casebooks [including teachers' manuals and supplements], other books and supplements, monographs, articles in bar journals, lawrelated book reviews, practice manuals and form books, articles relating to law written for publication in non-law review periodicals circulated primarily within the legal profession, books or articles related to law written for publication circulated to the general public, official or unofficial published explanations, comments or descriptions of law reform proposals, or statutory text).

No faculty member should feel pressured to engage in any particular kind of scholarship. However, the essence of the manifestations of scholarship listed above is in-depth research resulting in a creative written product, submission of the product to one or more critical editors for determination of its publishability, and its ultimate dissemination to the public or a segment thereof. While it is conceded that standards of editors and of publishers vary, this feature is an objective manifestation made by a party or parties other than the faculty member that the scholarship is publishable. This is a major distinguishing feature from other useful and stimulating forms of research endeavor which are more appropriately considered as a part of quality teaching (e.g., development of original materials for a new course) or public service (e.g. pro bono briefs to trial courts, appellate courts and courts of last resort).

Clearly, not all of the forms of scholarship listed above involve equal effort; consequently, they do not have equal value for performance-based pay determination

purposes. The essential criterion is whether the faculty member has fulfilled his or her commitment to engage in serious and continuous scholarship. While it is difficult to describe the magnitude of the scholarship effort by a member of the faculty, a major scholarly production at least every third year has been the minimal requirement since the Shakertown Retreat. Of course, there are some forms of scholarship involving a longer time span which are deemed functionally equivalent to the basic norm cited above - work on a scholarly book or treatise, for example. Such a project may absorb the faculty member's productive scholarly efforts over a longer period of time. The appropriate time frame for final publication, as with law review articles and other forms of scholarship, is a matter for consultation between the faculty member and the Dean. If the faculty member has a long term project and makes substantial and appropriate progress toward ultimate publication, the Dean may determine that the faculty member has engaged in scholarship, even though the project is not complete or near completion. Ultimately, the Dean, a tenured faculty with a record of scholarship, will be required to evaluate a particular publication or in-progress scholarship by comparing it to the faculty member's negotiated percentage of his overall performance quotient.

### C. Service

Service to the law school, the University, and the public is the third component of faculty performance. While not constituting as significant a portion of a faculty member's responsibility as teaching and scholarship, such service is nonetheless a substantial element of each faculty member's obligation to the institution. Each member of the faculty is expected to participate regularly and responsibly in the processes through which institutional policy is formulated and implemented. In addition, each member is expected to share in the demands on time and energy that result from the routine operation of the school. At a minimum, a faculty member should regularly attend faculty meetings, serve on an equitable share of law school committees (with due consideration given to the varying time demands of different committees), serve as chairperson on a fair and equitable basis (untured teachers will normally be exempt from this requirement), regularly attend law school functions appropriate for faculty (the student awards presentation, Siebenthaler lecture, and graduation), absorb an equitable share of the non-course-related advising of students, and participate in the selection of new faculty. Faculty are also encouraged to assist with the supervision and guidance of student groups and organizations (law review, moot court, inter-school competitions, etc.).

Service to the institution also includes service to the University. The faculty recognizes its obligation to participate fully as an important component of the larger institution. Faculty should be encouraged to bear a reasonable share of the duties inherent in the law school's full participation in the operation of the University. Service to the profession and public is also a part of this third component of faculty performance. Members of the faculty should seek opportunities for involvement in professional and public affairs that relate to their work at the University. However, such activities should not be permitted to impinge on the capacity of the faculty member to perform the principal responsibilities of teaching and scholarship at a high level. But professional and public service (e.g., continuing legal education, pro bono legal representation, and faculty members who provide it.

D. The Requirement of Full-Time Effort

The College of Law is and must continue to be staffed with faculty members who are full-time teachers and scholars. Roscoe Pound has stated this eloquently: "Law is a jealous mistress. Law teaching is a doubly jealous mistress. If one's main interest is in anything but his teaching he will be no teacher." R. Pound, Some Comments on Law Teachers and Law Teaching, 3 J. of Legal Educ. 519, 532 (1951). Indeed, both the Association of American Law Schools and the American Bar Association require that the faculty be composed generally of full-time teachers. The American Bar Association defines the matter thusly in standard 402(b): "A full-time faculty member is one who during the academic year devotes substantially all working time to teaching and legal scholarship, has no outside office or business activities and whose outside professional activities, if any, are limited to those which relate to major academic interests or enrich the faculty member's capacity as scholar and teacher, or are of service to the public generally, and do not unduly interfere with one's responsibilities as a faculty member." Northern Kentucky University amplifies this requirement of full-time effort in the following manner: "For full-time faculty members, outside consulting and other professional activity are limited to the equivalent of one day per academic week during periods when the faculty member is on full-time pay status. Time spent on such outside activity must be in addition to, rather than a part of, the normal full-time effort expected of members of the full-time faculty for University work. Outside activity must in no way interfere with University duties." The faculty expects that each of its members will recognize that law-teaching is a full-time job and will strictly comply with the standards above.

Professional activities outside the law school, in the form of consultation or professional practice, can be valuable to the institution and compatible with the demands of full-time faculty status. Such activities frequently enable faculty members to perform their teaching and research responsibilities at a higher level and enhance the reputation of the institution and of the individual faculty members involved. On the other hand, such activities have an almost limitless potential to undermine the performance and competence of the faculty as a whole. If not properly limited, they can adversely affect the quality of teaching and attention given law students as individuals, the scholarly interest and performance of the faculty, the participation of faculty in important law school functions, and much more. Consequently, both the Dean and the faculty are obligated to do whatever is necessary to keep such activities within proper limits. The foundation underlying these limitations is the fundamental notion that full-time teachers should not engage in professional activities outside the law school that divert them from their primary interests and duties as legal educators. The faculty of the College of Law is wholeheartedly committed to this notion. Consequently, it expects each of its members to abide by the above-stated limitations carefully and completely. The faculty also expects its members to be reasonably accessible to its students, other members of the faculty and the College of Law administration, and other colleagues and members of the University administration. While it is conceded that much productive work is and can be done effectively at home rather than the office, nevertheless, a faculty member cannot normally fulfill the responsibilities detailed herein unless he spends most of his working time at the University. No faculty member should create the impression that he or she is less than a full-time faculty member.

### III. Effective Teaching

Effective teaching is teaching students law, analysis and application - and doing it well. An effective teacher is well prepared and up-to-date on developments in the areas of law taught. Depth of knowledge is required. Effective teaching takes place in the classroom, in the office, in the hallways, and elsewhere. Inherent in effective teaching is effective communication with students, stimulation of thought and creativity, and motivation of the students. An effective teacher imparts a sense of professional responsibility, and is a model of careful, realistic thoroughness. Effective teaching requires substantial time for preparation, for keeping abreast of new developments, and for meeting students for consultation and advising, in addition to classroom teaching. Effective teaching can include curriculum development, development of new courses, and preparation and supplementation of teaching materials.

Effective teaching is measured by such things as:

- a) general reputation;
- b) student evaluation;
- c) original teaching materials, including supplements; and
- d) other information supplied by or requested by the faculty member.

Nothing in this policy precludes the Dean from exercising his/her inherent powers.

### IV. Scholarship

*[Entire base policy is included first with amendments to follow.]*

#### A. Justification for a Scholarship/Publication Component of the Performance Expectations.

1. Traditionally the legal academic has profoundly influenced the development of the law. It is believed that while practitioners are very busy, law professors have time to think about law and have the luxury of doing so in ways unaffected by loyalty to clients. As a result, courts and practitioners have sought guidance from academics on the interpretation of law and the direction in which legal doctrine should develop. Academic scholarship is looked to by the bar and the court for the clarification of conflicting principles and the definition of the limits of doctrine.
2. As a consequence, academic scholarship is in a real sense an obligation each faculty member owes to the profession independent of any obligation s/he owes to his/her particular institution. The institution, however, must provide its faculty with the opportunity to engage in scholarship/publication and must support and reward such activity.
3. Scholarship/publication is essential to an individual's professional growth and development. Continuous, disciplined and thoughtful inquiry expands the mind and generates professional confidence and a vital academic environment.

4. Scholarship/publication creates credibility and visibility for the institution insofar as the faculty are recognized as experts in their fields by the local and national legal communities.

B. Proposal

1. IT IS PROPOSED THAT THIS COMPONENT OF THE PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS BE TERMED SCHOLARSHIP.

