

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

For Progress Towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review & Emeritus Status

Approved by CAS Faculty:

March 26, 2018

Approved by CAS Dean:

March 26, 2018

Approved by Interim Provost John Stalvey:

July 31, 2018

Contents

1. <u>Definitions in CAS</u>	4
1.1. Faculty	4
1.2. Terminal Degrees in CAS	4
1.3. “Promise” in CAS	5
1.4. “Marked Strength” in CAS	5
1.5. “Sustained and/or Continuous” in CAS	5
1.6. External Reviewers in CAS	5
2. <u>Peer Review in CAS</u>	5
2.1. Departmental Peer Review Committees in CAS	6
2.2. Multi-disciplinary Clusters for Peer Review in CAS	6
2.3. Procedures of Peer Review Committees in CAS	6
2.4. Ongoing Refinement of the Review Process in CAS	6
3. <u>Criterial for Faculty Evaluation in CAS</u>	7
3.1. College-wide Criteria for Teaching	
3.1.1. Effectiveness in teaching in CAS	7
3.1.2. Continuing or advancing effectiveness in CAS	7
3.1.3. Excellence in teaching in CAS	8
3.1.4. Highly valued teaching in CAS	8
3.2. College-side Criteria for Service	9
3.2.1. CAS criteria for public, professional, and university service	9
3.2.2. CAS criterial for service appropriate to rank	9
3.2.3. Highly-valued service in CAS	9
3.3. College-wide Criteria for Research or Creative Activity	10
3.3.1. CAS criteria for generation and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge	10
3.3.2. CAS criteria for quality and significance of products, artifacts, or creative work	10
3.3.3. Values for research or creative products in CAS	10
3.3.3.1. Products and artifacts of academic research	10
3.3.3.2. Products and artifacts of creative activity	11
3.4. College-wide Value on Activities to Obtain Extramural Funding	12
4. <u>Emeritus/Emerita Status in CAS</u>	12
Appendices: Department Specific Guidelines for Faculty Review	12

Appendices:
Department-Specific Guidelines for Faculty Review

Appendix	Department	Page
A.	Anthropology	13
B.	Art	23
C.	Biological Sciences	32
D.	Chemistry	43
E.	English	52
F.	Geography and Environmental Studies	59
G.	Geological Sciences	68
H.	History	80
I.	Journalism and Communication	87
J.	Languages	100
K.	Mathematics and Statistics	109
L.	Music	116
M.	Philosophy	127
N.	Physics and Astronomy	139
O.	Political Science	146
P.	Psychology	154
Q.	Sociology	175
R.	Theatre and Dance	183

College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. The guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the standards used to evaluate faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews and reviews for emeritus status. It also incorporates discipline-specific standards adopted by departments where faculty tenure resides.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless guidelines specific to CAS or one of its constituent units are detailed in this document (including appendices), the College adopts statewide and UAA-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide and University-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN CAS

1.1 FACULTY

Tenure-track appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences are made at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor level. Non-tenure track (NTT) term appointments in CAS may be at the level of instructor, or at “academic rank” (viz., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor). Faculty qualifications and criteria for evaluation apply equally to faculty appointments in a particular discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREES IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs stipulate that to be eligible for promotion faculty must possess a terminal degree in the discipline or field. In CAS, that degree is typically a doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., D.Phil., Psy.D., D.M.A., etc.) in the department’s core discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. The Dean and Provost must approve proposed exceptions to the terminal-degree requirement on a position-by-position basis.

A terminal degree in the discipline is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, NTT faculty in CAS must possess an appropriate graduate degree unless an exception is approved by the Dean and Provost on a position-by-position basis.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs stipulate that assistant professors must demonstrate promise for high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In CAS, a demonstration of promise means that although significant scholarly goals have not yet been met, there is demonstrable progress toward those goals.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs stipulate that, to be promoted, faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Faculty must identify their own marked strength. In CAS, departments are expected to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs stipulate that promotion to higher ranks requires sustained professional growth, a sustained record of high quality scholarly accomplishments, and sustained contributions to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University. In CAS, “sustained” and “continuous” are interpreted to mean “repeated, regular and measurable annual progress for multiple years.”

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS IN CAS

Reviews for tenure or promotion require evaluation of the candidate’s record by professional references external to the University of Alaska, according to procedures described in the CBA. In recommending external reviewers to the Dean, CAS faculty should understand that both the stature of the reviewer within the discipline and the objectivity of the reviewer may affect the weight accorded to the external review. External reviews may carry less weight if the reviewer is not an academic or professional with stature in the discipline or if the reviewer’s own professional success may be enhanced by supporting the candidate. External reviewers who are likely to have greater impact are referees who have national or international reputations in the discipline and who hold the rank of Professor.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN CAS

Peer review committees in the College of Arts and Sciences are constituted in accordance with the CBA and UAA policies and procedures. Peer review committees are formed according to one of the following options, determined in consultation with the Dean. 1) A qualified department may elect to form its own review committee. 2) If a department is not qualified or does not elect to form its own committee, then it will participate in a multi-department peer review committee.

2.1 DEPARTMENTAL PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES IN CAS

A department is qualified to form its own peer review committee if it has sufficient faculty in rank to fulfill CBA and University requirements for number and rank of committee members. In case of temporary contingencies that reduce the number of eligible faculty, a single-department peer-review committee may include a qualified faculty member from outside the department. When possible, faculty diversity and community campus representation should be considered in the formation of single-department peer-review committees. Additionally, a NTT member will be added to a peer review committee when required by the CBA.

2.2 MULTI-DISCIPLINARY CLUSTERS FOR PEER REVIEW IN CAS

Faculty members in departments that are not qualified or do not elect to form a single-department peer-review committee are reviewed by a committee from a cluster of disciplines. The cluster of disciplines that collaborate on a particular multi-department committee will be recommended by the Dean with consent of the departments. When possible, multi-department peer-review committees should include eligible faculty from departments whose members are being reviewed, including representation of community campus faculty. When possible, faculty diversity should be considered in the formation of peer review committees. Additionally, a NTT member will be added to a peer-review committee when required by the CBA.

2.3 PROCEDURES OF PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES IN CAS

Meetings of peer review committees are conducted according to University policy and provisions in the CBA. The chair of each peer review committee is elected by the committee members. The committee chair signs all reviews on behalf of the committee. The evaluation of the committee should be stated as a recommendation to the Dean.

Faculty may be ineligible to serve on peer review committees for a variety of reasons. In addition to criteria for eligibility detailed in the UAA FEPPs, faculty may not participate in peer review committees that review a member of the faculty member's immediate family. Faculty who submit a letter advocating support for tenure or promotion of a faculty member under review may not also participate in the review of that faculty member. This does not apply if the letter contains only facts, events, or observations to which the committee member can personally attest and does not address the question of promotion or tenure.

2.4 ONGOING REFINEMENT OF THE REVIEW PROCESS IN CAS

At the end of each annual review cycle, peer review committees within the College may provide written suggestions to the Dean concerning ways to improve the consistency, efficiency, and fairness of the evaluation process. Committees may prepare written comments on these matters for the benefit of future reviewers. The Dean will make these commentaries available to reviewers in the next annual cycle.

If a recommendation for changing the process is approved by a majority of CAS peer review committees (where each peer-review committee casts a single collective vote), the recommendation will be placed before the College as a proposed revision to this document and forwarded for appropriate University level and administrative review. Amendments to the College's review process require the support of two-thirds of College faculty who respond to a formal ballot.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs establish evaluative criteria for review of faculty at the levels of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. In this section, CAS spells out its college-wide standards and general values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. Given the breadth of disciplines in CAS, the College recognizes that these standards may be subject to disciplinary interpretation and application. In appendices to this document, faculty in CAS departments have articulated the definitions, interpretations, and weighting of criteria appropriate to their disciplines. In the absence of approved departmental elaborations of specific University-wide or College-wide criteria, the following College-wide standards are applicable to reviews of faculty across the College.

