University of Alaska Anchorage

College of Health

School of Social Work

Criteria and Guidelines

for

Faculty Evaluation, Progression towards Tenure, Promotion, and Tenure

Ratified by Social Work Faculty 01/31/2013

Reviewed by UNAC, July 2014.
Approved by Elisha Baker IV, Provost, August 2014.

Table of Contents

This document defines the policies and procedures for faculty evaluation in the School of Social Work of the College of Health, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Materials contained in this document conform to the University of Alaska Board of Regents and University of Alaska Anchorage Policies on faculty evaluation. Nothing in this document is intended to be in violation of Regents Policy or University Regulation. It is recommended that faculty review those policies. They are currently available at: http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/facultyservices/tenure/index.cfm. If negotiated collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) or University policies are in conflict with these guidelines, the CBAs and University policies shall take precedence.

As detailed in the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, the faculty role is grounded in a comprehensive definition of scholarship, which can take any of five forms: discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation. All aspects of faculty work should demonstrate scholarship in one or more of these forms.

The faculty of the School of Social Work have two or three components to their workload, which are divided into five workload units for a given semester. Workload agreements are made annually based upon the faculty member's appointment at hire and subsequent modifications established between the faculty member and the appropriate University Administrative Officer (Director, Dean, Provost) as governed by the relevant CBA. Bipartite faculty workloads are comprised of teaching and service responsibilities. Tripartite faculty workloads are comprised of teaching, research and service responsibilities. The faculty evaluation process will be a review of performance of each of the components of a workload agreement. Faculty are encouraged to integrate the components of their workloads where doing so enhances the totality of their work.

Both bipartite and tripartite Social Work faculty are represented by United Academics AAUP/AFT Local 4996. The terminal degree for bipartite faculty is the Master of Social Work (MSW). The terminal degree for tripartite faculty is the doctorate. Tripartite Assistant Professors may make adequate progression towards tenure with only the MSW if their Letters of Appointment specify that they may work on the doctorate as Assistant Professor. The School of Social Work has no Instructors who go through the review process described here, also described in the CBA.

The heart of faculty activity in our discipline is to develop and disseminate knowledge that enhances human well-being and promotes social and economic justice. The faculty of the School of Social Work are social work professionals as well as academics. As such, they are committed and accountable to professional values, ethics, and standards as established by the National Association of Social Workers and the Council on Social Work Education. Social Work faculty likewise must comply with established University policies and procedures.

Training of Reviewers

All persons who serve as reviewers at any level must attend a training session coordinated by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate prior to the first time they serve as a reviewer or when four years have passed since they last attended training.

Preparation of File

It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit a complete and well-organized file for review. The purpose of the file is to demonstrate that the candidate is performing and contributing in a manner consistent with the expectations of her/his workload type (bipartite/tripartite), workload unit allocation (e.g., 4:1, 3:1:1, 2:2:1), and desired rank (for promotion or promotion with tenure) or current rank (for periodic review or tenure only).

The preparation of the file is time-consuming. Faculty need to use judgment in deciding which materials to include in the file. In general, candidates should select the exemplar products of their work, but evidence of growth over time should also be demonstrated. Thus, items that the candidate does not think demonstrate superior work but which help to demonstrate change or responsiveness to feedback may also be included. The self-evaluation narrative is a crucial component of the file, telling the story of the candidate's efforts and achievements and why they are important within the context of the candidate's scholarly identity and the University's, College's, and School's missions.

Although some specific elements are required for all review files, faculty members are urged to include additional items to support their claims of achievement and contribution. Submission of only the required elements may not be persuasive. Additional items are most likely to be helpful in the "full files" submitted for promotion and/or tenure. As stated in the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines note that tenure is not automatic and is not based on years of service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to establish a case that supports the awarding of tenure and promotion. Reviewers are dependent upon materials submitted for reaching conclusions about progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or periodic review. Reviewers do not solicit additional information and ought not to draw on their independent knowledge of a candidate's work. Additional materials may not be added to the file once submitted unless specifically addressed in the original file and not available at the time of file submission; for example, a candidate who just completed a PhD but whose transcript has not yet been received may provide a placeholder in the file for the verification of the degree.