- a) The term Scholarship is intended to be broader in terms of the scope of qualifying activity than is the term Publication. As can be seen below, activity beyond traditional treatise writing and law review publication can satisfy the Scholarship requirement.
- b) The term Scholarship is intended to be narrower in terms of the scope of qualifying activity than is the term Research and is intended to exclude activity that does not involve substantial critical evaluation.
- c) The term Scholarship is intended to describe activity that distinguishes the law professor from the law student. Scholarship is expected to reveal mature research capability; to present new ideas, concepts, or organizational principles; to compile original research data; to analyze, evaluate, criticize, propose, create.
- d) The term Scholarship is meant to identify activity that is the mark of an academic rather than of a practitioner. It should be the result of considered reflection upon legal, political, social or doctrinal consequences, in contrast to consequences to an individual client.

2. IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE SCHOLARSHIP COMPONENT CAN BE SATISFIED BY A RANGE OF ACTIVITY, AS FOLLOWS:

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarly activity includes

Publication of law related:

treatises

books and supplements

monographs

articles in law reviews or bar journals

book reviews

Practice manuals and form books

articles published in non-law review periodicals  
circulated primarily within the legal profession

Publication of:

other books or articles related to law

Drafting of:

official or unofficial published explanations, comments  
or descriptions of law reform proposals

statutory text

### 3. Comments

- a) Scholarly activity satisfies the Scholarship component of the Performance Expectations in part because of the traditional recognition of the demanding and intellectual nature of the process of readying an idea for publication.
- b) Moreover, the process of publication requires disciplined research, thoughtful inquiry, and a degree of commitment to justice and reason. (This is in contrast to, for example, advocacy of a particular position as a representative of a client.)
- c) Scholarly activities to some degree require the faculty to compete with other academics in the market place of ideas. There is at least an element of "having been judged and chosen" in law publishing. This in turn creates higher visibility of the institution and helps establish the credibility of the faculty in the community and among students.

### C. Related Activity

1. The following activity has some of the qualities of Scholarship but does not satisfy the Scholarship component, in part because the activity better satisfies other components of the Performance Expectations, in part because it does not reflect the critical quality of scholarly activity.

Related activity includes

Preparation of CLE outlines and materials

Presentation of speeches, lectures, or participation on  
panels

Compilation of existing materials in preparation for a new course

Development of course materials

Briefs and memoranda of law

2. Comments

- a) Related activity has great value to the institution, the community and to the professional competence of the individual faculty member, but it does not satisfy the Scholarship component.
- b) Related activity constitutes research rather than Scholarship, goes to the development of teaching competence rather than to intellectual challenge, evokes images of public service rather than images of the exercise of new ideas.

V. Service

A. Significance of Service

The term service should be broadly construed to include service to the College of Law, the University, the legal community, the academic community, and the community at large. Participation in service activities must not interfere with, or be substituted for, the obligation of each faculty member to teach effectively and engage in scholarship.

B. Service to the Law School

Within the above constraints, every faculty member must satisfy the service component. Generally, individuals can determine for themselves the type and extent of their service; however, certain forms of service must be performed by all faculty members. These include participation on College of Law and University committees, attendance at College of Law functions, and informal advising of students.

1. College of Law and University Committees

All members of the faculty must participate fully on College of Law committees. Responsibility for sitting on the traditionally busy committees should be shared equally. These include the Admissions, Curriculum, Promotion and Tenure, and Faculty Recruitment Committees. Participation includes active attendance at meetings, and completion of assigned reports and other duties. In addition, tenured members of the faculty are obligated periodically to chair committees. Under normal circumstances non-tenured members of the faculty will not be expected to chair committees.

Such equal participation will help fulfill the stated goal contained in the Self-Study Report of equalizing committee workload. (Self-Study Report, p. 129).

In addition, faculty members are encouraged to assist in the development and execution of University policy. This entails participation on the Faculty Senate as well as University committees.

2. Attendance at College of Law Functions and Events

There are a number of other obligations which faculty members must satisfy in addition to committee work. Faculty members should attend important College of Law functions. At the very least, these include graduation and the student awards ceremony.

[Amended April 19, 2012]

Any faculty member who regularly fails to attend these functions and events demonstrates an inexcusable lack of interest in the College of Law. Such a lack of interest is noticed by the students and otherwise reflects badly upon the College of Law. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to attend alumni and faculty social events, as well as bar association activities.

3. Informal advising of Students

Faculty members have an obligation to the students' professional development beyond teaching in the classroom. This obligation may be carried out in a number of ways. At the very least, however, faculty members should be available to engage in informal advising of students. Such advising may include (1) discussion of a particular course, (2) a general discussion of other areas of the law, (3) resolving a student's academic problems, (4) discussing various employment opportunities and (5) assisting in placing students in legal positions. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to act as faculty advisors to student organizations, as well as assisting such organizations in other ways, e.g., judging practice rounds for Moot Court competition or evaluating for the Law Review unsolicited articles in the area of the instructor's expertise.

C. Public Service

Faculty members are encouraged to engage in uncompensated public service, particularly if it is law-related. Such service not only benefits both the faculty member and the organization he assists, but also redounds positively to the College of Law. Therefore, involvement in all forms of public service should be considered by the Dean in determining performance-based salary increases.

The following are examples of public service; however, they are not meant to be exhaustive nor are they presented in any particular order of importance.

- 1) preparation and/or presentation of Continuing Legal Education materials;
- 2) active participation in local, regional or national bar associations or legal education organizations;
- 3) providing free legal advice to government agencies and practitioners;
- 4) editing professional journals;
- 5) pro bono representation of clients, including preparation of memoranda of law and appellate briefs;
- 6) presenting lectures and speeches;
- 7) participation in local, regional or national charitable, religious or political organizations.

#### VI. Evaluation

As amended April 30, 1997: [this does not apply to Legal Writing Faculty members]

The formula in Part VI is eliminated.

Compensation should be decided by the Dean at his/her discretion based upon the following criteria as well as the criteria set forth in the Compensation Policy apart from Part VI:

1. Quality of teaching in the context of the scope of the individual's teaching responsibilities.
  - A. The first obligation of professors is to teach effectively
  - B. The standard course load per year is four
  - C. Factors to be considered include (not an exclusive list)
    - i. The use of mid-term examinations (including the extent of feedback to students)
    - ii. The use of drafting, oral and problem-solving assignments (including the nature and extent of feedback to students)
    - iii. The extent to which legal reasoning is emphasized in class
  - D. In evaluating quality, the following matters should be considered
    - i. The number of classes taught
    - ii. The number of students taught
    - iii. Other matters bearing on the scope of the individual's teaching responsibilities
2. Scholarship
  - a. Scholarship remains a major responsibility of faculty, second only to teaching in importance
  - b. Goal: At least one significant publication every three years for each full-time teaching faculty member
  - c. The Dean shall assign a fifth course each year to individuals who do not meet the publication goal
3. Service

- a. This component may be met through service to the law school and to the university or the community
- b. Each faculty member should chair a major committee at least once every three years
- c. Those who do not wish to chair a major committee may ask to serve as members of committees in excess of a normal committee load or to teach a fifth course each year
- d. The Dean shall assign an individual course and/or additional committee work to individuals who do not perform the service component at an appropriate level and who do not chair a major committee at least once every three years, (but consideration should be given to special circumstances, such as serving as Faculty Senate President or the need to be available to students on an extended or concentrated basis)

E. Fifth Courses –considerations

1. A fifth course might not involve an additional preparation (e.g., it might be a second section of the same course)
2. Consideration should be given to the necessary or desirable cycle or order of courses
3. The assignment might be made to accommodate the administration in its scheduling of electives
4. The fifth course might be an elective that would not otherwise be offered because of low student enrollment

F. Student evaluations

1. Should be considered in the compensation process only to the extent that they demonstrate substantial deviations from acceptable norms
2. May be used by the Dean for other purposes

G. Flexibility

1. All professors have areas of expertise and any assignments of a fifth course should reflect the individual's strengths or current needs
2. For a variety of reasons, however, the law school may need to assign a professor to teach a course outside a faculty member's areas of expertise
3. Flexibility in accepting such assignments is encouraged (and will reflect favorable on the individual)

April 30, 1997

As originally adopted, Part VI read:

A. Designation of Weighing Factors

1. For purposes of performance evaluations, each faculty member shall designate the weighing factor to be used in evaluating performance in each of the following categories: teaching; scholarship; and service.
2. The allocation shall total 100% and shall be made within the ranges set forth below:

teaching:	40% to 60%
	scholarship:
	30% to 50%
service:	10% to 30%

3. The allocation shall be made each year, beginning in 1986 for the 1986-87 academic year, prior to the end of March or within seven days after meeting with the Dean to review his/her performance during the preceding evaluation period, as defined below, whichever is later.
4. The allocation may be changed by a faculty member from time to time during the evaluation period, provided that no change may be made without the approval of the Dean on good cause shown by the faculty member, and provided further that except in extraordinary circumstances no change shall be made after November 30 for the then-current evaluation period.
5. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Dean may allow a faculty member to reduce or increase the weighing factor in any one or more categories from those set forth above. For example, a person who teaches only nine credit hours in a given year may establish a weighing factor for teaching in the range of 35-50%. One who teaches six credit hours may establish a weighing factor of 20-30%. Conversely, one may establish, again with the concurrence of the Dean, a weighing factor in the 50-65% range for teaching fifteen credit hours. In a significantly different situation, one who was chairing a law reform commission might be permitted, depending on the circumstances, to allocate the bulk of his/her total weighing factor to the service category. Whenever any such adjustment is allowed by the Dean in his/her discretion, the Dean shall so notify the faculty, stating the reasons for allowing the adjustment.