Faculty typically have 30 units in their workloads that include teaching and service and, often research or creative activity. The allocation of those 30 units to research can come in many forms, such as 10%, 20%, or some other percentage of research/creative activity. Similarly, allocation of units to service comes in many forms. The College recognizes that expectations for research/creative activity and for service should be commensurate with the time allocated to these areas in the workload.

3.1 COLLEGE-WIDE CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Although some faculty in CAS have less teaching than others, all CAS faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the college.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in CAS

The foundation of effectiveness in teaching is maintaining command of subject matter. In addition, faculty are responsible for communicating course objectives to students by accurately stating and assessing the approved student learning outcomes. Faculty should solicit and consider feedback from their students.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in CAS

As faculty advance in experience and rank, they should demonstrate evidence of growth in subject field and contributions to curriculum development or modification. As faculty gain experience, they should also participate in the planning and review of departmental assessment. Additionally, as they apply for promotion, they should demonstrate how their teaching has changed and developed since the start of the review period.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in CAS

At the highest rank, faculty are expected to go beyond effectiveness in teaching; they must demonstrate excellence in teaching. Excellence combines individual effectiveness and instructional leadership through adoption and modeling of high-impact practices, program development, technical innovation, and mentoring of other faculty.

3.1.4 Highly-valued Teaching in CAS

There are many ways CAS faculty can explore and demonstrate teaching effectiveness and excellence. The following are valued highly by the College:

- Participation in assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting at the departmental, College, or University levels;
- Connecting students to community agencies, groups, and projects;
- Description of an innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
- Evaluation of teaching by colleagues;
- Curriculum development and program planning activities;
- Description of new course preparations;
- Description of major course revisions;
- Achievements of students, such as awards, publications, or other academic or professional recognition;
- Evidence demonstrating the creation of student interest and involvement;
- Tailored course evaluation procedures carried out by the faculty member;
- Contributions to student success for a diverse range of students, from the traditional college-age and campus-based students, to less traditional students and those who are geographically isolated from UAA's campuses;
- Responding to changes in student characteristics, such as their preparedness, learning styles, and embracing of technology;
- Using a wide range of instructional technologies;
- Using a range of instructional techniques (such as service learning, flipped classrooms, and team-based learning) that go beyond or augment traditional lecturing; and
- Using one or more of the following high-impact practices:
 - First-year experiences,
 - Learning communities,
 - Undergraduate student research,
 - Participation in graduate thesis or dissertation committees,
 - Service learning, community-based learning,
 - Instruction focusing on international or intercultural perspectives,
 - Writing intensive courses (courses in which each student produces at least 25 pages of finished writing that is evaluated as part of the course grade),
 - Collaborative assignments,
 - Diversity/global learning,
 - EPortfolios,
 - Internships, and
 - Capstone courses and projects.

3.2 COLLEGE-WIDE CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

The following standards apply when CAS faculty have service in their workloads. Expectations for service are commensurate with the proportion of effort assigned to service in the workload such that the breadth and/or depth of service should be adjusted accordingly. All CAS faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards; and all such faculty are encouraged to engage in forms of service that rely on their professional expertise and are valued by the College.

3.2.1 CAS Criteria for Public, Professional, and University Service

University faculty have professional expertise to make an impact in different arenas that are appropriate to the discipline and mission. In CAS, faculty are expected to contribute meaningfully to departmental service, as well as College and University service. Public and professional service is also valued in CAS. However, the College does not expect that faculty must engage equally in all arenas of service.

3.2.2 CAS Criteria Service Appropriate to Rank

The foundation of faculty service begins by identifying where professional expertise is needed and can make a positive impact. As faculty advance in experience and rank, they should continue and develop their service by specializing in those areas where they can make significant contributions. At the highest rank, faculty are expected to demonstrate leadership in a focused area of service in either public, professional, departmental, College or University service.

3.2.3 Highly-valued Service in CAS

In addition to materials about service that are required by the CBA or UAA FEPPs, CAS faculty are encouraged to provide additional evidence about forms of service that rely on their professional expertise and are particularly valued by CAS, including (but not limited to) the following:

- Participation in faculty governance;
- Participation on faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
- Mentorship of other faculty;
- Participation in accreditation activities;
- Participation in advancement and resource-development activities;
- Professional or public service that is recognized as a significant contribution to the profession or community;
- Professional or public service that brings prestige to UAA;
- Service to underserved populations, especially in Alaska;
- Service to non-profit groups in Alaska;
- Service that contributes to Alaska's economy;
- Service aimed at the health needs of Alaska;
- Departmental leadership that is responsive and proactive; and
- Contributions to University-wide boards and committees.

3.3 COLLEGE-WIDE CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following standards apply to CAS faculty who have research or creative activity in their workloads. Expectations for productivity in research or creative activity are commensurate with the proportion of effort assigned on the faculty member's workloads.

3.3.1 CAS Criteria for Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

CAS recognizes that the generation of research/creative activity takes time and effort.

However, it is dissemination of products of that effort on which promotion rests.

Dissemination takes various forms. With respect to research and creative activity, CAS departments are expected to define the disciplinary standards for dissemination.

3.3.2 CAS Criteria for Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

CAS recognizes that some venues of dissemination have more significance than others. Some have greater disciplinary prestige than others. Some reach a wider audience. As such, it is important for faculty to provide evidence of the disciplinary significance of the venue.

It is also important to address the impact of the research products, artifacts, or creative works. When possible, faculty should provide evidence of the impact of their dissemination because doing so provides evidence of external recognition.

As faculty advance in rank, their research/creative activity should achieve increasing recognition by professional peers external to the University of Alaska or the local community. In CAS disciplines, examples of external recognition might include (in addition to publication, funding, and performance): requests to serve as a peer reviewer; invitations to deliver keynote presentations or featured performance at national or regional venues; or editorship of disciplinary journals.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products in CAS

The UAA FEPPs provide different examples of finished and disseminated products of research or creative activity. In CAS, faculty disseminate a range of products from academic papers and books, to performances and showings of artistic works. Discipline-specific examples are especially important in CAS and should inform the evaluation of research/creative activity in each discipline.

3.3.3.1 Products and artifacts of academic research

Listed below are examples of research products. Because the following list is general, discipline-specific guidelines are especially important in CAS.

- Book (authored or edited)
- Refereed monographs
- Funded research proposals
- Refereed journal articles
- Articles in edited books
- Refereed proceedings
- Laboratory manuals and instructional materials for use beyond UAA

- Non-refereed monographs
- Non-refereed journal articles
- Reviews of publications or presentations that contribute to disciplinary debate and discussion
- Reviews of electronic media
- Non-refereed proceedings
- Cases published
- Research reports
- Paper presented at a professional meeting
- Annotated bibliography
- Translations, collections, bulletins, synopses
- Abstracts, books of readings, manuals
- Journal comments and notes
- Newspaper editorials or articles on professional topics.

3.3.3.2 *Products and artifacts of creative activity*

Creative activity may lead to interpretive performances or presentations of artistic works or the creation and exhibition of new works of art in such disciplines as Art, Dance, Theatre, or Music. There is an extremely diverse range of creative products in the arts. Below are examples of artifacts and products of creative activity. Because the list is general, discipline-specific guidelines are especially important in CAS.

- Example products of creative performance or presentation:
 - Production of a play
 - A concert
 - Creative work presented through slides or photographs
 - Directorial concepts
 - Lighting, set, costume design
 - Technical plots
 - Prompt scripts
 - Production photographs
 - Costume renderings with swatches
 - Scenographic models or ground plans/elevations
 - Plots, working drawing, revisions
 - Actor's journal
- Examples of products from the creation of new works:
 - Choreography
 - A sculpture, painting, print, photograph
 - A musical composition
 - An original play, film, screenplay, or adaptation

3.4 COLLEGE-WIDE VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

All faculty in the College are encouraged to obtain extramural funding to support all areas of their work. While potential sources of extramural funding vary across disciplines, faculty efforts to bring additional resources to the University are valued by the College. Interdisciplinary approaches to obtain extramural funding are also valued in CAS. Faculty should present evidence of their efforts to obtain extramural support, such as proposals submitted for extramural funding, funded extramural grants and contracts, documented interactions with philanthropic organizations, or memoranda of agreement with philanthropic organizations, as appropriate to the discipline. Examples of efforts to secure extramural funding include:

- Proposals submitted to federal agencies to fund research, creative activity, or pedagogical innovations;
- Proposals submitted to state agencies to fund research, creative activity, or pedagogical innovations; and
- Proposals submitted to local or community agencies to support service projects.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN CAS

The UAA FEPPs stipulate that emeritus or emerita status is based upon the quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarly achievements across the career. The faculty member is expected to have a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishment that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University. In CAS, such faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College or one of its departments. Faculty must have the endorsement of their department.

