

## V. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT AND TENURE

### Introduction

To be appointed to any faculty rank, a candidate must hold the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree as defined by the accrediting agencies or associations in the respective professional, craft, or academic field. Regardless of the educational requirement or credential, the primary emphasis must rest on the individual's professional profile and the overriding necessity of maintaining well-qualified faculty within the unit and the University. The determination and definition of the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree shall be made by the college in accordance with disciplinary requirements and faculty position.

### Definitions of Academic Ranks and Appointments

Emeritus. Appointment as Professor Emeritus or Emerita is an honor conferred upon a retiree in recognition of a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishments that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University. Candidates for Emeritus appointment must be full-time faculty members who have attained the rank of full professor and who have retired after a minimum of 10 years at the University of Alaska immediately prior to retirement. In exceptional circumstances, other faculty members who have achieved the highest academic rank available to them based on their professional, craft, or academic credentials and position may also be nominated. Following the consideration and recommendation of the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final appointment.

Distinguished Professor. The tenured appointment of Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, or University Professor may be given by action of the Board of Regents on recommendation of unit members and concurrence of the Chancellor and the President. The title of Distinguished Professor is considered to be a rare and special achievement. Candidates to be considered for award of the title Distinguished Professor must be nominated by their department. Following the consideration of the recommendation by the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Professor. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor must show clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high quality and significant\* scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. Candidates must have gained recognition in their professional, craft or academic field and demonstrate the likelihood of maintaining that stature. At the rank of Professor faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; contributions of high-quality and significance to the professional, craft, or academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution; demonstrated record of effective leadership in university affairs and in community engagement or service; and a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, usually the area of their primary responsibility, or through integration of their scholarly accomplishments across these components. A candidate's area of marked strength is one that draws on his or her unique talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution.

Associate Professor. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must show clear and convincing evidence of high quality and significant\* scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the mission of their units. Candidates should demonstrate an emerging level of recognition within their professional, craft or academic field. At the rank of Associate Professor faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; high-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the professional, craft, or academic field; high-quality scholarly contributions to the institution through university service and community engagement or service; and a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through integration of their scholarly accomplishments across components, that advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution. Non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor must also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor cannot be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.

Assistant Professor. Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor must show evidence of experience and achievement of, or definite promise for, the capability to produce sustained professional growth and contributions of high-quality and significance\* to the professional, craft, or academic field and the University. Candidates for promotion to Assistant Professor must show clear and convincing evidence of continuous professional growth in producing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. This will include: a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; scholarly contributions of quality and significance to the unit and institution through university service and community engagement or service; and evidence of promise for the continued contribution of scholarly achievements of high-quality and significance to the unit and University.

Instructor. Candidates for initial and continuing appointment at the rank of Instructor must show evidence of, or promise for, sustained professional growth and development of high quality and significant \*scholarly accomplishments in teaching and effective contributions to the unit, and institution through a variety of university and community service and engagement activities.

(\* Refer to section IV. Evaluation of Faculty for Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review for the definition of quality and significance of scholarship.)

### **Definition of Tenure**

The awarding of tenure serves the best interests of the individual and the University's institutional responsibility to create and disseminate of knowledge in a democratic society. The decision to grant tenure to an individual faculty member is one that has an enduring impact on the continuing growth in capacity, achievement, and reputation of the University. For the individual faculty member, tenure is the acceptance of an on-going obligation to continued scholarly performance and achievement at a high level of professional competency.

Tenure is not automatic and is not based on years of service. Therefore, it should not be recommended as a routine matter of course. Rather, tenure shall be granted to those faculty members who have provided evidence that demonstrates a sustained record of high-quality and significant scholarly performance and the promise of long-range contributions to the educational mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

The burden of proof that tenure should be awarded rests with the faculty member. Therefore, to be awarded tenure, a candidate must provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that she or he has met or exceeded the unit and university criteria for the appointed rank, that this record of scholarly achievement has contributed to the unit and institutional missions, and that such scholarly accomplishments are likely to continue into the future.

### **Consideration of Time in Rank for Tenure**

A faculty member may submit a file and request a review for tenure in any year of service. However, he or she must be reviewed no later than the mandatory year of service. A faculty member evaluated for tenure prior to the mandatory year for review shall be evaluated on the basis of performance expectations that would exist at the time of mandatory tenure review.