B. Evaluation

1. Evaluation Period. An evaluation of each faculty member's performance shall be made in March of each year. Except as otherwise stated below, the evaluation is to take into account only the faculty member's activities during the twelve-month period ending on the last day of the next preceding February. However, in determining teaching effectiveness, the periods that are to be considered are the last two complete academic semesters (and the intervening summer term if the professor taught a course during that term).
2. Point Values for Evaluation. Each faculty member shall be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5, in which 5 indicates an excellent performance, 4 indicates a very good performance, 3 indicates a good performance, 2 reflects a satisfactory performance, 1 reflects an inadequate performance, and 0 indicates poor performance in the category in question. In making the evaluations, the Dean shall consider the quantity and level of difficulty of the work undertaken, as well as the quality of the work actually performed. The Dean may also consider the success or failure of the faculty member in fulfilling commitments and intentions expressed in previous years.

The Dean shall evaluate all faculty members on the same basis. This means that no faculty member shall enjoy any presumption that his/her work is of high quality simply because he/she has been a faculty member for ten, twenty or any other number of years. Conversely, no allowance shall be made for the fact that a faculty member may be in his/her first or second year of teaching, or may be teaching a given course for the first time.

Teaching performance and service shall be presumed, in the absence of contrary indications, to be satisfactory - i.e., valued at 2.

3. Guidelines. While the basis for evaluation is within the sound discretion of the Dean, the Committee believes that the following guidelines would be appropriate:

- a) Teaching. While a professor's performance in the classroom is to be assumed to be satisfactory, relatively poor student evaluations, unless contradicted by other credible indications, should lower the number assigned to this category. Conversely, relatively good student evaluations should result in an appropriately higher evaluation. The Dean ordinarily should take into account the peer evaluations made of nontenured faculty personnel by members of the Retention, Promotion and Committee or their designates.
- b) Scholarship. A satisfactory performance ordinarily would result from reasonable progress on a law review article or the acceptance of such an article for publication. However, since each faculty member is expected to publish a law review article at least once every three years, or perform equivalent research and publication, "reasonable progress," by definition, cannot have been made during more than two years on the same article. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the Dean from taking into account the length, complexity and quality of any publication or other acceptable manifestation of the scholarship requirement.
- c) Service. Only serviced actually performed during the evaluation period may be considered. Because service may take a great many forms, evaluation of its quantity, quality and importance is particularly subjective in nature and the Committee believes that the attempt to establish guidelines would be the equivalent of trying to clean the Augean stables, a task which the Committee declines (with great respect, of course) to undertake.

4. Computation. The points awarded for the faculty member's performance in each evaluation category shall be multiplied by the weighing factor of that category established by the faculty member and the products shall be totaled.

An example may help. Assume that a professor has assigned a 50% weighing factor to teaching, 40% to scholarship, and 10% to service. Further assume that the professor has performed satisfactorily in the classroom, well in scholarship, and very well in service. The calculation would be as follows:

$$2 \times .50 = 1.0$$

$$3 \times .40 = 1.2$$

$$4 \times .10 = .4$$

The overall "score" of the professor would be 2.6.

5. Bottom Line. No performance-based raise shall be awarded unless the professor's overall evaluation is at least 2.0.

6. Determination of Amounts of Performance-Based Increases. The amount that is available for performance-based raises shall be determined. Next, the number of faculty members within each evaluation bracket shall be determined. Finally, the Dean shall allocate the performance-based increases in pay among the evaluation brackets on the following basis, in which X equals the base amount of the performance-based raise:

<u>Point evaluation</u>	<u>% of salary to be awarded as performance-based raise</u>
-1.99	0
2.0-2.49	X
2.5-2.74	1.5X
2.75-2.99	1.75X
3.0-3.24	2.0X
3.25-3.49	2.25X
3.5-3.74	2.5X
3.75-3.99	2.75X
4.0-4.24	3.0X
4.25-4.49	3.25X
4.5-4.74	3.5X
4.75-5.0	3.75X

7. There shall be no maximum dollar amount of, or other comparable limitation upon, any performance-based salary increase computed in accordance with these standards.
8. The Dean shall advise each faculty member during March of the evaluation which (s)he has made pursuant to this policy.

#### **6.41 Scholarly Activity and Recognition**

*[The below policy was adopted May 18, 2005. This amendment replaces #2 on pages 14-15 of the present Faculty Handbook. See original Section IV(B)(2) below.]*

##### **1. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY**

The College of Law is committed to the promotion of quality scholarship by its faculty members. Quality scholarship contributes to a faculty member's knowledge and to effectiveness of classroom teaching. The publication and dissemination of quality scholarship extends the reach of a faculty member's teaching to the profession and to the public. The benefits of the production of quality scholarship redound not only to the individual faculty member, but also to the law school, the university, and the community. For these reasons, a demonstrated record of rigorous analysis and continuing commitment

to quality scholarly productivity throughout a faculty member's academic career is the goal of this policy.

a. Definitions

i. Quality Scholarship

Quality scholarship requires rigorous analysis, and thus must go beyond primarily descriptive information (i.e., what cases, statutes, regulations, or a body of literature say). The factors indicating quality scholarship include:

- (a) The quality of the research and analysis. A significant publication demonstrates authoritative command of the chosen topic, familiarity with pertinent authorities, and careful evaluation of the authorities and issues.
- (b) The originality and scope of the thought presented in the scholarship and the contribution to the field it covers.
- (c) The scope of the chosen topic. A significant treatment of a narrow topic usually will be more detailed or contain deeper or more incisive analysis than might be required for a significant treatment of a broader topic.
- (d) Reputation of the publisher.
- (e) Impact. Among the indicia of a publication's impact are academics', judges', practitioners, or other professionals' use of the publication, frequency of citation, the publication's contribution to the candidate's reputation for scholarship, and its positive reception by an informed audience.
- (f) National or international scope.  
Although the quality, as opposed to quantity, of a candidate's work is the most important factor in evaluating scholarship, suitable length of a law journal article is normally a minimum of 30 printed pages, or 50 doublespaced, typewritten pages, often with significant footnote annotation.

ii. Qualifying Scholarship

A faculty member's record for scholarship is expected to consist of quality scholarship of suitable length and complexity in one or more of the following categories:

- (1) Articles in student-edited or peer-edited legal journals;

- (2) Original scholarly books and supplements or chapters thereof in the legal field;
- (3) Book reviews;
- (4) Articles published in non-legal periodicals circulated primarily in the legal profession; and
- (5) Drafting of official or unofficial explanations, comments, or descriptions of law reform proposals or statutory text.

iii. Co-Authored Scholarship

Co-authored quality scholarship of significant length and complexity meets the definition of qualifying scholarship.

A faculty member who has produced co-authored scholarship in one (or more) of the above categories must submit a signed memorandum to the Dean stating what contribution of that scholarship is attributable to the faculty member.

iv. Publication

“Publication” includes manuscripts for which the candidate has received a written commitment for publication, as well as those already published. In the case of invited scholarship (e.g., in symposia, etc.) “publication” occurs after the invitation has been made and the manuscript submitted.

v. Published

“Published” includes acceptance for future publication.

v.i. Student-edited Journal

A student-edited journal is a legal journal published by a U.S. accredited law school.

vii. Peer-edited Journal

A peer-edited journal is a legal publication of which the editors are primarily lawyers or academics devoted to the study of law.

b. Generally, non-tenured faculty members will be expected to have published and/or accepted for publication, three individually authored law review articles of suitable length and quality, one for promotion to Associate Professor, and a total of three for promotion to full professor and grant of tenure. If a non-tenured faculty member proposes to submit other scholarly and creative material, it is recommended that he/she communicate such intention, in writing, to the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall respond to such

communications in writing stating whether this proposed scholarly and creative material is an acceptable alternative.