Appendix A: Department of Anthropology Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

The Department of Anthropology within the Division of Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. The guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located. Information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression towards tenure/tenure/promotion/post-tenure review and by those responsible for assessing review files. Evaluation shall be based on qualitative and quantitative assessments of the faculty member's fulfillment of responsibilities in teaching, academic research, and service to the Department of Anthropology, CAS, and the University during the appropriate evaluation period.

Definitions and general guidelines apply to all tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in the Department of Anthropology. The Department of Anthropology expects that this document will provide guidelines for faculty members' development and progress. It may be revised according to appropriate disciplinary changes in approach, methods, or content.

Anthropology's guidelines are subject to those developed by the UA Board of Regents, relevant collective bargaining agreements, UAA, and CAS and the Office of Academic Affairs, as well as the policies of the University of Alaska Board of Regents. In cases of discrepancy, those other guidelines take precedence.

1.0 DEFINITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS

1.1 WORKLOADS

In the specific guidelines which follow, it is presumed that the typical faculty appointment represents a "tripartite" or **3:1:1** workload, i.e., comprised of 60% teaching, 20% academic research, and 20% service. Variants from this workload are to be expressed in *workload agreements*.

1.2 MARKED STRENGTH

If college-level or university-wide faculty evaluation guidelines require a marked strength, the Department of Anthropology interprets "marked strength" to mean productivity in teaching or academic research exceeding that required for rank.

1.3 REFEREED PUBLICATIONS IN THE DISCIPLINE

To be considered a refereed publication, manuscripts must undergo a process of detailed review by experts in the field of study. Online publications count equally with print publications if they appear in recognized and professionally refereed online locations. Research products may include vetted reports published in formal association with government agencies, non-government organizations (NGOs), or private corporations.

1.4 NON-REFEREED PUBLICATIONS IN THE DISCIPLINE

These publications are not subject to rigorous, outside review. Examples of non-refereed publications may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Research articles in non-refereed journals,
2. Technical reports, including reports to agencies, NGOs, or private corporations,
3. Non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials,
4. Presentations at conferences or workshops,
5. Articles in popular magazines that serve to enhance public support for scientific research, and/or
6. Unpublished papers for which the authors demonstrate their professional quality and usefulness.

1.5 ADHERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND ETHICS

All faculty are expected to conduct themselves according to the professional and ethical standards and guidelines of the University. In addition, all anthropology faculty are expected to adhere to the Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association regarding professional practices and/or ethical guidelines of anthropological subfields within which the candidate practices.

2.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

All candidates for tenure or promotion must document that they hold a doctoral degree in Anthropology or Archaeology (Ph.D or D. Phil.). Exceptions will be determined in advance with provost permission before hiring and will be documented in appointment letters. Candidates for tenure or promotion will be expected to demonstrate that, since the commencement of the tenure-track appointment:

- there has been a sustained commitment to and record of effectiveness in undergraduate and graduate teaching and supervision;
- there has been continued growth as an established scholar, as demonstrated by the development of a significant program of academic research and scholarship leading to recognition by peers and constituencies outside the institution; and
- the faculty member has become a responsible and contributing member of the academic community through university and professional service.

Additionally, candidates for tenure or promotion must demonstrate and document marked strength in either academic research or teaching, as defined respectively in the following sections.

The following guidelines apply to each of the three workload components respectively.

2.1 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching is a highly valued practice within Anthropology. In assessing teaching effectiveness, the quality and impact of the teaching practices are most important. Faculty in Anthropology are encouraged to articulate their teaching goals, methods, strategies, and philosophy in the context of self-evaluation and to reflect further on ways in which they engage in evaluation and quality improvement of their teaching practices in light of the significant limitations of student evaluations. Faculty should submit evidence of teaching practice across three levels of expectations as detailed below. Evidence can include documents, certificates, web links, or other sources in addition to narratives of self-evaluation or reflection. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the evidence required by the college, university, and collective bargaining agreements.*

Faculty should reflect on their ongoing efforts to implement the following minimal teaching practices during the review period:

- Developing clear and well organized syllabuses
- Maintaining fidelity to course content guides, including student learning outcomes
- Conforming to university policies related to accreditation (e.g., student contact hours)
- Providing necessary information to departmental and university committees for curricular and program assessment
- Being available to students for meeting and consultation (e.g., holding regular office hours, responding to emails)

In addition to the minimal expectations, faculty should augment and develop their teaching effectiveness by engaging in both progressive (Tier 1) and standard (Tier 2) teaching practices. Faculty should provide evidence of both Tier 1 and Tier 2 teaching practices, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

Tier 1 Teaching Practices

- Using peer or student feedback to improve course quality
- Articulating course, program, and GER student learning outcomes throughout course content to enhance and evaluate student learning
- Using and evaluating the effectiveness of innovative teaching techniques, methods, and deliveries

- Using and evaluating the effectiveness of high-impact teaching practices
- Using results from course, program, or GER assessments for course, curricular, or program revisions
- Implementing innovative assessment activities for course, curriculum, or program
- Supervising service learning projects
- Integrating community engagement into teaching practice
- Serving as a graduate student advisor or committee chair
- Serving as a primary mentor for undergraduate thesis or research
- Leading professional development activities (e.g., CAFÉ event) related to teaching
- Mentoring colleagues in teaching practices (e.g., providing peer teaching reviews, sharing teaching materials, consulting on teaching strategies)
- Teaching or mentoring students in such a way that one is recognized with an honor or award (Receiving teaching honors or awards)

Tier 2 Teaching Practices

- Developing new course materials (i.e., new course preparations and distance delivery options)
- Assisting with significant course and program curriculum revisions
- Teaching a variety of courses
- Supervising an independent or directed study
- Providing academic advising for students
- Serving as a member of graduate student advisory committee
- Serving as a secondary mentor for undergraduate thesis or research
- Contributing to documented student successes (e.g., awards, grants, publications, presentations)
- Enhancing course(s) by integrating content based on one's professional and research activities (including field projects, archival work, sabbatical activities)
- Integrating knowledge or skills from professional development activities (e.g., CAFÉ events) into teaching practice
- Disseminating teaching techniques and innovations (e.g., through publications and presentations to conferences and colloquia)
- Providing professional development workshops or lectures for students
- Writing letters of recommendation for students
- Assisting students with applying to graduate school or other professional positions

The Department of Anthropology will evaluate teaching practices to the degree appropriate to faculty rank and workload.

Associate Professor: For achieving the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document teaching effectiveness by providing evidence of:

- Promoting and contributing to the review and assessment of the Department of Anthropology's Student Learning Outcomes,
- Establishing an instructional environment leading to effective teaching,
- Command of course subject matter,
- Continuous growth in imparting disciplinary knowledge to students, and
- New course development and contributions to improving the curriculum.

Full Professor: For achieving the rank of Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document teaching effectiveness by providing evidence of:

- Promoting the Department of Anthropology's Student Learning Outcomes,
- Maintaining an instructional environment leading to effective teaching,
- Continuing command of course subject matter,
- Continuous growth in imparting disciplinary knowledge to students,
- Leadership in new course development and contributions to improving the curriculum,
- Peer evaluations as described above,
- Student accomplishments in academic research or creative activity,
- Letters of recommendation from other faculty or students, and
- Leadership in review and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

Marked strength in teaching involves a significant emphasis upon Tier 1 teaching practices.