One highly recommended additional item is a scholarly agenda, a statement which identifies the faculty member's areas of current expertise, the directions in which the candidate hopes to grow, and the relationship between the two. All areas of the faculty member's workload should be addressed, and thematic integration across the two or three workload components is encouraged though not required. The scholarly agenda differs from the self-evaluation in that the self-evaluation is specific to the review period, whereas the scholarly agenda addresses the broader vision of the work and provides a context for activities during the review period, with a particular eye toward the future. The suggested agenda content could be incorporated into the

self-evaluation or as a stand-alone document.

<u>Required file elements and review cycle:</u>

Abbreviated files are submitted by non-tenured faculty annually. They must include: a current curriculum vitae, a self-evaluation, and annual activity reports for the review period.

Pre-tenure annual files cover only the most recent year. They are reviewed by the Dean of the College.

Full files are submitted by non-tenured faculty undergoing 4th-year Comprehensive Review, by all faculty undergoing review for promotion and/or tenure, and by tenured faculty undergoing comprehensive (6th year) post-tenure review. They are reviewed by the College Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College, the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor. (Note: Comprehensive post-tenure reviews continue beyond the Dean only if a review is unsatisfactory. 4th-year comprehensive reviews continue beyond the Provost only at the written request of the faculty member.)

Full files must include: a table of contents and three sections covering introductory materials, the self-evaluation, and evidence of achievement within the faculty member's workload components.

The Introductory section must include: a current curriculum vitae; verification of the pertinent terminal degree when appropriate; and all annual workloads, activity reports, and review findings & recommendations for the review period.

The teaching sub-section of the Achievements section must include: all quantitative student evaluations from courses taught in the last six years (or all years in rank if fewer than six) and a syllabus for each course taught during the review period.

On occasion, new faculty are hired with some number of years at a previous institution credited toward their tenure and/or promotion at UAA. These faculty members must also include in the Introductory section their initial Letter of Appointment documenting this credited time, and their Achievements section should demonstrate accomplishments from those years.

See the United Academics CBA and the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for more detailed lists of documents that must be included in the Full File.

<u>Timing of Reviews for Tenure and Promotion</u>

As detailed in the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, at hiring, each tenure-track faculty member is assigned a Mandatory Year of Review for tenure. This year is specified in the initial Letter of Appointment and varies according to the faculty member's initial rank. Faculty members may undergo review for tenure before the mandatory year, but cannot go later than that year. 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.

There is no minimum length of time in rank required before undergoing review for promotion. All promotion files should cover the entire period the candidate has held the current rank, even when the candidate has undergone one or more 6th-year post-tenure reviews. Faculty members may submit promotion files when they feel ready, with the understanding that the expectations regarding achievement are about the same whether two years or six years have passed. It has been conventional for faculty members to serve for about five years in rank before standing for promotion. Note: Assistant Professors must be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor when they are reviewed for tenure, so in fact there is a mandatory year of review for their promotion.

The Teaching and Learning Component of the Workload

Definition of Teaching

Teaching is the art and science of sharing knowledge or skill and creating a setting that leads to student learning and the co-creation of student knowledge. Almost all Social Work faculty provide direct instruction in credit-bearing courses; all Social Work faculty engage in teaching and learning activities of some kind. Some Social Work faculty serve as Coordinator of academic programs (BSW, MSW) or field programs, and this is recognized as Teaching on Workload Agreements and Activity Reports. On occasion, intense curricular efforts are recognized on workloads as well. Other types of teaching, listed as "informal" on Activity Reports but consistent with several categories named in the University guidelines (e.g., Instruction and Learning Experiences, Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources, Mentoring Students, Advancing Teaching Excellence, and Advancing Student Excellence) are also valued: building curriculum, assisting with accreditation, advising and mentoring students, mentoring fellow faculty, and engaging in teaching-related professional development.

Some of these informal teaching activities may overlap with Service or Research. For example, faculty may be engaged in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, or they may serve as formal teaching mentors through CAFÉ programs. Curriculum and accreditation work may be embedded in School committee assignments.