Initial appointment to the rank of Professor may be made with or without tenure. Faculty initially appointed to the ranks of professor without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure no later than the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) consecutive year of service. Appointment to Professor may continue beyond the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) year only with tenure.

Initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor may be made with or without tenure. Faculty initially appointed to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure must be reviewed for tenure no later than the fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) consecutive year of service. Appointments to the rank of Associate Professor may continue beyond the fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) year only with tenure.

All non-tenured faculty members appointed to a tenure-track position at the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor must be reviewed for tenure no later than the seventh (7<sup>th</sup>) consecutive year of service. Appointments to these ranks may continue beyond the eighth (8<sup>th</sup>) year of service only with tenure.

For the purposes of determining the mandatory year of tenure review, all consecutive years of service, including periods of leave of absence at full salary and sabbatical leave, shall be counted. Periods of leave of absence at partial or no salary will not be included unless requested in writing by the unit member and approved at the time the leave is granted. A partial year of service that includes at least one semester of full-time faculty service may be counted as a full year of service when it has also been used to determine eligibility for any sabbatical leave. Periods of officially requested and approved parental, family, or medical leave shall be excluded from the determination of the mandatory year of review unless the faculty member requests that such leave be counted toward their time in rank.

At the time of hire, a faculty member may request up to three (3) years of service from a prior institution be counted toward their faculty service at the University.

### **Denial of Tenure**

Faculty who are not awarded tenure by the end of their mandatory year of review shall be offered a terminal appointment for one additional year of service. If a faculty member chooses to apply for tenure prior to the mandatory year, she or he may withdraw at any step in the process prior to review by the Chancellor. However, if the review proceeds to the Chancellor and the decision is to deny tenure, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal appointment.

## VI. EVALUATION PROCESS AND REVIEW CYCLE

### Introduction

The decision to grant tenure and/or promote a faculty member shall be based on the performance of the work that the faculty member has been employed to do, his or her performance of the duties with respect to unit and University expectations for faculty rank, and the broader responsibilities expected of all members of the faculty academic community (see Section III). Although the review for promotion and tenure might happen simultaneously, the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank are two separate actions.

### Types of Evaluation

Annual Retention Review. In an academic year or work year in which a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not scheduled for comprehensive retention, tenure, or promotion review, the faculty member shall receive an Annual Retention Review. The faculty member will submit an Abbreviated Portfolio (see below section). The evaluation will be completed by the dean, dean's designee, or director of the faculty member's unit, or by the campus director or president, or designee, in the case of community campus faculty members. The unit member's tenured department chair may complete the review as the unit administrator's designee. In those units that have developed procedures for the inclusion of peer review in this process, such action shall occur before the evaluation by the unit administrator.

Comprehensive Retention Review. During the fourth year of a tenure-track appointment a faculty member will undergo a comprehensive and diagnostic review by peer review committees and administrators, and the Provost. The faculty member may also request that the review proceed to the Chancellor. The purpose of this review is to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion and to notify him or her of any gaps or areas that need to be strengthened. Once the faculty member begins the comprehensive review process, they may not request that it be converted to a tenure or promotion review. The faculty member is required to submit a Scholarly Portfolio for this review (see below section).

Tenure Review. A full tenure review is conducted to determine whether a tenure-track faculty member's work has demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, community engagement or service, and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment, faculty rank, and position. The deciding factor in tenure decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have contributed in sufficiently significant ways to the University mission, so as to merit the right to continuous employment at the institution. The faculty member is required to submit a Scholarly Portfolio for this review. The Chancellor makes the final decision on tenure, giving due consideration to the recommendations of the peer review committees and appropriate administrators.

Promotion Review. Tenure-track and tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a full promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, community engagement and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. The evidence in the Scholarly Portfolio shall cover the time period since the candidate's last comprehensive review, or tenure or promotion decision. The deciding factor in promotion decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have met the

established unit and university criteria so as to merit appointment at a higher academic rank. For this review, the faculty member will be required to submit a Scholarly Portfolio.