2.2 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

In assessing academic research/creative effectiveness the quality, quantity, and scholarly significance of the products should be the primary concern. Faculty in Anthropology are encourage to articulate academic research goals, methods, and results in relation to the field of anthropology in the context of the self-evaluation. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the evidence required by the college, university, and collective bargaining agreements.*

Information to be evaluated for effectiveness in academic research or creative activities in Anthropology during the review period shall include, but is not limited to, items listed below under two tiers of scholarly production:

Tier 1 Research Activities

- Books or Monographs, either sole or co-authored,
- Edited books,
- Edited issues of refereed journals, as guest editor/special issue
- Refereed articles with a significant contribution to the manuscript,
- Book chapters,
- Funded academic research greater than \$5,000,

- Refereed reports, and
- Research/creative projects that seek and incorporate review by community members.

Tier 2 Research Activities

- Funded academic research less than \$5,000,
- Submitted grant proposals irrespective of funding success,
- Non-refereed articles,
- Non-refereed reports,
- Book, monograph, or article reviews,
- Conference papers or posters,
- Published abstracts,
- Participation in workshops and other professional panels,
- Developing formal community partnerships for research,
- Products of research/creative projects that are disseminated to communities (ex. community presentations, community-knowledge exchange and research dissemination, products for community or public use that result from research), and
- Research-capacity building in communities (ex. providing training for community members to act as co-researchers, co-authoring publications with community-members).

Note: Additional forms of scholarly publication may be offered by the candidate for consideration.

Specific indicators or evidence of quality of publications and other works may include:

- The reputation of the journal or book publisher,
- The number, source, and substance of citations,
- Published reviews and reprints,
- Frequency of online downloads from websites or libraries,
- Demonstration of impact, and
- Positive assessment from community representatives.

All items produced under the categories listed under Tier 1 or Tier 2 above are considered “scholarly units.” For example, each book or article produced is a distinct scholarly unit. Ideally, academic research or creative activities should include some combination of both Tier 1 and Tier 2 scholarly products. Collaborative work, which is central to anthropological inquiry, is encouraged.

The Department of Anthropology will evaluate academic research and creative activities to the degree appropriate to faculty rank and workload.

Associate Professor: For achieving the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology, a minimum of 5 scholarly units, of which 3 must come from Tier 1, is required. It is expected that those

working toward the rank of Associate Professor are establishing themselves within their chosen field and thus may have more publications in local or specialized journals.

Full Professor: For achieving the rank of Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document academic research/creative activity effectiveness by providing evidence of:

- Scholarly effectiveness demonstrated by production of at least 7 scholarly units under the categories listed above, additional to those units demonstrated at the Associate Professor level. At least four of those scholarly units must be produced from the Tier 1 level (section 2.2 above),
- A significant level of recognition by professional peers on a national and international level, and
- Sustained and extensive generation and dissemination of significant and high-quality disciplinary knowledge.

Marked strength in academic research is defined as a minimum of 20% more scholarly units overall and in Tier 1.

2.3 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Service includes a combination of departmental, college, university, and professional activities. Faculty may select among any of these, with the expectation that faculty service concentrates first on contributing service at the departmental level. Accomplishments in service can be demonstrated through; certificates of participation; letters of participation or support; email responses to journal, book, grant, and other professional reviews or evaluations; awards and recognition as well as through personal review or reflection, and other products as appropriate. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the evidence required by the college, university, and collective bargaining agreements.*

Departmental Service

At the departmental level, basic responsibilities expected from all faculty include faculty meeting attendance and participation, and attending Anthropology Club, thesis defenses, or other departmental events when possible.

Tier 1 Departmental Service

- Hiring committee chair
- Serving as departmental chair
- Leading academic program development activities
- Coordinating the Anthropology undergraduate program's academic assessment
- Serving as Anthropology Graduate Program coordinator
- Guiding curriculum changes through the department and governance.

Tier 2 Departmental Service

- Mentoring other faculty in the department

- Serving as a hiring committee member
- Serving as a member of departmental scholarships committee
- Participating in academic program development activities
- Giving guest lectures in other anthropology classes
- Assisting with planning and execution of departmental events
- Contributing to departmental documents, policies, and procedures.

College Service

Tier 1 College Service

- Serving as a peer review committee chair
- Chairing or co-chairing a CAS committee appointed by Dean or Associate Dean
- Participating in faculty, administrator, or search committees outside of Anthropology

Tier 2 College Service

- Serving as a peer review committee member
- Serving on a CAS committee appointed by Dean or Associate Dean
- Serving on a Student Award Selection committee (e.g., Undergraduate Research and Scholarship)
- Mentoring faculty outside the Department of Anthropology
- Giving guest lectures in other CAS classes

University Service

Tier 1 University Service

- Serving as faculty advisor for a student club or organization outside of the department
- Chairing or co-chairing a university-level committee or task force
- Chairing or co-chairing a Faculty Senate committee
- Serving on Faculty Senate or equivalent governance or curriculum review bodies
- Writing documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the university's mission or operation

Tier 2 University Service

- Serving as a reviewer for university and college scholarships
- Contributing to university initiatives (e.g., ePortfolio)
- Delivering lectures or talks on campus (e.g., UAA Bookstore)
- Giving guest lectures in non-CAS classes

Community Service

Tier 1 Community Service

- Writing blogs, paper articles, about anthropology for the public in non-academic settings.

- Organizing activities for students and or teachers for a school district (within or outside of Alaska)
- Participating in community events or panels that draw on professional expertise
- Organizing a training or education program public officials on some aspect of disciplinary expertise
- Establishing ongoing community partnerships.
- Planning in discipline related events in the community (Instructor for Olé class, Archaeology day, Anthropology day, Public education participation programs)
- Chairing public boards, task forces or committees
- Testifying before legislative bodies or in court based on disciplinary expertise
- Consulting on a major or large scale project
- Consulting for business and community organizations

Tier 2 Community Service

- Participating in community events (school district, scouts, etc.)
- Leading or participating in public talks (e.g. bookstore, schools, library, “nerd night” or science pub
- Training or educating public officials on some aspect of disciplinary expertise
- Participating in discipline related events in the community (Guest speaker for Ole class, Archaeology day, Anthropology day participant, guess speaker for public education programs)
- Serving on public boards, task forces or committees.
- Consulting paid or unpaid for professional work or input

Professional Service

At the professional level, all faculty area expected to maintain membership in local, national, or international professional societies.

Tier 1 Professional Service

- Serving as an officer in a professional society at the local, national, or international level.
- Serving as an editor for a journal
- Serving on an editorial board
- Leading organization for a professional conference
- Chairing a conference session
- Serving on National or international grant committee or panel
- Delivering workshop as the lead instructor

Tier 2 Professional Service

- Managing a web site for a professional organization
- Performing duties for a professional organization or journal
- Serving as a member on organizing committee for a professional conference
- Organizing a conference session or a panel

- Reviewing journal, grant, book, scholarship, student papers, manuscript as a referee
- Organizing a professional workshop

All faculty are expected to contribute service from both tiers at levels appropriate to rank.

Associate Professor: For achieving and maintaining the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document increasing service activity effectiveness by providing evidence of:

- A record of departmental, college, university, professional, and public service, and
- A strong promise for continuing and expanded achievement.

Full Professor: For achieving and maintaining the rank of Professor of Anthropology, faculty are expected to contribute service at the departmental, college, university, and professional levels particularly in leadership positions. Senior faculty must document the following service activity effectiveness for promotion to the position to Full Professor:

- A record of departmental, college, university, professional, and public service, and leadership in university affairs,
- Participation in a wide range of professional service activities at state and national levels, and
- Recognition of service contributions by external public and professional organizations through letters of support.

2.4 EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF ANTHROPOLOGY

The Department of Anthropology affirms, following Board of Regents policy 04.04.070, that emeritus status is an honor conferred upon the outstanding retirees of the university and not an automatic recognition of services rendered. Emeritus status is based upon the quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, research, and service across the course of his or her career as judged by his or her peers. The faculty member is expected to have a sustained record of outstanding accomplishment that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the Department of Anthropology and the University.