December 16, 2005

The faculty adopted the below Scholarship Recognition Policy:

The below categories apply to individually authored “quality scholarship,” as that term is defined pursuant to the definition that was agreed upon at the May 18, 2005 faculty meeting. All references below to how a law school is “ranked” refer to a school’s rank in the U.S. News & World Report peer assessment rankings. Individual faculty members may receive a maximum of \$30,000 per year in scholarship recognition awards. This policy will be reviewed in the 2008-09 academic year to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving the goals of the policy.

1	\$15,000	• Article in student-edited flagship journal at law school ranked #1-50 (including ties); New, original books.
2	\$10,000	• Articles in student-edited flagship journal at law school ranked outside of the top 50; Articles in student-edited secondary journals; Articles in peer-edited legal journals; New editions of previously-written books.

#### Date of Rankings

On occasion, one school might fall outside of the top 50 while another school might enter the top 50. Under this proposal, for purposes of determining whether a school is in the top 50, the Dean will look at the date the publication offer is received.

#### Co-Authored Scholarship

A faculty member who has produced co-authored scholarship in one (or more) of the above categories must submit a signed memorandum to the Dean stating what contribution of that scholarship is attributable to the faculty member. The correlating award will be commensurate with the contribution attributable to the faculty member.

#### Collateral Awards

Any monetary awards a faculty member receives from sources outside this Scholarship Recognition Policy to produce a particular piece of scholarship shall be deducted from the individual award for that piece of scholarship. With respect to scholarship for which the faculty member receives royalties, two times the royalties received after the first year of publication shall be deducted from the individual award for that piece of scholarship. Such scholarship will be eligible for awards during the awards cycle one year after initial publication. This Scholarship Recognition Policy applies to scholarship produced by a faculty member while he or she is on sabbatical or other form of reassigned time when the faculty member produces a piece of quality scholarship in addition to the scholarship the faculty member was expected to produce during that sabbatical or other form of reassigned time.

December 16, 2006

All tenured law teaching faculty shall produce a substantial publication every two (2) academic years. The Dean shall have the authority to waive or modify this requirement for a particular

faculty member, if in his/her judgment, such a waiver serves the best interests of the College of Law.

February 19, 2003

All Legal Research and Writing faculty shall produce a substantial publication every three (3) academic years. The Dean shall have the authority to waive or modify this requirement for a particular faculty member, if in his/her judgment, such a waiver serves the best interests of the College of Law.

February 19, 2003

1. Faculty members, both tenured and untenured, have continuing responsibilities in areas of effective classroom teaching, service and scholarly activity.
2. In addition, all faculty members have a responsibility to engage in scholarly publication. Generally, tenure will not be granted without evidence of scholarly publication. This responsibility for scholarly publication continues after tenure.
3. In the normal sequence, it is expected that faculty members granted tenure will engage in scholarly publication at least once every three years. (Requirements for non-tenured faculty are somewhat different in this area because untenured faculty members are engaged in demonstrating "tenurability".)
4. There are valid reasons for delaying scholarly publications. In certain cases it may be proper for a faculty member to engage in no scholarly publications. Relevant considerations include, without limitation, the following:
  - a. A longer publication in the process of preparation or scholarly activity significantly above that normally required of a faculty member may be deemed a valid reason for lack of scholarly publication.
  - b. Service, teaching loads, committee assignments, and scholarly activity apart from publication may be valid reasons for a lack of scholarly publication, provided these activities are of sufficient importance to the law school and are carried on at levels significantly above that normally required of a faculty member.
5. The Dean has certain inherent powers in areas such as salary adjustments, summer teaching assignments, committee assignments, and teaching assignments.
6. It is important to emphasize that a faculty member's total contribution in all areas is more important than the faculty member's contribution in any one area and that lesser contribution in one area can be evened out by greater contribution in another area or areas. Problems relating to faculty member's failure to engage in scholarly publication, as well as to his or her overall productivity, should be resolved whenever possible by informal discussion between the Dean and the faculty member.

March 7-8, 1981

#### **6.42 Post Tenure Review**

The faculty during the October 25, 2000 meeting adopted a Post Tenure Review, which would be added to the Faculty Handbook. The policy mirrored a NKU policy. It is included in the current Faculty Handbook and is not reprinted here. The faculty also adopted at the same meeting Narrative for Post Tenure Review – Law Teaching Faculty and Narrative for Post Tenure Review – Law Library Faculty. Both narratives are included in Appendix A to this Section 6.

## 6.5 SUMMER POLICIES

Intersession and similar course schedules to be taught during the summer are included in the teaching assignments made pursuant to the Summer School Compensation Policy.

April 28, 1993

The faculty adopted the following policy on April 2, 1986.

1. Summer Term Curriculum. To the extent that it is feasible to do so, in light of the financial resources available, the courses or types of courses listed below should be offered during the summer term:

- a) Criminal Law;
- b) At least one course appropriate for first-year, part-time division students, such as Remedies, Products Liability and Family Law;
- c) At least one breadth and perspective course;
- d) A seminar;
- e) A tax course;
- f) A Uniform Commercial Code course; and
- g) A public law course, such as Administrative Law, Environmental Law, Admiralty Law, Labor Law courses, and Municipal Corporations.

Except for Criminal Law, the specific courses to be offered need not be the same from year to year.

2. Selection of Faculty. The following matters are to be considered in selecting faculty to teach during the summer term:

- a) The faculty member must be competent to teach the course which is to be assigned to him or her, or become competent in the subject prior to the beginning of the summer term;
- b) Ordinarily, one should not be considered for summer term teaching if (s)he fails to obtain a rating of "adequate," at least, in each of the teaching, scholarship and service categories for the rating period next preceding the summer term; and
- c) Subject to the foregoing, each faculty member who wishes to teach during the summer term should have a relatively equal opportunity to do so - i.e., faculty wishing and qualified to participate should be assigned on a rotating basis.

This proposal will be effective immediately, except for paragraph b, which will become effective with respect to the 1987 summer term.

Faculty will be paid at the rate of 6% per credit hour with a maximum of \$3,100 per credit hour, based on a set amount decided annually by the Dean.

January 25, 1984

[Revised to reflect current

practice, December, 2011]

## **6.6 CLINICAL FACULTY**

Clinical faculty members are expected to serve and may serve on faculty committees, except for committees relating to tenure-track personnel matters, such as the Faculty Appointments Committee and the Law Faculty and Law Library Faculty RPT Committees. These clinical faculty members are expected to attend all meetings of the faculty, and they may, as part of their expected participation in faculty governance of the law school, vote on all matters brought before the faculty for consideration, except for matters relating to tenure-track personnel matters, such as faculty appointments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.”

August 19, 2004

The policy above does not apply to tenure-track clinical faculty. Tenure-track clinical faculty members may serve on any faculty committee and may vote on all matters brought before the faculty for consideration.

[March 17, 2011]

### **6.61 Director of Clinical and Public Engagement Programs**

The faculty approved the concept of creating a new faculty position, Director of Clinical and Public Engagement Programs, and hiring someone to fill the position during the 2006 hiring season via national search. The position is envisioned as a 12-month administrative position with possible teaching obligations involving the classroom component of Chase’s externship program. The main responsibilities of this position are to improve Chase’s clinical learning and public services opportunities for students, including supervising Chase’s current externship and public engagement programs, help develop clinical and public engagement opportunities for part-time students, and provide support for faculty and administrators involved with clinical and public engagement programs or interested in developing such programs.

December 16, 2005

The faculty voted to implement the following:

1. There is hereby established a new position of Director of Clinical and Public Engagement Programs.
2. The Director’s position will be a 12-month administrative position, possessing the same type of faculty status granted to the Director of the Local Government Law Center.
3. The Director’s position is to be filled expeditiously.

February 22, 2006

The faculty postponed its search for a clinical director pending further decision making on the direction in which it wants to shape its clinical offerings.

September 20, 2006

## **6.7 TENURE FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND WRITING POSITION**

Any full-time Legal Research and Writing Position shall be a tenure-track position under the following conditions:

- (1) The tenure for any such position shall be specific to teaching Legal Research and Writing.
- (2) A person occupying a Legal Research and Writing position shall have no right to make a lateral move from a Legal Research and Writing Position into a full-time non-Legal Research and Writing Law Faculty position. Such person may apply for a non-Legal Research and Writing faculty vacancy by going through the Faculty Appointments process the same as any outside candidate. If a person holding a Legal Research and Writing position is approved by the Faculty and hired into a non-Legal Research and Writing position, that person shall be subject to all of the procedures and standards required for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure required of a non-Legal Research and Writing appointee.
- (3) Under no circumstances shall a person holding a Legal Research and Writing position be allowed to teach more than one course other than Legal Research and Writing from the Law School curriculum, with a maximum of three semester hours credit, in any regular academic year (Fall and Spring Semesters).
- (4) A person holding a Legal Research and Writing position shall have the same opportunities as any non-Legal Research and Writing teacher to be assigned to teach during the Summer Term.
- (5) A person holding a tenure-track Legal Research and Writing position shall have full Law Faculty voting rights.