Post-Tenure Review. Tenured faculty will be reviewed every three years. The post tenure review process should review and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, and provide formative feedback to faculty to assist their continued development, and production of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. Every three years, the dean, dean's designee, or director of the faculty member's unit, or the campus director or president, or designee, in the case of community campus faculty will complete the review and provide written feedback. The faculty member will submit an Abbreviated Portfolio for this review. Every sixth year, the faculty member will submit a Scholarly Portfolio and undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review by peer review committees, unit administrators, and the Provost. The peer review committees and administrators shall make an evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly achievements over the preceding six years in the categories of teaching, academic research or creative activity, community engagement and university service in accordance with the unit and university expectations for his or her rank in place at the time of the last promotion decision. The committee shall comment on specific strengths and/or weaknesses in performance. The review may proceed to the Chancellor at the request of the faculty member. At any time prior to a scheduled evaluation, the dean or director of the faculty member's unit, or the campus director or president of the faculty member's community campus may initiate the post-tenure review process. In addition, a post-tenure review shall be conducted upon the request of the unit member.

Distinguished Professor Review. A department may initiate the recommendation for the appointment of a faculty member as a Distinguished Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, or Distinguished Service Professor. Such nominations consist of a letter in support of this recommendation, which may be accompanied by other letters written by faculty members and civic leaders. The letters of support should include evidence relative to the specific appointment area of teaching, research, service or all of these in the case of the rank of Distinguished Professor. Nominations are directed to the nominee's dean or director, or campus director or president, who forwards them to the Provost with his or her recommendation. The Provost refers nominations to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee for their recommendation. Provost then forwards nominations and recommendations to the Chancellor, who will make the final decision regarding recommendation to the President.

Professor Emeritus Review. Upon retirement, a faculty member may be nominated by peers or unit administrators for appointment to the rank of Emeritus or Emerita Professor. The nominating body will submit a dossier<sup>1</sup> that will be reviewed by peer review committees, unit administrators, the Provost and the Chancellor. The dossier shall provide evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievements across the career arc. Reviewers determine whether the candidate has achieved a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishments that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

## **Evaluation Review File**

The Evaluation Review File (ERF) is the full set of materials reviewed by faculty peer review committees and academic administrators during the retention, tenure, promotion, post-tenure and emeritus review process.

---

<sup>1</sup> The contents of the dossier are not prescribed and are left to the discretion of the nominating body. However, the materials assembled in the dossier should provide sufficient evidence for the reviewers to determine the merit of the nomination.

Retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review recommendations shall be based upon review of only those scholarly accomplishments in the areas of faculty responsibilities that are described and documented in the faculty member's ERF. The ERF includes:

1. A Scholarly or Abbreviated Portfolio of materials submitted by the candidate (see following section);
2. Materials submitted by other persons prior to the submission deadline (e.g. letters of support or external reviews);
3. Written evaluations and recommendations from subsequent levels of review; and
4. Any rebuttal statements or other responses submitted by the faculty member.
5. All student evaluations for a period of up to six years prior to date of current review.

## **Review Cycle**

Except in the case of a mandatory review, the candidate has the responsibility of notifying the unit dean or director, or campus director or president, of his or her intent to stand for promotion and/or tenure.

### **1. Comprehensive Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Post-Tenure Reviews**

Candidates will submit their Scholarly Portfolio to the Campus Director or President's, or Dean's office in accordance with the calendar established by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Campus director or president, unit director or department chair
- b) Unit peer review in accordance with the unit guidelines
- c) Dean
- d) University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
- e) Provost
- f) Chancellor (except in the case of 6-Year Post-Tenure review, which will proceed to this level only at the request of the faculty member)

### **2. Annual Retention Review**

Candidates will submit their Abbreviated Portfolio to the Campus Director or President's, or Dean's office in accordance with the calendar established by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Campus director or president, unit director or department chair
- b) Unit peer review in accordance with the unit guidelines
- c) Dean

### **3. Post-Tenure Review**

Candidates will submit their Abbreviated Portfolio to the Campus Director or President's, or Dean's office in accordance with the calendar established by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Campus director or president, unit dean or director, or the respective administrator's designee. The faculty member's tenured department chair may provide a review at the request of the aforementioned administrator.

#### **Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Faculty with Joint Appointments**

If a faculty member has a joint appointment with .50 effort assigned to each of two promotion-and tenure-granting academic units, then the faculty member may initiate his or her application for candidacy in either unit. The Evaluation Review File (ERF) will be made available to the tenured department chairs for their reviews, in accordance with the type of review. The file will then proceed to the peer review committee and dean in the unit in which the candidate initiated the process. The recommendations of these unit reviews will be inserted into the file and provided to the candidate before the file proceeds to the second unit for review by the peer committee and the dean. The recommendations of the second unit's reviews will be inserted into the file and provided to the candidate before the file proceeds through the remaining levels of review.