All candidates for emeritus status are expected to have conducted themselves throughout their careers according to the professional and ethical standards and guidelines of the University. In addition, candidates for emeritus status are expected to have adhered to the Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association regarding professional practices and/or ethical guidelines of anthropological subfields within which the candidate has practiced. Failure to adhere to these standards is grounds for denial.

Appendix B: Department of Art Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Art in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Art.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree for faculty teaching Art History is a PhD in Art History. The terminal degree for most faculty in the Department of Art is an MFA in Studio Art or an appropriate area of Art study (for example, MFA in Graphic Design, Ceramics, Painting, etc). NASAD recognizes the Master of Fine Arts as an appropriate terminal degree for studio art faculty. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified artist-teachers may hold other academic degrees: others may not hold any academic degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, training, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for a Masters of Fine Arts degree in the

appropriate field. The Dean and Provost must approve proposed exception to the terminal-degree requirement on a position by position basis.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. The Department does not have additional standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Theater & Dance and Music.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The goals of the Department of Art's faculty evaluation guidelines are the following:

- Inform new faculty members of expectations for progress towards tenure and promotion;
- Provide clear guidelines for faculty who are submitting files for promotion, tenure and post-tenure;
- Assist reviewers in making fair and appropriate judgments about candidates in the Department of Art.

These guidelines are intended to be the Department of Art's interpretation of university promotion and tenure review guidelines for faculty in Art; however, this document should not be taken to be exhaustive in describing ways that faculty can meet university standards for promotion, tenure and progression towards tenure. Each faculty member has unique strengths and abilities. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make the strongest case when building the progression towards tenure, promotion and tenure files. These guidelines are meant to instruct but not limit faculty members. Because of the diversity inherent in the field of art, the possibility exists that the candidate's academic research/creative activity, teaching and service will not fall within the range of the suggested criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify the unique circumstances and the complexities of their particular workloads when appropriate.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

Teaching activities create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and student attainment of UAA's Student Learning Outcomes. It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following aspects:

1. Instruction and Learning Experiences;
2. Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources;
3. Mentoring Students;
4. Advancing Teaching Excellence;
5. Advancing Student Excellence:

The faculty member's self-evaluation should address teaching effectiveness at a level appropriate for the relevant review.

The Department of Art's disciplinary definition of teaching includes not only classroom activities but the range of activities that support the delivery of courses to students.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the Department places special emphasis on that list and other examples including:

- Development of methods for teaching students to become well-rounded artists;
- Evidence of helping students enhance and expand technical and aesthetic skills for their specific disciplines;
- Participation in or mentoring of student organizations to encourage and develop extra-curricular studio use;
- Evidence of teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student achievements, such as participation in exhibitions, presentations to professional organizations, or acquisition of grants/scholarships;
- Discussion of results received on student evaluations;
- Discussion of the selection of resources for a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- Discussion of grading in a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- Awards and recognition received by the faculty member for teaching excellence;
- Evidence of involvement in student career development (e.g., providing references or letters of recommendation).

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload.

All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the

following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

Public, professional and university service is essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly and creative excellence, enables shared governance, and meets the internal operational needs of the university and department. All faculty members are expected to engage in public, professional and university service activities, with increasing involvement at high ranks, as appropriate to the discipline and the missions of the department and the college.

Service is defined as those activities outside the classroom that contribute to the mission of the department, college, university, and public square, including community involvements both drawing upon disciplinary expertise and reflective of engaged citizenship on the part of the faculty member.

The file should contain evidence of the faculty member's service commitments and should demonstrate increasing levels of service as the faculty member progresses through the ranks.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the Department places special emphasis on that list and other examples of service including:

Departmental Level

- Chairing a faculty search committee;
- Serving as a member of a Department of Art committee;
- Serving on an ad hoc Department of Art committee;
- Fundraising
- Tracking departmental data such as alumni successes, job placement of graduates, etc.

College Level

- Serving as Chair of the Department of Art;
- Serving on a college committee;
- Chairing college committee.

University Level

- Serving on Faculty Senate or equivalent governance or curriculum review bodies;
- Serving on a University-wide committee;
- Chairing a University-wide committee.

Professional Level

- Organizing/facilitating conferences and workshops;
- Managing professional/organizational webspaces;
- Evaluating manuscripts for publishers, journals or other professional materials;
- Serving as a panel chair at a professional conference;
- Serving as an officer of a professional society;
- Maintaining active membership in professional societies;
- Jurying student or professional exhibitions;
- Curating art exhibitions at the local, regional, national and international level;
- Conducting discipline-specific workshops;
- Participating by invitation as guest lecturer, seminar or workshop leader;
- Applying for and receiving public commissions.

Community Level

- Serving on a local, state, and/or national organization;
- Organizing activities for the pupils and teachers of the Anchorage School District, or districts throughout the state;
- Acting as liaison between the Department of Art and the Anchorage School District;
- Being involved in community events or panels that draw upon disciplinary expertise.
- Serving on or providing leadership for local, state, national and or international arts organizations

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

The pursuit of creative/research activities to advance the Visual Arts is a reasonable expectation of studio artists and art academics. Creative/research activities of many types are conducted by Department of Art faculty. While the generation of creative/research work is arduous and time-consuming, the exhibition/publishing of the work also adds to the creative workload according to the quality and quantity of the venues for exhibition/publication.

Active and continuous creative work should be demonstrated, keeping in mind the quality, quantity and complexity of the creative endeavor. Also important is the quality and quantity of exhibition venues for this research with an emphasis on quality.

The affirmation gained from sharing research and its results is also essential. Colleagues should proactively subject their work to the judgment of their peers especially through presentations, exhibitions, and publications.

Art faculty are primarily trained in the creation and exhibition of visual art, although some faculty may choose to focus on research with less emphasis on public exhibitions. The file should contain representative documentation of the faculty member's research and/or creative activity productivity.

Because of the diversity inherent in the field of art, the possibility exists that a candidate's creative/research activities will not fall within the range of the suggested criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify the unique circumstances of his or her research and the complexities of their particular creative inquiry when appropriate.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The departmental standards are described below.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. The Department adopted the description products and artifacts of academic research as stated in CAS FEG's Faculty members whose workloads include creative activity in the visual arts are expected to document the outcomes of that activity as evidenced by products, artifacts, creative works or performances. It is to be understood that faculty are not restricted to the activities outlined here, nor are they expected to show performance in each of the categories. Furthermore, since each discipline has distinct differences and emphasis, it will benefit each faculty to address these issues in their self-evaluation, for the benefit of colleagues reviewing the files who may need assistance in understanding the impact of these differences on the time and effort needed for production.

In addition, the following lists are examples of academic research and creative activity, but by

no means represent all of the possibilities:

- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with international or national visibility;
- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with regional visibility;
- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with local visibility;
- Group Exhibitions at any level;
- Works included in public art collections;
- Grants received;
- Consulting (paid or unpaid);
- Public Art commissions;
- Professional free-lance work;
- Public performances;
- Participation on public panels;
- Website or other web activity;
- Review of exhibitions in local, national, and/or international newspapers, publication and/or on the web;
- Curation and production of exhibitions.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research/creative activity – meet the college-wide and university-wide standards for this component of the workload.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research/creativity – meet the college-wide and university-wide standards for this component of the workload.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix C: Department of Biological Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Biological Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Biological Sciences.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is a doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., D.Phil.) in biology or closely-related discipline.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT instructors who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in biology or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. In the Department a marked strength is defined under the framework of the review criteria for promotion and/or tenure in a workload component where the member presents evidence that department criteria have been exceeded. Artifacts in evidence of marked strength are denoted in the individual sections.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts the CAS definition. The Department also recognizes that research productivity, especially peer-reviewed publication, in Biological Sciences is often discontinuous; thus, “sustained and/or continuous” is defined as an average over the review period.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a single-department committee that, if needed, will add members from another department in consultation with the Department Director.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-

wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

According to the UAA FEPPs (section IV.a.), “When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning...” As well, “Faculty members are expected to be reflective practitioners who continuously examine their effectiveness as educators.”