Teaching activities must be addressed in the self-evaluation. The faculty member should provide an orienting statement about her/his area(s) of emphasis and reflect on the activities and products engaged in during the review period. The self-evaluation should address, for example: how activities during the review period contribute to the School and College priorities and identify thematic linkages to other workload areas. Community-based teaching and learning activities and other innovative teaching strategies should be highlighted, as should the use of educational technologies and other "distance" teaching efforts. Interdisciplinary and collaborative work should be highlighted, with commentary regarding the faculty member's contribution.

The self-evaluation narrative should briefly describe teaching activities that may be unfamiliar to reviewers outside the School. When relevant, for example, faculty should explain the use of new pedagogies, or show how the Coordinator role includes a focus on curriculum or mentoring community field instructors, or explain the vital liaison role inherent in teaching a numbered Field Seminar class.

All faculty should reflect on growth in areas of teaching and in particular courses. For example, although it is not expected that a new faculty member will be wholly successful in teaching endeavors, it should be evident that the candidate is aware of strengths and weaknesses, and is building on the first and addressing the latter. Over time, s/he should be able to demonstrate that her/his teaching activities are contributing to students' learning. Likewise, new faculty would likely be more focused on individual courses than on program-wide curricular efforts, but over time, s/he should contribute to the School academic programs as a whole. More experienced faculty, too, may be new to particular pedagogies such as service-learning or educational technologies or to particular content areas, and they would also be expected to be less successful at first but to show growth over time. All faculty should address new course preparations or major revisions, and it is seen as a strength that faculty are willing to try new things. The self-evaluation should tell the story of such professional growth.

Teaching effectiveness is essential. As stated, a period of development is an expected part of assuming a new teaching role or course. The self-evaluation should assess teaching quality, and given time and demonstrated professional development, the faculty member must demonstrate her/his contribution to student learning. The Social Work accreditation body requires that graduates demonstrate a variety of professional competencies; every faculty member must play a role – and be able to show that s/he plays a role – in students' becoming competent practitioners.

The teaching activities and outcomes listed below fall into three tiers. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive. If candidates think other activities demonstrate accomplishment in this workload area, they are encouraged to identify them. However, it is their responsibility to explain to what tier the activity belongs.

Tier 1: Highly Valued Activities and Accomplishments

- In established courses: consistent contribution to student learning.
- Leadership with aspects of program-level curriculum development/revision or accreditation.
- Mentoring student research or projects through which the student wins public recognition (e.g., receives a grant or presents/publishes results).

Tier 2: Valued Activities and Accomplishments

- In established courses: overall pattern of contribution to student learning (with some

exceptions).
- In new courses: thoughtful design of new content and new assignments.
- With new pedagogies: thoughtful experimentation and professional development activities.
- Contribution to aspects of program-level curriculum development/revision or accreditation.
- Mentoring student research or projects that earn credit. This does not include projects that are part of courses already recognized on workload agreements.
- Providing academic advising in ways that helps students "stay on track" without sacrificing chances of success.

Tier 3: Somewhat Valued Activities and Accomplishments

- In established courses: updating with relevant literature, providing clear expectations.
- In new courses: using someone else's materials, providing clear expectations.
- Fostering opportunities for student leadership and recognition.

Although there is no precise formula for teaching activities and outcomes required for specific ranks, there is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. For successful faculty review, even for progression towards tenure, all faculty must demonstrate the minimal activities and accomplishments of Tier 3. To qualify as Tier 2, activities and accomplishment should indicate that the faculty member is, on balance, effective and engaged with both students and the broader educational mission of the School. In Tier 1, there is increased emphasis on the faculty member's impact. There is no expectation that any faculty member's teaching will fall uniformly into Tier 1, as that would not allow for experimentation and growth. As a general guideline, the files of Associate Professors should provide an overall flavor of Tier 2. Professors' files should fall solidly into Tier 2, with some aspects of their teaching qualifying as Tier 1.