For faculty members with a joint appointment that is more than .50 effort assigned to a single promotion- and tenure-granting academic unit, then the faculty member must initiate their application for candidacy in the unit in which they are assigned the most effort. This unit conducts the review, but must include a tenured faculty member from the minority unit as a voting member on the unit peer review committee for the candidate's file. The file will then proceed to both Deans for their respective reviews, and then continue through the remaining levels of review.

#### **Right of Rebuttal and Appeal**

The candidate will have access to all information used in the evaluation, be notified of all peer committee meetings, and be provided copies of all findings and recommendations. Candidates have the rights of rebuttal and appeal. They shall have the opportunity to submit a written response to the findings and recommendations at each review level for consideration at the next level of review.

Candidates also have the opportunity to appeal a negative recommendation by the Campus Director or President, or Dean regarding reappointment or a negative recommendation by the Chancellor regarding promotion or tenure.

A faculty member may seek reconsideration of the campus director's or president's, or dean's decision by appealing to the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee. After reviewing the matter, the committee will make a recommendation to the campus director or president, or dean. The campus director's or president's, or dean's final decision may be appealed to the Provost only where such decision is inconsistent with the recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee.

A faculty member denied promotion or tenure may seek reconsideration of the decision by appealing to the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee. After reviewing the matter, the committee will make a recommendation to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's final decision may be appealed to the UA President only in cases of denial of tenure or denial of promotion to full professor and where the Chancellor's final decision is inconsistent with the recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee.

## **Scholarly and Abbreviated Portfolios<sup>2</sup>**

Candidates need to provide accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of achievements for review at the departmental, college, and university levels. The portfolio is the candidate-developed portion of the Evaluation Review File (ERF) which provides this documentation. Faculty members who are candidates for comprehensive retention, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review shall prepare a complete *Scholarly Portfolio* that describes and documents their scholarly achievements in each of the three components of faculty responsibilities, teaching, academic research or creative expression, and community engagement and university service, appropriate to their position and appointment. Faculty members scheduled for annual retention or post-tenure review shall prepare an *Abbreviated Portfolio*.

Reviewers at any level of the review process may verify evidence in the portfolio. If reviewers find a discrepancy in the portfolio, this will be documented in the recommendation.

Portfolios should be submitted on CD, DVD, or other portable media.

### **a. Scholarly Portfolio**

The Scholarly Portfolio showcases a faculty member's scholarly achievements and provides evidence supporting the faculty member's scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activity, and community engagement and university service. The portfolio makes faculty work visible by creating a coherent narrative for assessing, reflecting upon and documenting one's scholarly achievements in each of these areas. However, in evaluating a faculty member's scholarly achievements, it is more important to focus on the criteria of quality and significance than on categorizing the work or achievement.

Tenure-track faculty scheduled for comprehensive retention, tenure, or promotion review, and tenured faculty scheduled for comprehensive post-tenure review shall prepare a Scholarly Portfolio that highlights a selective sample of the candidate's scholarly work, with narrative sections that provide context and continuity for the selected materials. The portfolio has three sections and shall include:

1. A Table of Contents of portfolio sections and all supporting documentation in each section;
2. Section I: Introductory materials, including:

---

<sup>2</sup> The concept and description of the Scholarly Portfolio and its development has been adopted with modifications from the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the California State University-Monterey Bay.

- a. Curriculum Vitae;
- b. Verification of certificates, licenses and degrees;
- c. Faculty Scholarly Agenda(s) relevant to the period under review;
- d. Annual Workload Agreements for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
- e. Annual Activity Reports for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators; and
- f. Copies of findings and recommendations from the most recent annual retention, comprehensive retention, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review(s), whichever are applicable.

3. Section II: An Integrative Narrative; and

4. Section III: Portfolio sections that describe and document high quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility of teaching, academic research or creative activity, community engagement and university service. Within the teaching section of the portfolio, candidates are required to include: a) all student evaluations from the previous six years, and; b) a selected example of syllabi from each of the courses he or she has taught. Documentation should be limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track position at UAA, or since the last comprehensive retention, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, documentation should be included from those years as well.