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

In Biological Sciences, the teaching section of the review file must include items as specified in the UAA FEPPs (section VI). Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, and that may be used to demonstrate a marked strength in teaching, in the Biological Sciences may include (but is not limited to):

1. Copies of assignments, course plans, exams with accompanying explanations of their potential effectiveness
2. Teaching and/or mentoring awards
3. Formal assessments of student achievement (such as instructor-designed course evaluations)
4. Competitive student fellowships/scholarships/grants awarded
5. Student research presentations and publications
6. Student post-graduate successes
7. Documentation of faculty development in teaching and mentoring
8. Formal evaluation of teaching by peer faculty

The Department of Biological Sciences requires the following information be included in the teaching section of the review file:

1. A brief description of each class taught in order to provide context for review. The description should include
 - a. Course name and number
 - b. Class size
 - c. General pedagogical approach
2. Copies of departmental teaching evaluation surveys (if available)
3. Copies of peer evaluations of teaching (if available)
4. A brief description of student mentoring activities in order to provide context for review. The description should include, where applicable
 - a. Postdoctoral fellow mentoring
 - i. Number of postdocs mentored

- ii. Descriptions of postdoctoral fellow successes (including after their postdoc where applicable)
- b. Graduate student mentoring
 - i. Number of students mentored
 - ii. Number of student committee memberships
 - iii. Number of students mentored in teaching (TAs)
 - iv. Descriptions of student success (including after their graduate degree where applicable)
- c. Undergraduate student mentorship
 - i. Number of students mentored
 - ii. Number of academic advisees
 - iii. Number of students mentored in laboratory preparation
 - iv. Descriptions of student success (including after their undergraduate degree where applicable).

NOTE re IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports: IDEA student evaluations should be used with full consideration of their limitations, which include the adequacy of: a) sample size; b) student response rates; and c) the IDEA course database; d) course failure/drop/withdrawal rate. Reviewers should exercise care when interpreting numerical scores whenever IDEA results are considered unreliable or do not represent the class as a whole. Adequate sample size is critical in the use of student evaluations as teaching indices or metrics. See <http://www.idea.ksu.edu/resources/index.html> for additional information, or the IDEA Center for information on interpreting results: Overview of Student Ratings: Value & Limitations; Using IDEA Results for Administrative Decision-making.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. In addition to the items listed in Section 3.1, artifacts used for demonstrating effective teaching in the Biological Sciences include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. Faculty in Biological Sciences are encouraged to (a) act upon any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews, (b) examine their effectiveness and (c) make changes as appropriate such that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching, using data and artifacts available in the review file.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must provide clear and convincing evidence that demonstrates a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is the highest academic rank the University can bestow, so artifacts included in the review file should lend support to sustained

excellence. Examples may include (but are not be limited to):

1. Teaching awards
2. Letters of commendation from other faculty or students
3. Development of curriculum
4. Development of innovative teaching methods
5. Successful mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate students
6. Other professional recognition of teaching

Evidence that demonstrates leadership as it relates to teaching activities, which may demonstrate a marked strength in teaching includes (but is not limited to):

1. Design of effective teaching strategies that are shared and discussed with other faculty
2. Identification and development of solutions that meet teaching needs
3. Chairing peer mentoring committees
4. Participation in peer review of teaching

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. In addition, reviewers should note that the Department considers mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in research and teaching a teaching activity that is highly valued.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload.

All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. All Assistant Professors in Biological Sciences undergoing annual review are expected to demonstrate growth towards effective achievement of scholarly contributions in service that support scholarly excellence and the University mission. Metrics for potential success may include (but are not limited to) service on department and/or community campus as well as university committees, review of manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, and reviewing textbooks.

Assistant Professors, regardless of workload assignments, who undergo comprehensive fourth year review are expected to demonstrate evidence of promise or achievement of effective contributions in service that support scholarly excellence. Metrics for a sustained record of scholarly contributions should include a continuing record of service to the department's academic and professional development, and contributions to university service. Other metrics of service that support a sustained record of scholarly contributions and may also demonstrate a marked strength in service can include contributions to community, state and national service such as giving talks to local organizations, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and activities related to the faculty member's professional development.

Assistant Professors standing for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate both high-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service that supports scholarly excellence. The minimum level of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong, continuing and productive involvement in the Department of Biological Sciences' academic and professional development. Other metrics of high-quality and significant scholarly service, and that may also demonstrate marked strength in service, can include contributions to the department, university and to the faculty member's profession such as service on university-wide committees, review of student presentations, peer-review for academic journals, or proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments agencies, chairing sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, disseminating scholarly information to the public, participation in steering committees, boards and councils, etc.

Associate Professors standing for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of effective leadership in service that supports scholarly excellence in both department and university affairs. The minimum level of demonstrated record of effective leadership in service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership record of significant service in the department's academic and professional development such as chairing departmental, college or university-wide committees. Other metrics of effective leadership in service that may also demonstrate a marked strength in service can include leadership contributions to the university and to the faculty member's profession such as review of student presentations, manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals and proposals for funding agencies, as well as involvement in committee assignments, chairing sessions at or hosting state, national, and international meetings, reviewing textbooks, holding office in one's professional societies, steering committees, councils and/or boards, and other professional community service activities.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. In the Department service includes a combination of scholarly activities at the department, university, professional and public levels that support the academic discipline and

university mission. All faculty members are expected to contribute to department, university, professional and public service. Moreover, it is expected that Biological Sciences faculty regularly attend and participate in department and/or community campus meetings and committees, and perform other duties consistent with the department goals and as the Director requests. Reviewers should be aware that faculty service as referees or as members of review committees for journals, books, grant proposals, research programs, national level centers, and/or experimental facility awards requires substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute for or replace departmental or university service.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

The Department of Biological Sciences has specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in research/scholarly activity. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion. The minimums are elaborated as per each 20% of workload devoted to research. In cases where a faculty member changes workload categories (e.g., changes from 20% research workload to 40% research workload) research productivity should be judged on a pro-rated basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. In Biological Sciences, the hallmark to demonstrate research success is peer-reviewed publication of one's research results. Therefore, faculty with research as part of their appointment are expected to publish in the peer-reviewed literature while at UAA. Research faculty are also expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis; thus, evidence of these submissions should be included in the review file. In review of funding activity, funded external competitive grant proposals will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, and awards of experimental time and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit but will not replace the expectation of external research funding. Industry, non-profit and government cooperative agreements, partnerships and contracts for research activities, as well as patents based on the faculty member's research and held by the university may also be included in research activity.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. Research in the Biological Sciences is expected to yield refereed publications and, optionally, non-refereed publications as defined:

Refereed Publications:

Prior to publication, refereed or peer-reviewed publications manuscripts undergo a process of detailed review by independent experts in the field of study prior to acceptance in academic journals or other scholarly publications. The result of the review may suggest minor, moderate, or major changes; a recommendation for immediate publication; or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book to which the manuscripts were submitted.

Editor Reviewed Publications:

Editor reviewed manuscripts are reviewed by one or more editors. Examples may include (but are not limited to) final reports, technical reports, and conference publications.

Non-Refereed Publications:

These publications are not subjected to rigorous scientific review. Examples of non-refereed publications may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Research articles in non-refereed journals
- Technical reports
- Non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials
- Articles in popular magazines which serve to enhance public support for scientific research

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to both of these categories, productivity must include publishing in refereed journals. Refereed publications in peer-reviewed journals are expected to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory; such publications serve as a representation of the faculty member's ability to design, conduct, and mentor novel research at UAA.

Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the authorship conventions associated with their particular disciplines (e.g., many sub-disciplines within the biological sciences recognize the last author as senior author of the publication whereas others view the second author as senior author of the published work).

The level of research productivity over a particular interval being reviewed for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion will be defined primarily by the number and quality of publications (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.). The expected output will be dictated by the workload agreement assigned to the faculty member as well as

the faculty member's rank. The projected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion.