THE GENERAL CRITERIA FOR HIRING A TENURE-TRACK LEGAL RESEARCH AND WRITING TEACHER ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A candidate for a position as a tenure-track Legal Research and Writing teacher shall have a law degree from an ABA accredited law school, shall be admitted to practice law in some United States jurisdiction, and must have some substantial experience after graduation from law school which demonstrates the ability to effectively teach Legal Research and Writing.

[Addition to Section III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK AND GRANTING OF TENURE in College of Law Section of Faculty Manual.]

Special Factors: Legal Research and Writing Position

If tenure is conferred upon a person holding rank as a teacher of Legal Research and Writing at the College of Law, the contract between that person and the University which confers tenure shall contain a provision stating that such person's tenure is specific to teaching Legal Research and Writing at the College of Law. A person occupying a tenure-track Legal Research and Writing position shall have no right to make a lateral move from a Legal Research and Writing position into a non-Legal Research and Writing Law Faculty position. Such person may apply for a non-Legal Research and Writing position by going through the Faculty Appointments process the same as an outside candidate. If a person holding a Legal Research and Writing position is approved by the faculty and hired into a non-Legal Research and Writing Law Faculty position, that person shall be subject to all of the procedures and standards required for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure required of a non-Legal Research and Writing Law Faculty appointee.

The reappointment, promotion and tenure criteria used for law faculty shall apply to a person holding an appointment as a Legal Research and Writing teacher except as modified below:

- (1) Because of the special time-intensive nature of teaching Legal Research and Writing, the primary basis for evaluation will be Quality of Teaching. A strong performance in the area of

teaching effectiveness is mandatory. It is recognized that substantially more of the effective teaching of Legal Research and Writing will occur outside the classroom environment than in the teaching of other courses in the law school curriculum.

(2) Published scholarship may be different than that expected of a regular law teaching faculty member, e.g., focused on the area of teaching Legal Research and Writing, although it is not required to be. The quality and value of scholarly activity, not the number of such activities, shall influence tenure and promotion recommendations for Legal Research and Writing faculty.

(3) In the area of service, again, the quality and value of such activity, not the number of such activities, shall influence tenure and promotion recommendations for Legal Research and Writing faculty.

(4) While desirable, Recognition in the Legal Community is not a requirement for promotion and tenure for Legal Research and Writing faculty.

September 26, 1990

## 6.8 ADJUNCT FACULTY

The faculty adopted the below regarding adjunct faculty:

A. The use of adjuncts is largely to enrich the law school experience rather than to supplement the full-time faculty and their knowledge. Given this, whenever possible, we should attempt to have full-time faculty teach all but the most specialized courses or courses where the use of a sitting judge or highly skilled practitioner would be more educationally effective.

When feasible, courses should be taught by full-time members. There is, of course, nothing wrong with utilizing adjuncts in the program to provide that sort of window on the world of practicality that they do provide and to provide certain experiences which may in a particular case extend beyond those of most full-time faculty members.

B. It would perhaps improve the availability of adjunct faculty to both day and evening students and work more easily into the schedules of adjunct faculty in some courses taught by adjuncts were offered on Saturdays. In terms of the availability to both day and evening students, less pressure on the time of the adjunct, and ease of planning schedules for both students and adjunct faculty, Saturday would seem to be a good time to offer some courses. We would suggest that one course be offered on an experimental basis between the hours of 10 and 1 on a Saturday.

C. Certain schools rely heavily on certain adjuncts to consistently teach courses. Although in the cases where the adjunct professor is a recognized expert in the field, this is obviously a benefit to the student, this practice should certainly be limited to such cases and unless the adjunct instructor has demonstrated particular expertise in the field that brought him to substantial recognition by his peers at least within the locality, there is no obvious reason to hire an adjunct again and again to teach a course simply because the person has taught the course in a reasonably satisfactory manner before unless it is done along with some type of effective peer evaluation by one or more full-time faculty on some reasonable, periodic basis established by the dean of the law school.

D. Although present economic circumstances may not allow it, we feel that pursuant to a fuller study of adjunct teachers' pay scales, serious consideration should be given to improving the pay of adjunct faculty.

E. Adjunct faculty shall be peer reviewed the first, second, fourth and seventh year of their teaching or by the request of the administration.

September 20, 2000

The Dean shall immediately implement a plan for review of adjunct faculty.

March 31, 1982

We recommend that a written policy be established regarding pay scales, qualifications, course loads, standards of teaching effectiveness, means of hiring and of discharging adjunct faculty.

March 7-8, 1981

At the October 26, 1983, faculty meeting an adjunct faculty handbook was adopted. Appendix I was deleted in its entirety "with directions that it be redrafted to conform to the present policies since changes have recently been made." Article 4 was amended February 22, 1989. Article 3 was amended September 20, 2000.

**6.81 NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY  
CHASE COLLEGE OF LAW  
ADJUNCT FACULTY HANDBOOK**

INTRODUCTION

The College of Law recognizes the value conferred upon it by a competent, experienced and broad-based adjunct faculty. To that end, the College of Law endeavors to achieve a healthy mix of adjunct and full-time faculty, the benefits of which have been recognized by the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. However, because the task of providing the core of legal education should predominantly fall upon full-time faculty, adjunct faculty serve their most valued purpose in those courses which require special expertise or practice in order to adequately amplify the subject area. Through the guidelines promulgated in this handbook, the College of Law reaffirms its commitment to the development and retention of its adjunct faculty base.

ARTICLE I - FACULTY

- A. The appointment of an adjunct faculty member in the College of Law will be based upon a recommendation initiated within and approved by the office of the Associate Dean with the approval of the Dean of the College of Law.
- B. All adjunct faculty appointments at the College of Law shall be identified by one of the following ranks: Lecturer, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Law, Adjunct Associate Professor of Law, or Adjunct Professor of Law.
- C. Definition of adjunct faculty and rank:

Adjunct Faculty: Adjunct faculty are fully qualified judges or practitioners who are paid more than 50% of their salary from non-University sources but who contribute significantly to teaching and service to the College of Law. Adjunct faculty will not be granted tenure, faculty retirement, insurance benefits or leave but may be entitled to all other University benefits.

Lecturer: This term shall connote a judge or practitioner who regularly presides over one or more class meetings during a course which is assigned to another member of the faculty and who lectures for the purpose of providing information on a specific subject area within such course. It is intended that only those persons who regularly appear as guest lecturers in specific courses shall hold the rank of Lecturer.

Adjunct Assistant Professor of Law: This rank shall connote the normal entry level for an adjunct faculty member and, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall apply to all adjunct faculty through their first four semesters or summer terms of teaching.

Adjunct Associate Professor of Law: Except in extraordinary circumstances, this rank shall connote adjunct faculty with more than four but less than ten semesters or summer terms of teaching experience at the College of Law and who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and who have otherwise met the criteria for promotion as hereinafter defined.

Adjunct Professor of Law: Except in extraordinary circumstances, this rank shall connote those persons with more than ten semesters or summer terms of teaching experience at the College of Law and who have demonstrated superior teaching abilities and who have otherwise met the criteria for promotion as hereinafter defined.

## ARTICLE II CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

An adjunct faculty member will have the right to teach in an atmosphere of free intellectual inquiry in accordance with institutional regulations and subject to the constraints of federal and state legislation; he/she will not be subject to constraints or harassments that impair teaching and creativity. An adjunct faculty member has the responsibility to insure an atmosphere of free inquiry by exploring relative alternative viewpoints and bringing to the classroom relevant substantive material gleaned from the practice of law. The following criteria shall be considered in reaching decisions on promotion:

1. Quality of teaching.
2. Effective utilization of outside resources and the ability to relate relevant substantive practical experience to the subject matter under consideration.
3. The extent to which he/she has remained current in his/her field and has utilized current materials to enrich the classroom experience.

These criteria shall be applied based upon the descriptions below. These descriptions are illustrative but not inclusive.

Quality of teaching: Principally, this means effective classroom teaching, and it is to be measured by student evaluations, including the ability to intellectually challenge and stimulate students, and by peer evaluations, which shall include classroom visitations. Also included is teaching work outside the classroom, both on a one to one basis and in groups; included in this are answering questions after class and in the office and meeting with groups to assist the learning process.