**b. Abbreviated Portfolio**

Tenure-track faculty scheduled for annual retention and tenured faculty scheduled for post-tenure review shall prepare an Abbreviated Portfolio. The Abbreviated Portfolio shall contain:

1. Curriculum Vitae;
2. Faculty Scholarly Agenda relevant to the period under review;
3. Self-appraisal;
4. Annual Faculty Workload(s) for the past year or since last review, whichever is applicable signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
5. Annual Activity Report(s) for the past year or since last review, whichever is applicable, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
6. Copies of the findings and recommendations from the most recent retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review when applicable; and
7. Optional selected documentation to support the self-appraisal.

Candidates may wish to consult Appendices before preparing their portfolio sections. In addition, prior to their first review, candidates shall attend a training session, offered annually, on how to document their scholarship, and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of scholarship being presented. Candidates are also required to attend a training session prior to subsequent reviews if there have been substantial changes to the faculty evaluation policies and procedures.

### **c. Descriptions of Scholarly Portfolio Elements**

#### ***Table of Contents and Introductory Materials***

The first section of the Scholarly Portfolio shall include a Table of Contents of all materials in the portfolio, followed by introductory documents that provide the context for the subsequent descriptions and documented evidence of scholarly achievements.

#### ***Integrative Narrative***

The Scholarly Portfolio shall include an Integrative Narrative, of no more than five pages, that synthesizes and interconnects the candidate's scholarly achievements within the context of her or his designated responsibilities. Furthermore, the Integrative Narrative should draw together the sections of the portfolio and tie the faculty member's scholarly achievements to the department, unit, and University mission and goals. The narrative should emphasize collaborative, interdisciplinary, engaged or integrative activities. It shall also provide an opportunity to reflect on one's professional growth and development in accordance with unit and university criteria for tenure and promotion.

#### ***Portfolio Sections***

The Scholarly Portfolio shall include sections describing and documenting selected scholarly achievements in each of the areas of faculty responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activity, and community engagement and university service, as appropriate to the candidate's position and appointment. At the beginning of each section, candidates are to include a reflective summary statement of no more than three pages relating the described scholarly achievements to the documentation included in that section. The reflective summary should also include a description of how scholarly work will be built upon or further developed. The reflective summary statements may complement or provide a level of detail to further support, but not substitute for, the Integrative Narrative.

*Evidence shall consist of carefully selected examples of the candidate's most accomplished scholarly work, not an exhaustive compilation of materials.* Nevertheless, the selections must be sufficient to make it possible to document a consistent pattern of quality scholarly achievement over time. Documentation within each of the portfolio sections shall focus on the quality and significance of the scholarly activity<sup>3</sup>, using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials. It shall focus on documenting the scholarly activities and accomplishments of the individual faculty member rather than on documenting the generalized results of a project or a program. Similarly, in documenting collaborative scholarly work, the faculty member shall focus on his or her personal role and contributions to the collaborative process and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to highlight scholarly activities which represent integrative, interdisciplinary, collaborative, or engaged work, as well as those activities which make significant contributions to the attainment of department, unit/campus, or university missions or goals.

### **d. Descriptions of Abbreviated Portfolio Elements**

#### ***Self-Appraisal***

---

<sup>3</sup> The criteria defining the quality and significance of scholarly work is provided in Section IV. Evaluation of Faculty work for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.

The Abbreviated Portfolio shall include a self-appraisal, of no more than three pages, that synthesizes the candidate's scholarly achievements and contributions in each area of responsibility and that summarizes progress toward tenure or promotion where applicable, as well as progress in any areas identified from previous recommendations as needing improvement.

### ***Optional Selected Documentation***

The faculty member may, at their discretion, opt to include selected evidence to support their self-appraisal. Selected documentation should be kept to a minimum and focus on providing supporting evidence of scholarly accomplishments only in those cases where the curriculum vitae and/or the Annual Activity Reports cannot fully reflect the quality or significance of the scholarly work.

### **Relationship of Unit Documents to University-wide Guidelines**

The primary responsibility for faculty evaluation decisions concerning the hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion of faculty members resides in the unit. Therefore, each unit is expected to:

- Establish comprehensive unit-specific evaluation guidelines and procedures for all facets of the faculty evaluation process, including hiring, annual retention, comprehensive, promotion, tenure, post-tenure, distinguished and emeritus review. Unit guidelines may authorize the development of department and division level guidelines to ensure the inclusion of professional, craft, and academic disciplinary perspectives.
- Establish unit policies and procedures that ensure the inclusion of community campus representation on peer review committees generally, and for the specific cases where unit committees will be reviewing the file of a community campus faculty member assigned to the unit.
- Establish policies and procedures for the hiring and appointment of new faculty, including the development of position descriptions and the allocation of effort and responsibilities within the workload agreement. These policies and procedures must conform to University guidelines, Board of Regent's policies, and other relevant governance and regulatory policies and guidelines.
- Ensure that its faculty evaluation guidelines conform to the University guidelines with special regard to the mission of the University and its regulatory documents, the definition of scholarship, the responsibilities of faculty, the criteria of quality and significance of scholarship, and the standard procedures for faculty evaluation. Use the University-wide components identified for the responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activity, and community engagement and university service as the basis for developing the range of possibilities for faculty scholarly work appropriate to the profession, craft, or discipline unique mission of the unit.
- Develop profiles establishing unit expectations for faculty performance at each rank, including Emeritus, and for post-tenure review in the areas of faculty responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activities, and community engagement and university service, with expectations of continuous growth and productivity reflected in the profiles. This should include specific profiles for community campus faculty members assigned to the unit, as well as descriptions of Defined Service if the unit has or anticipates having members with these assumed responsibilities.

- Provide specific examples of acceptable evidence and forms of documentation for each of the areas of faculty responsibilities.
- Submit unit guidelines and procedures to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and Provost for review and approval.

### **Relationship of Departmental Documents to Unit Documents**

With unit authorization, a department may develop department-specific guidelines. These guidelines may include procedures for departmental peer review if the department has a sufficient number of faculty members to conduct such reviews in a fair, rigorous, and on-going manner. If a department opts to establish departmental review, then resulting guidelines for faculty evaluation must be in accordance with and subordinate to unit documents and university-wide guidelines. The department will be expected to establish comprehensive department-specific evaluation profiles and guidelines that parallel those of the unit with respect to outlining the scope and range of faculty scholarly work, establishing profiles of expectations for rank, and delineating acceptable forms of evidence and documentation appropriate to the profession, craft, or discipline.

## **VII. FACULTY SCHOLARLY AGENDA AND ANNUAL WORKLOADS**

### **Introduction**

Two key documents serve to guide and support the faculty member's career development: a) the Faculty Scholarly Agenda; and b) the Annual Workload. While these two documents are complementary, they are distinct. Together, they strive to balance and guide the complex and necessary interplay between the individual faculty member's scholarly and professional goals and pursuits and the needs, goals, and mission of the University.

### **Faculty Scholarly Agenda<sup>4</sup>**

Upon initial appointment and at regular intervals, each tenure-track faculty member shall develop a scholarly agenda that sets forth his or her vision and aspirations for scholarly work during a given three to five-year period. A scholarly agenda should provide the faculty member with a guiding framework from which to continuously chart his or her career, and give explicit voice to these aspirations when negotiating and establishing workloads within the unit. The scholarly agenda should engage the faculty member in examining the following considerations:

- What are the current intellectual, creative, craft or professional practice questions, issues or problems with which I am currently engaged or want to be engaged?
- What are my long-term goals for making contributions to these questions, issues or problems through my teaching, academic research or creative activity, or community engagement and university service?

---

<sup>4</sup> The concept and description of the Scholarly Portfolio and its development have been adopted with minor modifications from Portland State University, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (1996);

- What are my general responsibilities as a faculty member and what relative emphases should I place upon teaching, academic research, professional or craft practice, creative expression, community engagement and university service?
- How do these scholarly activities relate to and enhance the departmental and unit missions and programmatic goals, and the larger University mission?

The resulting agenda should reflect the unique strengths, talents, and expertise of the individual faculty and her or his professional development goals and needs. While the agenda establishes a guiding framework for a three to five year period, it should remain flexible and open to change in response to unanticipated opportunities and needs of both the individual and the institution. Faculty are encouraged to refer to prior reviews and recommendations to identify strengths that should be recognized and advanced, and areas that may benefit from more focused experiences, mentoring or professional development. Once the faculty member has written the scholarly agenda, it is shared and discussed with the Department Chair, Director, or Dean as part of the planning process for establishing the Annual Workloads.

Departments and units generally are more effective at accomplishing their wide-ranging missions when they encourage diverse scholarly agendas across the membership of the faculty. Therefore, units and departments should encourage faculty interaction and dialogue so that individual faculty may draw on the shared expertise of departmental or unit peers in the development and refining of scholarly agendas. This joint career development process promotes both individual and departmental development, and contributes to the intellectual, professional, craft, and creative climate of the department, the unit, and the University.