In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation within one year of arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity; however, reviewers should note that such work does not satisfy the requirement to demonstrate de novo research activity while at UAA.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

Assistant Professors of Biological Sciences undergoing annual reviews before promotion are expected to demonstrate progress in scholarly accomplishments in research. Metrics for potential success can include manuscripts published, proposals submitted or funded, students (graduate or undergraduate) and/or postdoctoral scientists recruited for research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

Assistant Professors undergoing 4th year comprehensive review should have at least one refereed manuscript accepted for publication for each 20% of the faculty member's workload that is assigned to research during the review period, as well as at least two additional manuscripts submitted for publication in refereed journals or books derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. Other metrics of success can include presentations at conferences, invited presentations, and submitted/funded proposals to external and internal funding sources as principal investigator or co-principal investigator.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 40% research -- demonstrate effective research through high-quality and significant contributions in academic research/creative activity in this workload component. To demonstrate high-quality and significant contributions in research/scholarly activity, the minimum research productivity required for promotion to Associate Professor is at least 0.5 manuscripts per year accepted for publication in refereed journals or books during employment by UAA for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload; at least one manuscript is to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA

laboratory for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload.

It is acknowledged that not every publication is equal and the quality of publications shall also be considered. Journal impact factor or number of times a publication has been cited may be considered; however, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case for the impact of his or her work. The intent is for the faculty member to have established themselves independently as an effective and productive investigator. In addition, the faculty member should have competitive external funding at a level appropriate to the faculty member's workload and research field. Other metrics of success can include funded internal competitive awards and external research contracts. A publication record in excess of the above standard in combination with acquisition of competitive external support may also demonstrate marked strength in research.

Competitive external funding could include (but is not limited to) national-level competitive federal, corporate, and foundation grants. Examples include:

1. National Institutes of Health—Basic Research Grants (R01), Small Research Grants (R03), Academic
2. Research Enhancement Awards (R15), Exploratory/Developmental Research Grants (R21/R33)
3. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association—Sea Grant National Grants, National Marine Mammal Laboratory etc.
4. National Science Foundation—Early Concept Grants for Exploratory Research (EAGER), Rapid Response Research Grants (RAPID), Small Grants for Exploratory Research (SGER), Faculty Early Career Development Grants (CAREER), Large Research Grants for most solicitations, Exploratory Research Grants for many solicitations
5. United States Department of Agriculture—National Institute of Food and Agriculture formula grants (NIFA)
6. United States Department of Energy—Biological and Environmental Research (BER) Grants
7. United States Environmental Protection Agency—Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Grants
8. Department of Defense—Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and related grants
9. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
10. Private foundations—American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Mellon Foundation, North Pacific Research Board, Rockefeller Foundation, etc.

3.3.3.2 Benchmark for promotion to Professor

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for promotion should—under the assumption of 40% research—demonstrate an extensive record of high-quality and significant accomplishments in academic research/creative activity through productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. An extensive record of high-quality and

significant scholarly productivity will be measured by continued success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program. Funding support sufficient to sustain the research program, as outlined above, may be considered as additional evidence of a continued record of research achievement. This support includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national labs.

The rank of Professor is an indication of the international stature of the scientist among his/her peers, so evaluation by researchers external to UAA must be sought, where reviewers should weigh both the number and quality (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.) of refereed publications produced, plus research funding received, and/or support awarded at national labs over the individual's career to determine whether an "extensive record of high-quality and significant" research is evidenced, or whether a marked strength in research exists. This is very much a professional judgment issue, best left to peers for determination since quality of research can really only be judged by others in the field. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. As pointed out above, research faculty in Biological Sciences are expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis; thus, evidence of these submissions should be included in the review file. In review of funding activity, funded external competitive grant proposals will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, and awards of experimental time and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit but will not replace the expectation of external research funding. Industry, non-profit and government cooperative agreements, partnerships and contracts for research activities, as well as patents based on the faculty member's research and held by the university may also be included in research activity.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. In Biological Sciences, the endorsement from the faculty will be based on a comprehensive and distinguished record of excellence in teaching, research and service in support of the university and academic discipline.

Appendix D: Department of Chemistry Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Chemistry in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Chemistry.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is Ph.D., DPhil, or Sc.D. in Chemistry or appropriately associated field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. At this time the Department has not yet defined departmental standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College.

The department advises that a uniformly distributed production of peer reviewed articles is not an appropriate sole determinant of sustained research productivity in chemistry. Although regular submission of manuscripts for peer review may result in annual publication, it is not to be seen as a negative if a faculty member’s publication record occurs in less regular batches. If a faculty member does publish on a less uniform schedule, other research activities associated with obtaining funding, collaboration, student mentorship, and laboratory operations should clearly justify that irregularity. Publication on a less regular schedule does not excuse not meeting a publication expectation commensurate with a research allocation.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Chemistry, Physics/Astronomy, and Geological Sciences.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The Chemistry Department recommends the following information be included in the teaching section of the review file:

1. A brief description of each class taught (in order to provide context for review). The description should include;
 - a. Course name and number.
 - b. Class size.
 - c. General pedagogical approach.
2. A brief description of student mentoring activities (in order to provide context for review). The description should include;
 - a. Number of undergraduate students mentored (if applicable),
 - b. Number of graduate students mentored/graduated (if applicable).
3. Copies of Departmental teaching evaluation surveys.
4. Copies of mentoring committee teaching evaluations if available.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

When evaluating the teaching for faculty in the Department, caution must be exercised in using the IDEA student evaluations for a variety of reasons including the adequacy of: a) sample size; b) student response rates; and c) the IDEA course database. The adoption of the IDEA course assessment tool by UAA occurred in Fall 2007 and statistical temporal comparisons involving the same faculty teaching the same course(s), different faculty teaching the same course(s), and comparisons of faculty teaching similar courses at other university campuses will not be wholly reliable until about 10-12 semesters of reliable data are accumulated. Reviewers should exercise care when interpreting numerical scores whenever IDEA results are considered unreliable or do not represent the class as a whole. However, the IDEA instrument can provide useful indicators of one's teaching when mean values fall outside or within this range. In such instances, the review process should focus on providing faculty constructive advice and recommendations.

Adequate sample size is another issue related to the use of student evaluations as teaching indices or metrics. Faculty may obtain documentation from the Office of Academic Affairs relating to the reliability of IDEA data. Evaluations based on 5 or fewer students should also be

dismissed, particularly when beginning class sizes are less than 5 (*sensu* IDEA presentation, 4 Sept 2007). Access <http://www.idea.ksu.edu/resources/index.html> for additional information, or the IDEA Center for information on interpreting results: [Overview of Student Ratings: Value & Limitations: Using IDEA Results for Administrative Decision-making](#). It is incumbent upon the faculty being reviewed to address the reliability of the evaluations being presented if such concerns exist.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. In the Department, given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. Teaching, according to University guidelines, consists of the following aspects, rearranged in order of importance for the Chemistry Department:

1. Instruction and learning experiences,
2. Mentoring students,
3. Building and developing curriculum and learning resources,
4. Advancing teaching excellence, and
5. Advancing student excellence

Although all aspects of teaching are valued, the Department emphasizes instruction and learning experiences (classroom) and mentoring students (in research). Faculty need to provide in their review files evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching, depending on which faculty rank is under review. Examples of types of evidence are provided below.

Faculty in Chemistry should mentor and involve undergraduate and/or graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research. Faculty having research workloads should include any combination of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research program to produce refereed publications. Metrics of successful mentoring of research include awards for mentorship of research, copies of CHEM A498 undergraduate research forms which describe undergraduate research projects and expectations, and evidence of students garnering competitive scholarships, fellowships, and

grants; completing Honors and graduate theses, publishing in peer-reviewed literature, delivering presentations at regional, national, and international conferences, going on to more professional training; and attaining employment within their field. Other types of student mentoring include academic and career advising, supervision of teaching assistants, etc. Documentation may include lists of advisees, student letters, or evidence of any of the above metrics.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. In the Department, it is anticipated that faculty regularly attend and participate in department meetings and committees, performing these and other duties consistent with normal departmental operating procedures and those that the Chair periodically requests. Contributions to both professional and public service should be discipline-related. Reviewers should note professional service of faculty who serve as referees or as members of review committees for journals/books/grant proposals/research programs/national-level centers and/or experimental facility awards since such activities necessitate substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute nor replace department or University service.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. In the Department the minimum level of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include guiding contributions to the department, University, and to the faculty member's profession. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments for funding agencies, chairing sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and disseminating scholarly information to the public.