Effective utilization of outside resources and the ability to relate relevant substantive practical experience to the subject matter under consideration: This criterion connotes the principal reason for employment of adjunct faculty by the College of Law. The College of Law recognizes that certain subject areas are more fully amplified with the assistance of an experienced judge or practitioner. Accordingly, this criterion seeks to measure the extent to which an adjunct faculty member is able to relate relevant substantive practical experience to the teaching materials being

utilized. This is to be measured by the use of examples demonstrated in class or in handout materials or the use of pleadings or legal forms where relevant as well as the utilization of law review articles. While relevant substantive practical experience should be integrated into the classroom setting in an organized manner, recanting personal experience for its own sake often results in a digression from the subject matter at issue. As a consequence, great care should be exercised to avoid telling "war stories." It should also be born in mind that the adjunct faculty member is responsible for adequately conveying the course material described under the description for such course in the College of Law catalog. Therefore, the entire scope of the course, as well as the use of "practical" materials should be confined to an organized presentation of the subject matter of the course being taught.

The maintenance of currency in the field of expertise and the use of current materials: This criterion connotes the extent to which the adjunct faculty member has continued his/her education, either in practice or through more formal means, and has kept abreast of current developments in the area in which he/she is teaching and the extent to which such adjunct faculty member has communicated his/her expertise through the use of current up-to-date materials in the classroom.

### ARTICLE III APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Adjunct Assistant Professor: Except in extraordinary circumstances, all adjunct faculty who have less than four semesters or summer terms of teaching experience at the College of Law shall be appointed to the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor of Law. Such appointment shall be for a one semester term and shall terminate at the conclusion of the semester in which he/she is initially appointed. The Associate Dean, after having reviewed peer evaluations and student evaluations which are described hereafter, shall have the right to offer an appointment in successive semesters to such adjunct faculty member at the appropriate rank depending upon the College of Law's need for such an appointment which shall be determined, in part, by the availability of full-time faculty to teach the course in question and the number of students who enroll for the course. Even in the event that an offer of an adjunct faculty appointment is made and accepted, the College of Law reserves the right to revoke such offer in the event that there is insufficient enrollment in the course to justify its being offered. Adjunct faculty who have been appointed and who have taught for four semesters shall be reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean at the conclusion of four semesters with a view towards promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor of Law at the conclusion of the fourth semester. The criteria to be employed in reviewing adjunct faculty for promotion is described in Article IV hereof. Except in extraordinary circumstances, in the event the Associate Dean, in consultation with the Dean, determines that such adjunct faculty member shall not be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor after four semesters in rank as an Assistant Professor, such decision shall operate to terminate any further employment of such adjunct faculty member with the College of Law.

Adjunct Associate Professor: Except in extraordinary circumstances, all adjunct faculty who have more than four but less than ten semesters or summer terms of teaching experience at the College of Law shall have attained the rank of Adjunct Associate Professor of Law. All appointments of Adjunct Associate Professors shall be for one semester or summer term and shall terminate at the conclusion of the semester or summer term in which he/she was appointed. The Associate Dean, after having reviewed peer evaluations and student evaluations described hereafter, shall have the right to offer an appointment in successive semesters or summer terms to

such Adjunct Associate Professors depending upon the College of Law's need for such an appointment which shall be determined, in part, by the availability of full-time faculty to teach the course in question and the number of students enrolled for such course. Even in the event that an offer of an appointment to the rank of Adjunct Associate Professor shall have been made and accepted, the College of Law reserves the right to revoke such offer in the event that there is insufficient enrollment in the course to justify its being offered. Adjunct Associate Professors who have been appointed and who have taught for ten semesters or summer terms shall be reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean at the conclusion of the tenth semester of summer term with a view towards promotion to Adjunct Professor of Law. The criteria to be employed in reviewing Adjunct Associate Professors for promotion is described in Article IV hereof. Except in extraordinary circumstances, in the event the Associate Dean, in consultation with the Dean, determines that such Adjunct Associate Professor shall not be appointed to the rank of Adjunct Professor after ten semesters or summer terms in rank as an Adjunct Associate Professor, such decision shall operate to terminate any further employment of such Adjunct Associate Professor with the College of Law.

Adjunct Professor: Except in extraordinary circumstances, all adjunct faculty who have more than ten semesters or summer terms of teaching experience at the College of Law shall be appointed to the rank of Adjunct Professor of Law. All appointments of Adjunct Professors shall be for one semester or summer term and shall terminate at the conclusion of the semester of summer term in which he/she was appointed. The Associate Dean, after having reviewed peer evaluations and student evaluations described hereafter, shall have the right to offer an appointment in successive semesters or summer terms to such adjunct professors depending upon the College of Law's need for such an appointment which shall be determined, in part, by the availability of full-time faculty to teach the course in question and the number of students enrolled for such course. Even in the event that an offer of an appointment to the rank of adjunct professor shall have been made and accepted, the College of Law reserves the right to revoke such offer in the event that there is insufficient enrollment in the course to justify its being offered.

#### ARTICLE IV REVIEW OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

"All adjunct faculty of all ranks shall be evaluated each semester or summer term by the students enrolled in his/her course who shall submit student evaluations to the office of the Associate Dean in a format prescribed the College of Law. In addition to student evaluations of classes taught by all adjunct faculty each semester or summer term, all adjunct faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor shall be subject to peer review and shall have his/her class visited by a member of the College of Law's Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Committee or such tenured full-time faculty as may be appointed by the Committee, provided, however, that each semester or summer term, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs shall furnish the Committee a list of those adjunct faculty who have been appointed on a one-time basis and who are not expected to teach on a continuing basis at the College of Law, and such adjunct faculty are not subject to the peer review process. Those adjunct faculty who are not so designated by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and who are expected to continue on a regular basis will have a peer evaluation in the first and third semester or summer term in which they teach, and thereafter, will be evaluated every second semester or summer term until they achieve the rank of Professor. The full-time faculty member undertaking such review shall provide a report to the

Associate Dean and to the adjunct faculty member which shall evaluate the teaching effectiveness of the adjunct faculty member. No particular format is prescribed for this report, and it may very well, if the teaching is satisfactory, include nothing more than a statement as to the date on which the evaluation took place and that the teaching was found to be satisfactory. The report of the full-time faculty member is to be submitted to the Associate Dean as provided below. The number of classroom visits is left to the discretion of the full-time faculty member conducting the evaluation. The full-time faculty member who will be reviewing the adjunct faculty member shall ordinarily provide at least one week's notice to such adjunct faculty member prior to undertaking classroom visitation. Prior to submitting the report of the peer review to the Associate Dean, the full-time faculty member undertaking the review shall provide a copy of his peer review to such adjunct faculty member, and if requested by such adjunct faculty member within one week of his/her having received a copy of the peer review, the fulltime faculty member will review the contents of such report with such adjunct faculty member. After such review, or at the expiration of the one week period if no review is requested, the fulltime faculty member shall submit the report to the Associate Dean. The adjunct faculty member shall have the right to respond to such report by directing such response to the Associate Dean within one week of submission of the report to him/her or the review of the contents of the report, whichever date is later. The Associate Dean, after consultation with the Dean, shall review the classroom visitation reports and responses from the adjunct faculty member, and the student evaluations of the adjunct faculty member's courses, in determining whether to reappoint or promote such adjunct faculty member after the time periods listed in Article III.

#### ARTICLE V - PAY SCALE

The pay scale for all adjunct faculty shall be determined by the Provost of the University. The pay for all adjunct faculty holding the rank of Assistant and Associate Professor will be equal and shall be determined by applying a uniform multiplier to the number of credit hours being taught each semester. The salary for each adjunct faculty member shall be determined and shall be communicated to such adjunct faculty member by the Associate Dean in his/her letter of appointment to such adjunct faculty member preceding the semester or summer term for which the appointment is made. All adjunct faculty achieving the rank of Adjunct Professor shall receive a one-time salary increase in an amount to be determined from time to time by the Provost of the University. All adjunct professor of law shall receive the same pay determined by applying a uniform multiplier to the number of credit hours such adjunct professors shall be teaching during the semester or summer term of appointment.

#### ARTICLE VI GENERAL POLICIES

Notwithstanding any other section of this handbook, all adjunct faculty shall comply with the policies of the university and the policies of the College of Law regarding attendance at regularly scheduled classes and the scheduling of make-up classes where it is necessary to cancel a class, requiring attendance and keeping accurate attendance records, the distribution of a syllabus and course outline to all students at the first session of the class as well as other policies adopted from time to time by the College of Law. Such policies are delineated more fully in Appendix I attached hereto. Failure to comply with such policies may result in such adjunct faculty member's termination.