These guidelines should not be construed as rigid requirements; the candidate has the responsibility and opportunity to demonstrate how a particular constellation of activities and evidence demonstrates teaching effectiveness commensurate with rank and the distribution of workload components.

Evidence Submitted by the Faculty Member

The faculty member should provide an orienting statement to complement the self-evaluation and guide reviewers as they interpret the evidence items. The message that different evidence items are intended to convey will vary in transparency; the candidate must explain to reviewers how to prioritize items and read the evidence. The same syllabus may provide evidence of keeping current with the literature, adding new educational technologies, and clear expectations for students. A note from a colleague who observed a candidate's class several times may demonstrate efforts to solicit feedback and a peer's positive evaluation of content delivery and expertise. A certificate from CAFÉ may demonstrate efforts to learn a new teaching strategy.

Results from student evaluations, especially over time, may demonstrate improvement with the same class.

The University requires that quantitative student evaluation results (at this writing, the IDEA course evaluation) and course syllabi be included in full files as evidence of teaching. Faculty are urged to select additional items that will further support the story of their teaching. Such items could include:
- Results from other *systematic* attempts to solicit student feedback, such as through Qualtrix or anonymous handwritten surveys. Thank-you cards from students are not considered systematic evidence.
- Results from peer observations.
- Certificates or content summaries from CAFÉ, CCEL, FTC, or professional conference sessions related to new curricular content or teaching strategies.
- CCGs for new or updated courses.
- A summary chart showing trends in student evaluation scores over time.

The Service Component of the Workload

Definition of Service

All faculty are expected to provide service as a part of their workload. Service can be performed within the School of Social Work, the College and University, the profession, and the community, at local, regional, national, and international levels. Faculty members are normally expected to provide a balance of service in all areas – Public, professional, service to the discipline, and university service. Faculty are cautioned not to over-commit themselves with service activities such that they jeopardize their ability to successfully complete other aspects of their workload.

The types of service that faculty may provide fall into three tiers. The lists below are not intended to be exhaustive. If candidates think other activities demonstrate accomplishment in this workload area, they are encouraged to identify them but it is their responsibility to explain to what tier they belong.

Tier 1: Highly Valued Activities
University (University-wide, College, and School of Social Work):
- o High-intensity and high-impact service requiring high levels of faculty effort such as elected or appointed positions to: College of Health Curriculum or Peer Review Committee, UAA Graduate or Undergraduate Academic Boards (GAB, UAB), University Assessment Committee, or University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- o Providing leadership to high intensity committees that meet weekly or bi-weekly, such as: School of Social Work MSW or BSW Curriculum or Admissions Committees,

Faculty Search Committees.

Professional:
- o Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Commissions, Councils, or Board; National Association of Social Workers (NASW).
- o Ongoing peer review of manuscripts or grant proposals.

Community:
- o National, state or local commissions or boards.
- o Leadership positions on Tier 1 or 2 bodies.

Tier 2: Valued Activities

University (University-wide, College, and School of Social Work):
- o Membership on high intensity committees that meet weekly or bi-weekly, such as: School of Social Work MSW or BSW Curriculum or Admissions Committees, Faculty Search Committees.
- o Serving on committees or boards that meet less frequently or are short-term such as: College of Health Interdisciplinary Research or Curriculum Committees, UAA CAFE;
- o Leadership positions on Tier 3 bodies.

Professional:
- o Alaska Chapter NASW Board membership.
- o Serving as an organizer or chair of a national conference committee.
- o Peer review of a single manuscript or conference proposals.

Community:
- o Providing non-remunerated consulting or board membership to a community group.

Tier 3: Somewhat Valued Activities

University (University-wide, College, and School of Social Work):
- o Low-intensity service such as membership on an *ad hoc* committee with minimal expectations.

Professional:
- o One-shot activities, such as volunteering at a professional conference.

Community:
- o Single-event service in the community.

The distinction among the tiers is a function of the faculty member's time commitment and of the impact of both the committee itself and the faculty member's contribution. Decisions made by Tier 1 bodies are consequential for the entities or individuals affected by them; these bodies also require a greater commitment of time and effort from their members. The time and effort required by Tier 2 bodies is generally less, and the results of their work may be felt somewhat less. Leadership at both of these levels indicates a significant commitment by the faculty member. Tier 3 activities may be very important for few people, but their impact is less widespread, and these activities require relatively little time.

