



Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

RECEIVED
RECEIVED

DEC 19 2014
DEC 19 2014

OFFICE OF
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99508-4614
T 907.786.1994
www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate

To: Provost and Vice Chancellor Elisha Baker,
University of Alaska Anchorage

Fr: Kimberly Swiantek,
UAA Governance Office

Re: Proposed Correction to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs)

On October 3, 2014 the Faculty Senate approved changes to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs). The proposed corrections, copied from similar language in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, page 3 and the post-tenure language in UNAC CBA 9.2.5.a, is "The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's **most recent** tenure or promotion review **was initiated, or since initial appointment to a tenure-track position if there has been no promotion.**"

Please see the attached memo for more information.

If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Provost

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved

Comments:

E. Baker

Elisha Baker, Provost and Vice Chancellor

12/12/2014

Date

Chancellor

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved

Comments:

Tom Case

Tom Case, Chancellor


5 JAN 2015




Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508-4614
T 907.786.1050, F 907.786.1426
www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/

September 25, 2014

To: Elisha Baker IV 
Provost and Vice Chancellor

From: Marian Bruce 
Assistant Vice Provost, Faculty Services

Re: Proposed correction to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs)

The new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines say that any faculty member, administrator, academic unit, administrative unit, or faculty union may propose changes to the guidelines using the following process: "A proposed change is to be submitted in writing to the Provost. The Provost will coordinate a review of the proposed change by the University administration, the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, and UNAC and UAFT. The Provost will share any suggestions for modifications and other comments with the proposer of the change. A proposed change will be implemented only upon the approval of the Provost, the UAA Faculty Senate, UNAC, and UAFT" (page 34).

I am proposing two corrections to the FEGs regarding the period of review for promotion. The current language says:

"Promotion Review. Tenure-track and tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. **The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's last tenure or promotion decision**" (pages 25-26).

This language is sufficient for faculty hired without tenure, where tenure and promotion are simultaneous decisions. It does not suffice for faculty hired without tenure who are then tenured without promotion. For example, in the case of a faculty member hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, who receives tenure and later applies for promotion to Professor, the current language would require the period of review to be the time since receiving tenure, not the entire time in the rank of Associate Professor. Our practice at UAA,

based on page 3 of Chapter III of the Faculty Handbook, has been to consider the entire time spent in rank when a faculty member is being considered for promotion.

In addition, the Faculty Senate Executive Board has requested a correction to clarify that promotion files should include material from the year of review for tenure or last promotion. The current language says the review should be since the "last decision." They are asking that this to be modified to be since review initiation, which would allow faculty to include material during the year of review, as that material was not considered in the last review. This change is consistent with the current practice for post-tenure review as specified in Article 9.2.5.a of the UNAC CBA, as well as with current practice at UAF and UAS.

My proposed corrections, copied from similar language in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, page 3 and the post-tenure language in UNAC CBA 9.2.5.a, is **"The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's most recent tenure or promotion review was initiated, or since initial appointment to a tenure-track position if there has been no promotion."**

See attached for a track changes version of these corrections.

promotion in rank are two separate actions.¹⁹

Types of Evaluation

Annual Progression towards Tenure Review. In an academic year or work year in which a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not scheduled for comprehensive fourth year, tenure, or promotion review, the faculty member shall receive a Progression towards Tenure Review. The faculty member shall submit an Abbreviated File (see following section). The evaluation will be completed by the Dean or Director, or designee, of the faculty member's unit, and in the case of community campus faculty members by the Campus Director or President, or 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. The annual review should evaluate and provide feedback on the faculty member's performance with respect to his or her progress in scholarly accomplishments toward promotion and/or tenure expectations.

Comprehensive Fourth Year 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 provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion, and to notify him or her of any gaps or areas that need to be strengthened, as well as areas of strength to be sustained and enhanced. Once the faculty member begins the comprehensive review process, he or she may not request that it be converted to a tenure or promotion review. The faculty member is required to submit a Full File for this review (see following section).

Tenure Review. 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, and professional 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 Full File 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, and other relevant sources.

Promotion Review. Tenure-track and tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and

¹⁹ Note that while these are two separate decisions, non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor shall not be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.

professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's **last-most recent** tenure or promotion **decision review was initiated, or since initial appointment to a tenure-track position if there has been no promotion**. 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 Full File.

Post-tenure Review. Some tenured faculty will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the relevant CBA (UAFT only). 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 or designee, or in the case of a community campus faculty member the Campus Director or President, or designee, will complete the review and provide written feedback. The tenured department chair may provide review at the request of the dean, director or designee. The faculty member will submit an Abbreviated File for this review.

Comprehensive Post-tenure Review. Every sixth year, the faculty member will submit an Full File and undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review by peer review committees, unit administrators, and the Provost in accordance with the relevant CBA. The peer review committees and administrators shall make an evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly achievements over the preceding six years in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional 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 or tenure decision. The committee shall comment on specific strengths and/or weaknesses in performance. If the overall evaluation of the post-tenure review by the unit peer review committee and administrator(s) are satisfactory, the review proceeds no further and is complete. An unsatisfactory review by the peer review committee or the administrator(s) will proceed to the university-wide evaluation committee and the Provost. The review may proceed to the Chancellor at the written request of the faculty member.

For UNAC-represented faculty members, 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.

For UAFT-represented faculty members, non-scheduled evaluations may only be initiated for just cause and pursuant to the applicable article dealing with disciplinary investigations of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UAFT and the University of Alaska. Provided that the non-scheduled evaluation meets these criteria, the initiator will provide the same timely notice as required for scheduled evaluations. While the primary purpose of post-tenure review is