## APPENDIX I

[Omitted because not adopted by the faculty.]

## APPENDIX II

1. A: The grade of A is given to student work which is outstanding. This level of achievement represents honors work. This grade is not automatically given to the best performance in a class, but is used to show that the work is of a superior level. Thus, in the context of an examination or paper, all or most issues will be identified. The presentation will be logical, well-developed and contain very good analysis. The law is accurate and used sensibly. Creativity should be present.
2. B and B+: The grade of B is given to student work which is solidly competent. B represents more than satisfactory, yet not outstanding. Thus, in the context of an examination or paper, all or most major issues, and some other issues, will be identified. Usually the presentation is logical, well-developed, containing good analysis. The law is usually accurate and sensibly used. Creativity may be present. The grade of B+ is given to work which is among the more competently done in the B level, yet not sufficient for the grade of A.
3. C and C+: The grade of C is given to student work which is of satisfactory professional competence. Thus, in the context of an examination or paper, the major issues are identified. In the main, the law is accurate but sometimes handled imprecisely. Such a paper or examination is often given characterized by conclusory statements. Extraneous issues may appear. Although the presentation may lack logical, analytical development, it does demonstrate a basic understanding of the area covered. The grade of C+ is given to work which is among the more competently done in the C level, yet not sufficient for the grade of B.
4. D and D+: The grade of D is given to student work which is not of satisfactory professional competence but which demonstrates a modicum of knowledge and ability. Thus, in the context of an examination or a paper, the discussion is often not fully developed and frequently proceeds in a illogical manner. Usually some major issues are not identified. For those issues that are identified, often there are substantial inaccuracies in the law and its application. The grade of D+ is given to work which is among the more competently done in the D level, yet not sufficient for the grade of C.
5. F: The grade of F is given to student work which is of substantially less than satisfactory professional competence. This grade represents a low level of achievement, and is not given automatically to the worst performance in a class. Thus, in the context of an examination or paper, the performance is worse than that for a grade of D. The presentation demonstrates little or no competence.

6. A+: The grade of A+ is reserved for the unusual and truly outstanding performance. It is not automatically given to the highest A in a class, but is given in only exceptional cases where the performance is outstanding on both a relative and an absolute scale. (This grade would carry 4 quality points for computation of the grade point average; placing the grade on the transcript is deemed sufficient recognition for this outstanding work.)

October 26, 1983, as amended  
February 22, 1989

Amended Article III of Adjunct Faculty Handbook adopted September 20, 2000:

### ARTICLE III EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

All adjunct faculty, regardless of rank, shall be evaluated each semester or summer term by the students enrolled in his/her course on Student Evaluation Forms supplied by the College of Law.

In addition to the student evaluations, all adjunct faculty shall be subject to peer review by a member of the College of Law's Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee or their designated representative.

For all newly appointed adjuncts, they shall be peer reviewed the first, second, fourth and seventh year of their teaching or by the request of the administration.

All adjunct faculty, regardless of rank or length of teaching at the College of Law, shall be subject to peer review, if requested by the Dean or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the College of Law.

The full-time faculty member undertaking such peer review shall provide a report to the Associate Dean and to the adjunct faculty member which shall evaluate the teaching effectiveness of the adjunct faculty member. No particular format is prescribed for this report, and it may very well, if the teaching is satisfactory, include nothing more than a statement as to the date on which the evaluation took place and that the teaching was found to be satisfactory. The number of classroom visits is left to the discretion of the full-time faculty member conducting the evaluation.

The full-time faculty member who will be reviewing the adjunct faculty member shall ordinarily provide at least one week's notice to such adjunct faculty member prior to undertaking classroom visitation.

Prior to submitting the report of the peer review to the Associate Dean, the full-time faculty member undertaking the review shall provide a copy of his peer review to the adjunct faculty member, and if requested by the adjunct faculty member within one week of his/her having received a copy of the peer review, the full-time faculty member will review the contents of such report with the adjunct faculty member. After such review, or at the expiration of the one week period if no review, or at the expiration of the one week period if no review is requested, the fulltime faculty member shall submit the report to the Associate Dean.

The adjunct faculty member shall have the right to respond to such report by directing a response to the Associate Dean within one week of submission of the report to him/her or the review of the contents of the report, whichever date is later.

In determining whether to reappoint an adjunct faculty member, the Associate Dean will consider visitation reports and responses from the adjunct faculty member, and the student evaluations of the adjunct faculty member's courses.

## **6.9 FACULTY COMMITTEES**

[Compiler's Note: The list of committees was revised to reflect current practice. December, 2011]

All committee reports shall be submitted to the Dean's Office in electronic format for distribution to each faculty member, all Deans, and to the SBA. [Compiler's note: Revised to reflect current practice and to avoid specific format designations, December, 2011]

April 28, 1993

The Standing Committees of the Faculty are:

Academic Standing/Honor Council

Admissions

Curriculum

Faculty Recruitment

Library

Library Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Reappointment,  
Promotion and Tenure

April 26, 1983, as amended  
[Amended April 19, 2012]

Each standing committee be charged with preparing and submitting for full faculty approval a formal jurisdictional statement.

April 26, 1983

Membership of those committees that are not confidential should be posted.

November 5, 1975

### **6.9.1 Academic Standing Committee**

The Academic Standing Committee hears all petitions for readmission and reinstatement filed by students previously dismissed from Chase College of Law.

In addition, the Academic Standing Committee reviews all files of students seeking admission to the College of Law who have been dismissed from another law school. In such cases, if the Academic Standing Committee determines that the student is eligible to apply for regular admission, it shall forward the applicant's file to the Admissions Committee accompanied by a

memorandum attached to the file stating the reasons which justify the Academic Standing Committee's conclusion. If, however, the Academic Standing Committee is of the opinion that an applicant should receive credit for course work completed at another law school, it shall have the authority to confer advanced standing for course work not to exceed 30 hours.

April 25, 1984, as amended

#### **6.9.2 Admissions Committee**

1. To propose changes in admissions policy to the faculty.
2. To interpret and implement the admissions policy as adopted.
3. To consider applicants to the College of Law who have not attended another law school or who have attended another law school but are released to the jurisdiction of the Admissions Committee by the Academic Standing Committee.
4. To make decisions concerning the acceptance and rejection of such applicants.
5. With the Assistant Dean, to award those scholarships which have been put under the jurisdiction of the Admissions Committee.
6. To recommend changes in the practice or procedure for awarding scholarships.
7. To consider any matter referred to the Committee by the faculty or Dean and to make any proposals concerning such matters as the Committee may deem appropriate.

April 25, 1984

[Repealed April 19, 2012]

### **6.9.3 Curriculum Committee**

The Curriculum Committee has jurisdiction to consider and to make recommendations to the Faculty concerning the following matters.

- I. Revisions in the required curriculum, including:
  1. Addition or deletion of courses from the list of required courses,
  2. Modifications of the sequencing of required courses,
  3. Changes in the number of hours of credit given for courses, and
  4. Substantial changes in course format and/or content.
- II. Revisions in the elective curriculum, including:
  1. Addition or deletion of courses from the list of elective offerings,
  2. Modification of the
    - a. sequencing of elective courses
    - b. frequency with which they are offered in each division
    - c. prerequisite requirements
  3. Changes in the number of hours of credit given for courses
  4. Substantial changes in course format and/or content
- III. Revision of other graduation requirements of a curricular nature, such as the writing and breadth and perspective requirements.
- IV. Any other curricular matter referred to the committee by the Faculty of Dean.

April 25, 1984

[Repealed April 19, 2012]

### **6.9.4 Faculty Development Committee**

This committee is reinstituted effective with the 2009-2010 academic year and will, among other possible charges, address what faculty activities the law school should encourage and reward and how those rewards should be structured.

[May 14, 2009]

### **6.9.5 Law Library and Information Technology Committee**

This committee was established to comply with ABA Standards.

March 21, 2007

[Repealed April 19, 2012]

#### **6.9.6 Library Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Library Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the applications of law library faculty for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure and submits its recommendations to the Law Library Director.

April 25, 1984

#### **6.9.7 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee has exclusive jurisdiction to evaluate all untenured faculty for the purpose of making recommendations to the faculty with regard to retention, promotion and tenure at the Salmon P. Chase College of Law in accordance with the Faculty Handbook and with the Policies and Practices for Promotion and Tenure adopted by the faculty. The Committee also has jurisdiction over all other matters as may be referred to it.