Although there is no precise formula for the service required for specific ranks, there is the

expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. These guidelines should not be construed as rigid requirements; the candidate has the responsibility and opportunity to demonstrate how a particular constellation of activities and products demonstrates productivity commensurate with rank and the distribution of workload components.

Evidence Submitted by the Faculty Member

The faculty member should provide an orienting statement about her/his service. This statement should complement the overall self-evaluation and guide reviewers as they interpret the evidence items. The statement should address, for example: how activities during the review period contribute to the candidate's scholarly agenda and/or to School and College priorities, thematic linkages to other workload areas, and how activities serve the people of Alaska.

All service activities should be detailed in the candidate's activity reports. The Service section of the self-evaluation should include an overview highlighting arenas in which the faculty member has made particular contributions, learned lessons or engaged in activities that reinforced teaching or research activities, or brought particular prestige to the School or the University. A simple list of activities is unnecessary. Emphasis is less on busyness than on contribution. The level of responsibility and contribution should increase with rank and time in rank. Evidentiary items may include: approved workload agreements, annual activity reports, letters of acknowledgement, commendations, committee correspondence, proposals, and other products, but it should be evident that the candidate selected them intentionally.

The Research
Component of the Workload

Definition of Research

Social Work research should inform the understanding of and responses to a variety of social issues, and/or it should inform the preparation of social workers and others who work in this arena.

Interdisciplinary, collaborative, and community-engaged research is valued, especially as it has an impact on social work and social welfare in Alaska. Large, externally-funded projects are valued, as are small, community-based projects and work in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. The School recognizes that most research requires significant investment of time and effort such as in the cultivation of relationships and grant proposal submission.

Each tripartite faculty member is expected to engage in research activities. *Faculty need to establish a **clear and consistent pattern** of scholarly production in one or more areas of expertise* that is proportional to the research allocation of the workload (e.g., those with a 2:2:1 contract would be expected to be more active than those with a 3:1:1 contract).

In contrast to Teaching and Service, the products of Research lend themselves to tiers more easily than do activities.

Evidence Submitted by the Faculty Member

The faculty member should provide an orienting statement about her/his research agenda, area(s) of expertise, and reflect on the activities and products engaged in during the review period. This statement should complement the scholarly agenda and overall self-evaluation, guiding reviewers as they interpret the evidence items. The statement should address, for example: how activities during the review period contribute to the candidate's scholarly agenda and/or to School and College priorities, how different research products relate to each other, thematic linkages to other workload areas, and how activities serve the people of Alaska. Interdisciplinary and collaborative work should be highlighted, as should work that has had an impact on social work practice or in the community. The statement should provide the candidate's assessment of the impact of the work; for example, what audiences are reached through various forms of dissemination, and why a given vehicle is the best one for reaching those interested in the findings. When the faculty member is engaged in activities with one or more other collaborators, the faculty member's contribution should be delineated.

Products that have been disseminated or are currently under review with external bodies should be included. For a physical (non-electronic) file, the first page of the product may be sufficient, while electronic copies of full papers and other materials should be available as well. Full text should be provided in electronic files.

The research products that faculty may use as evidence of activity and productivity fall into three tiers. The lists below are not intended to be exhaustive. If candidates think other types of products demonstrate accomplishment in this workload area, they are encouraged to submit them but it is their responsibility to explain what those items demonstrate and to what tier they belong.

Tier 1: Highly Valued Evidence

- Published book (authored).
- Published book (edited).
- Published manuscript in refereed professional journal.
- Externally-funded research proposal.
- Article or chapter in edited book.

Tier 2: Valued Evidence

- Report (not peer-reviewed);
- Refereed presentation (paper or poster) at a professional conference or meeting.
- Internally-funded grant proposal.
- Unfunded external grant proposal.
- Products related to the development and dissemination of innovations in Social Work

practice.