To ensure the process strikes a balance between the individual member's academic freedom and the unit's operational requirements, it must:

- a. recognize the individual's career development needs,
- b. respect the diversity of individual faculty interests and talents, and
- c. advance the unit mission and programmatic goals.
- d.

Primarily, the scholarly agenda is developmental, not evaluative. An individual's contributions to scholarship should be evaluated in the context of the quality and significance of the work presented for evaluation. While the scholarly agenda is included in the Faculty Evaluation File, it is included to provide insight into and context for the individual member's goals, intellectual interests and connections to departmental and university missions and needs. However, the scholarly agenda will not be considered nor be construed as establishing an evidentiary base for evaluation purposes.

### **Annual Workload**

Based on the individual faculty member's scholarly agenda and the resulting unit planning process, individual faculty members shall consult with the department chair, campus director or President, or designated administrator in order to prepare the proposed annual workload. The resulting workload should provide the faculty member with the opportunity to meet the established university and unit criteria for retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

The written and signed Annual Workload serves as the contractual agreement outlining the specific teaching, academic research or creative expression, community engagement and service activities expected for the specified time period.

## **VII. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS**

### **Introduction**

Faculty evaluation committees and academic administrators evaluate each candidate's file and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review before the recommendation is reviewed and a decision made by the Chancellor.

### **Election and Composition of Peer Review Committees**

#### **a. Eligibility**

All department, unit and university faculty evaluation committees shall be composed of tenured faculty members. Those not eligible to serve include:

- A faculty member who is on an approved leave of absence or sabbatical.
- A faculty member who has been elected to serve, or is currently serving, on a peer review committee at a preceding or subsequent level of review..
- Tenured faculty who are under consideration for promotion.
- A faculty member who an administrative workload of fifty-percent or more.

On all department, unit, and university faculty committees, only those faculty members who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion may vote on the candidate's file.

#### **b. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee**

The guidelines establishing the election process and composition of the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be determined by the UAA Faculty Senate, subject to the approval of the UAA Chancellor. The process for establishing and revising the guidelines must provide for consultation with, and approval by, the faculty of Prince William Sound Community College.

The University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee has the following responsibilities:

- Review department, division, and unit evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria for consistency with the University policies outlined herein, and to make recommendations to the Provost for any needed changes.
- Provide a university-wide, institutional-level perspective in the evaluation of faculty members who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure, for those faculty undergoing a comprehensive retention or

comprehensive post-tenure review, or for faculty who have been nominated for Distinguished or Emeritus/Emerita Professor appointments.

The Faculty Senate shall also establish a Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee, and determine the selection process and membership composition.

### **Ethical Standards for Reviewers**

All persons serving as reviewers, including faculty members, department chairs, and administrators, are expected to conduct themselves according to the ethical standards and guidelines of the University. As faculty evaluation is a key facet in personnel decision-making, the process must be conducted with due diligence to maintain the confidentiality of the candidate and the committees' deliberations. Reviewers may not move, remove, or copy any portion of the Evaluation Review File (ERF), including all material submitted by the candidate in the Scholarly or Abbreviated Portfolio.

### **Mandatory Training of All Reviewers**

All persons serving as reviewers, including faculty members, department chairs, and unit administrators, shall attend a training session prior to the first time they serve on any faculty evaluation committee or review faculty files, or if five years or more have passed since the last time they attended training. All reviewers must also attend a training session if there have been substantive changes in policy since their last training. The purpose of the training is to ensure consistent, rigorous, and fair application of university-wide faculty evaluation guidelines across the University, with emphasis on how candidates document their scholarship, and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of evidence of scholarship being presented. The training shall be conducted each fall, and will be coordinated by Academic Affairs and CAFE, in conjunction with representatives from the Senate Faculty Evaluation Committee and representatives from United Academics and UA Federation of Teachers.

### **Continuous Renewal**

To ensure the continuous renewal and enhancement of the faculty evaluation processes within the university, each level of review will provide copies of their findings and recommendations to the level of review which proceed them in the review process. This will assist each level of review in enhancing its processes, use of evidence, and ability to rigorously, fairly, and consistently apply unit and university criteria for quality and significance of quality work.

The entirety of these guidelines shall be reviewed in four years from their effective date to determine effectiveness. Subsequent review and consideration for revision will be made on a regular basis every six years.