April 25, 1984

[Repealed April 19, 2012]

#### **6.9.9 Students on Faculty Committees**

Two students (1 night and 1 day) shall be appointed to each administrative and faculty committee with the following exceptions: (1) Tenure and Promotion Committee, (2) Academic Standing Committee, (3) Student members on the Admissions Committee are ineligible to vote on individual files. They may vote on policy matters only. Aside from the above stated exceptions, student committee members shall be voting members equal to all other committee members.

March 31, 1978

Committee appointments shall be made by the President of the Student Bar Association subject to approval by a majority vote of the House of Representatives of the Student Bar Association. Appointments are to be restricted to those students possessing at least a Junior standing.

March 1, 1974

#### **6.10 FACULTY MEETINGS**

All matters needing consideration of the faculty shall be issued to all members of the faculty one (1) week in advance to be properly presented at a faculty meeting.

April 28, 1978

An agenda shall be prepared and posted for the information of the students. Any motions which are adopted or any matters of particular interest to the students shall be posted on the Student Bar Association bulletin board.

November 5, 1975

Based on the advice of Counsel, the Kentucky Open Meeting Act does not apply to faculty meetings.

December 6, 1974

## Voting

Full-time, tenured and tenure-track, non-teaching law library faculty shall have the right to vote in faculty meetings of the College of Law on all issues affecting the library or library faculty in their capacity as librarians and on personnel matters affecting them as faculty members of the University generally. In preparing the agenda for faculty meetings, the Dean shall designate, in his discretion, those agenda items on which such library faculty may vote.

April 30, 1986

The Student Bar President or his duly appointed representative shall be entitled to one (1) vote on those issues voted upon by the full faculty that directly affects the students at Chase. It shall be in the discretion of the Chair as to those matters directly affecting students and disqualification from voting on any matter must be declared before any vote is taken. No action by the Chair shall be construed as a ruling in favor of the students. This policy does not apply to votes approving students for graduation.

April 30, 1986

## 6.11 ADVISING OF STUDENTS

[Compiler's note: Faculty should refer to the Student Handbook for the most recent information related to the Open and Structured Curricula.]

April 19, 2012

[Repealed April 19, 2012]

## 6.12 PROFESSIONALISM MATTERS

Faculty members shall cover ethical and professionalism issues in each course. These issues shall be interwoven into the content of the course to assist students to learn how the issues arise and how they should be resolved. The Dean shall monitor implementation of this policy as part of performance review.

October 26, 1988

It is unprofessional: (1) to give an examination preview that is substantially a summary of the final examination; or (2) to give a final examination which is not substantially different from previous exams which are available to students. Every faculty member is expected to devise a challenging examination based upon the course material. It is each faculty member's professional responsibility to comply with ABA Standard 304(b) which reads as follows: "The scholastic achievement of students shall be evaluated from the inception of their studies. As part of the testing of scholastic achievement, a written examination of suitable length and complexity shall be required in every course for which credit is given, except

clinical work, courses involving extensive written work such as moot court, practice court, legal writing and drafting, and seminars and individual research projects." The Dean shall undertake any measures necessary to insure compliance with the above recommendation and ABA Standard.

April 27, 1982

### **6.13 PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD**

- I. Name - This award shall be named the NKU Chase Public Service Award.
- II. Purpose – This award shall recognize significant law-related public service to the community beyond the law school and the University by members of the Chase Faculty. [For purposes of this award, the term Chase faculty shall include law school and library faculty as well as Chase administrators.

Each year, when appropriate, a winner shall be selected for recognition. In any year a winner is selected, one additional member of the Chase faculty may be selected for an "Honorable Mention" recognition.

#### **III. Selection Procedure**

- A. Administration of the Award – The Office of the Dean of the Chase College of Law shall be responsible for the administration of this award.
- B. Eligibility – All full-time members of the Chase faculty shall be eligible for this award.
- C. Nominations – Chase faculty members who wish to be considered may selfnominate or have others nominate them.

Any eligible member of the Chase faculty who wishes to be considered for the Public Service Award shall assemble a packet outlining his or her public service activities during the previous calendar year and submit that packet to the Selection Committee no later than February 1 following the close of the year under consideration.

- D. Selection Committee – The selection of awards will be made by the Selection Committee. The Committee shall be comprised of a member of the Alumni Board of Governors, a person appointed by the Volunteer Lawyers Project and a person appointed by the NKU Scripps Howard Center for Public Engagement. The Office of the Dean of the College of Law will facilitate the establishment and the work of the Selection Committee.

The Committee shall consider the nomination packets and select the award winners using voting procedures the Committee deems appropriate and the selection criteria outlined below. The Committee shall inform the Dean of the College of Law no later than April 1 of the award recipients, if any, for a particular year.

- E. Selection Criteria – In making its selection, the Selection Committee shall take into account the impact of the nominee's public service activity in the community addressed by the activity and shall consider the nature and scope of such activity and, where appropriate, the level of student involvement in such activity.

While teaching is specific to the classroom and scholarship is the written expression of a legal idea, public service in the law is law in action in the service of a public good, such as the development of the law or the improvement of access to the law through a public project or through pro bono legal services. Examples of service to be honored with this award include the following public interest endeavors: pro bono representation of clients; participation in local, regional or national bar associations and legal education association on topics dealing with the public interest; law-related participation in local, regional or national non-profit organizations or public interest endeavors; provision of pro bono legal services to government agencies and the courts; presenting lectures and speeches on legal topics to non-lawyers; or law-related participation in local, regional or national charitable, religious or political organizations. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive and is not presented in any particular order of importance.

IV. Announcement and Award

- A. Announcement – Announcement of the winner of the NKU Chase Public Service Award and the Honorable Mention recipient shall be made at the Chase College of Law graduation ceremony.
- B. Award – The award shall consist of a plaque to commemorate the service of the recipient. In addition, the names of the winner and the Honorable Mention recipient shall also be inscribed on a separate plaque to be publicly displayed at the law school. In addition, in recognition and celebration of the public service activity for which the award is presented, the law school shall allocate for each year an award is made, in addition to and above any normal budgeting earmarks, \$10,000 for use by the Chase Public Interest Fellowship Program.

March 25, 2010

**6.14 MISCELLANEOUS**

During the first class session for each course, the professor shall inform the students of the materials to be covered in that course by written syllabus. Any changes shall be made in writing. The Administration shall be given a copy.

October 3, 1983

The faculty reaffirmed the recommendation of Task Force IV adopted at Shakertown directing the Dean to consult with those professors who consistently give high grades. Grade distributions for every class for each semester shall be distributed to all full and part-time faculty.

April 27, 1982

The Tutorial Program is a Student Bar Association program. Faculty at the College of Law should not be directly involved in the Student Bar Association's Tutorial Program.

March 7-8, 1981

The Dean will explore the possibility of NKU allowing the College of Law to adopt its own policy on the matter of outside consulting by faculty. It is the consensus of the faculty that the below stated policy would be acceptable:

It is recommended that a statement that is applicable to the law school concerning outside activities would be as follows:

"the Salmon P. Chase College of Law of Northern Kentucky University recognizes that faculty members are on occasion called upon to provide consulting and other professional activities by outside agencies, industries, governmental organizations, and private individuals. Such activities are normally looked upon with favor where they (1) contribute to the professional development of the faculty member, or (2) contribute an expertise to a problem of society, industry, government or individual, that is not commonly available, or (3) provide some carryover into the instructional program on the professor involved. Such activities may not interfere with law school duties and one's obligation to the law school and the university must take priority over any outside, income producing commitments."

"It shall be the responsibility of each faculty member to see to it that such consulting or other remunerated activities as may be engaged in shall be in compliance with the spirit of this policy. The dean of the law school shall have the responsibility of monitoring such activities within the law school. The dean shall, in those cases where he finds non-compliance with this policy, take appropriate steps to bring the faculty member back into compliance."

March 7-8, 1981

**6.15** The following faculty were recommended for and awarded Emeritus status:

Chase Emeriti Faculty (As of July 2025)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Years of Service</u>
Carol B. Allred	19
Roger D. Billings Jr.	43
Robert M. Bratton	22
Carol Bredemeyer	44
C. Maxwell Dieffenbach	
David A. Elder	33
Nancy L. Firak	33
Edward Goggin	26
W. Jack Grosse	21
Chris Gulinello	19
Martin J. Huelsmann	34
Jennifer Jolly-Ryan	31
William R. Jones	19
Kamilla M. Mazanec	
Gerard A. St. Amand	18
Lowell F. Schechter	33
Frederick R. Schneider	39
Robert L. Seaver	
David Short	12

Mark Stavsky	37
Henry L. Stephens, Jr.	45
John T. Valauri	39
Eugene W. Youngs	
Caryl A. Yzenbaard	41