Tier 3: Somewhat Valued Evidence

- Presentation at a conference or meeting (not refereed).
- Conference proceedings (not refereed).
- Documents demonstrating research projects in progress (e.g., IRB proposal, data collection instrument).
- Evidence of relevant professional development activities.
- Newsletters or other items directed to popular audiences.
- Documents related to mentoring student research that leads to publication or presentation.
- Educational software or tools that are available to others.
- Organizing a research-related conference.
- Reviewing others' grant proposals or manuscripts.
- Documents demonstrating significant editorial responsibility, as for a professional journal.

The key distinction between Tier 1 and Tier 2 is the level of dissemination and systematic critique, and the result of that critique. Tier 1 "commercially available" products, as those published in journals or books, are more accessible than the "gray literature" or presentations, and Tier 1 products have been judged by peers to be of high quality. Grant proposals may or may not be publicly available, but that some are funded implies a different level of quality.

Some items in Tier 3 require additional comment. First, evidence related to current research activities is important insofar as it demonstrates ongoing effort; file contents should not suggest that a candidate stopped work after the last project. However, if more valued products are available from the same project, the Tier 3 items need not be submitted. For example, a funded grant proposal for a current project is more impressive than an IRB proposal and makes the latter unnecessary; however, for small projects without funding, an IRB proposal may be all that is available. Likewise, professional development activities may indicate ongoing efforts but in themselves are not research products.

Second, several items in Tier 3 overlap with other workload categories and may be mentioned there as well. Mentoring students and developing educational tools would normally fall under Teaching; what makes these items appropriate for Research is that they are disseminated. Editorial work, conference organization, and reviewing others' work would normally fall under Service; what makes them appropriate here is that these positions indicate that the candidate has become recognized as an expert in the field. Likewise, research disseminated via agency newsletters would normally be considered Service but may be mentioned under Research if it helps demonstrate the community impact of someone's work.

Materials such as policy briefs or op-ed pieces may include research findings, but normally these would be considered under Service because the purpose is as much to advocate for a position as to disseminate knowledge.

Although there is no precise formula for the research productivity required for specific ranks, there is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. A minimal guideline for those with 3:1:1 workloads for favorable review of Assistant Professor may be: evidence of making progress in efforts to establish and complete projects; for promotion to or periodic review as Associate Professor: an average of one publication and juried presentation per year; for promotion to or periodic review as Professor: at minimum an average of one Tier 1 publication per year plus juried presentations. For those with a different tripartite workload allocation, expectations should be pro-rated. These guidelines should not be construed as rigid requirements; the candidate has the responsibility and opportunity to demonstrate how a particular constellation of activities and products demonstrates productivity commensurate with rank and the distribution of workload components.

Criteria for Tenure

Candidates for tenure who are at the level of Assistant Professor will be reviewed for evidence of potential for success in teaching, service and research (as appropriate). Candidates for tenure at the Associate Professor level will be reviewed for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, service and research (as appropriate) at the level of Associate Professor and the prospects for faculty member's continued professional growth and development.

Candidates for tenure who are at the level of Professor will be reviewed for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, service and research (as appropriate) at the level of Professor.

Criteria for Professor Emeritus/a or Distinguished Professor

Faculty with at least ten years' service who are about to retire at the Professor level may submit a full file for review as Professor Emeritus/a. Following the faculty review process, the Chancellor makes the final appointment. Faculty requesting this designation would be expected to demonstrate consistent achievement at the Tier 1 level across workload components.

On very rare occasions, the Board of Regents recognizes superb faculty members as Distinguished Professors in teaching, research, or service. Colleagues in the School must nominate candidates for this honor, and faculty review must endorse the nomination. The Chancellor and the President also must support the nomination, with the Chancellor making the formal recommendation to the Board of Regents. Faculty being reviewed for this honor would be expected to demonstrate consistent achievement at the Tier 1 levels across workload components with exceptional strength in the workload component for which s/he is nominated.

Appeal Process

A faculty member may appeal a decision involving tenure, promotion, or other deficient review,

with the Chancellor. Information regarding an appeal is in the United Academics CBAand also available from the Office of Academic Affairs.