For promotion to Professor, faculty must demonstrate leadership in service. In the Department, the minimum level of demonstrated record of effective leadership should include effective leadership in service contributions to the university and to the faculty member's professional development. These include reviewing student presentations, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments and/or proposal review for significant funding agencies,

chairing sessions at state, national and international meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and/or holding office in one's professional societies.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the Department places a high value on service that builds consensus and a collaborative team in the Department.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Reviewers for research by faculty in the Department should recognize that UAA has limited research support and infrastructure. Reviewers should also understand the difference among three kinds of dissemination in Chemistry.

- Referred Publications. Prior to publication, refereed manuscripts undergo a process of detailed review by independent experts in the field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes; a recommendation for immediate publication; or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book to which the manuscripts are submitted.
- Editor-reviewed publications. These manuscripts are reviewed by one or more editors. Examples may include (but are not limited to) final reports, technical reports, and conference publications.
- Non-referred publications. These publications are not subjected to rigorous scientific review. Examples of non-refereed publications may include (but are not limited to) the following:
 1. Research articles in non-refereed journals
 2. Technical reports
 3. Non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials
 4. Articles in popular magazines which serve to enhance public support for scientific research.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. In the Department, primary emphasis for research performance will be placed on refereed manuscripts; editor reviewed and non-refereed research products are considered to be a secondary level of research productivity and will not be acceptable as sole criteria for assessing the faculty member's potential for success in the research component of the workload or to determine progress towards tenure and promotion.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska.

In addition, to assist reviewers in ascertaining the faculty member's academic/scholarly research accomplishments during the review period, the in the Department are encouraged to include in their review file copies (or links) of all manuscripts that are in preparation, submission/review, in press/accepted for publication, or published. In assessing performance, primary emphasis will be placed on refereed manuscripts; editor reviewed and non-refereed research products are considered to be a secondary level of research productivity and will not be acceptable as sole criteria for assessing the faculty member's potential for success in the research component of the workload or to determine progress towards tenure and promotion. Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the authorship standards associated with their particular discipline (e.g., principal vs. senior authorship; principal vs. co-principal investigator, etc.).

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

The Chemistry Department has crafted specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in academic research. While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions in other categories, productivity must include publishing in refereed journals. Refereed publications in peer-reviewed journals are expected to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory; such publications serve as a representation of the faculty member's ability to design, conduct, and mentor novel research at UAA.

The level of research productivity over a particular interval being reviewed for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion will be defined primarily by the number and quality of publications (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.). The minimum expected output will be dictated by the workload agreement assigned to the faculty member as well as the faculty member's rank. The projected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

The hallmark for research in the Department is peer-reviewed publication of one's research results. Therefore, tripartite faculty are expected to publish in the peer-reviewed literature while at UAA. In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity. However, reviewers should note that such work does not satisfy the requirement to demonstrate de novo research activity while at UAA.

Assistant Professors in the Department undergoing comprehensive should have at least one refereed manuscript accepted for publication, for each 20% of the faculty member's workload that is assigned to research performed during the review period, as well as at least two additional manuscripts submitted for publication in refereed journals or books derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. Other metrics of success can include presentations at conferences, invited presentations, and submitted/funded proposals to external and internal funding sources as PI or Co-PI.

The minimum research productivity required for promotion to Associate Professor is at least 0.5 manuscripts per year accepted for publication in refereed journals or books during employment by UAA for each 20% of the faculty member's workload, at least one manuscript is to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload. It is acknowledged that not every publication is equal and the quality of publications shall also be considered – such as consideration of journal impact factors or number of times a publication has been cited. The intent is for the faculty member to have established themselves independently as an investigator. In addition, the faculty member should have obtained funding at a level appropriate to the faculty member's workload and research field which supports research outcomes, creative productivity, and student research opportunities.

Competitive external funding could include any national-level competitive federal or Foundation grant competition. Examples include:

- NIH – Basic Research Grants (R01), Small Research Grants (R03), Academic Research Enhancement Awards (R15), Exploratory/Development Research Grants (R21/R33).
- NSF – early Concept Grants for Exploratory Research (EAGER), Rapid Response Research Grants (RAPID), Small Grants for Exploratory Research (SGER), Faculty Early Career Development Grants (CAREER), large Research Grants for most solicitations, Exploratory Research Grants for many solicitations.
- USDA – National Institute of Food and Agriculture formula grants (NIFA) US DoE
- US EPA – Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Grants
- PRF/ACS/Cotrell/etc.-
- Recognized Professional research granting Institutions
- Private foundations – American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Howard Hughes Medical Inst., Mellon Found., N. Pacific Research Board, Rockefeller Found., etc.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should demonstrate through research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. An extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly productivity across one's career will be measured by a continued rate of success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program that includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national

The rank of Professor is an indication of the stature of the scientist among his/her peers, so evaluation by researchers external to UAA must be sought, where reviewers should weigh both the number and quality (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.) of refereed publications produced, plus research funding received, and/or support awarded at national labs over the individual's career to determine whether an "extensive record of high-quality and significant" research is evidenced. This is very much a professional judgment issue, best left to peers for determination since quality of research can really only be judged by others in the field.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines.

In the Department, faculty at all ranks with research components to their workload are also expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis, evidence of these submissions should be included in the review file. In reviewing funding activity, external competitive grant proposals that are funded will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants and awards of experimental time and collaboration at state or federal agencies, national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit. Research contracts which support creative activities, contribute to a faculty member's research program, or provide research opportunities for undergraduate and/or graduate students will also be given merit.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix E: Department of English Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of English in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of English.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department of English, the terminal degree required for promotion is a doctoral degree in English or an appropriate area of English studies (for example, a PhD or DPhil in Linguistics, Literature, Rhetoric, or other areas of scholarship encompassed within English studies). The terminal degree for faculty in Creative Writing is the MFA.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. The English Department has not articulated discipline-specific definitions of a marked strength in teaching, service, research or creative activity.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The English Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the English Department opts for a single-department committee that, if needed, will add member from other disciplines in the CAS Humanities Division. The departmental committee will also include an appropriate additional member for review of a faculty member with a joint appointment.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching Activities in the Department of English

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The English Department places special emphasis on evidence of some activities in that list, including the following:

1. description of an innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
2. evaluation of teaching by colleagues;
3. curriculum development and program planning activities;
4. description of new preparations;
5. description of major course revisions;
6. achievements of students, such as awards, publications, or other academic or professional recognition;
7. evidence demonstrating the creation of student interest and involvement;
8. tailored course evaluation procedures carried out by the faculty member;
9. discussion of results received on student evaluations;
10. discussion of the selection of texts for a course and the pedagogy behind it;
11. discussion of changes made in the course from previous offerings and the reasons for them;
12. discussion of grading in the course and the pedagogy behind it;
13. discussion of teaching support activities (e.g., student conferences and advising sessions);
14. awards or recognition received by the faculty member;
15. evidence of active involvement in graduate and/or undergraduate thesis committees; and

16. evidence of involvement in student career development (e.g. providing references or introductions).

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The English Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Valued in the Department of English

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The English Department has identified the following examples of valued service:

Departmental Level

- chairing an English department committee;
- coordinating an English department program;
- serving as a member of an English department, CAS, or university committee;
- serving on a hiring committee (either within or external to the department); or
- serving on an ad hoc departmental committee.

University and College Level

- chairing a university board or CAS committee;
- serving on an invited or appointed university or CAS task force or committee; or
- serving on Faculty Senate or equivalent governance or curriculum review bodies.

Professional Level

- organizing/facilitating conferences, colloquia, and workshops
- managing professional/organizational webspaces
- evaluating manuscripts for publishers, journals, or other professional publications
- serving as a panel chair at a professional conference
- serving as an officer of a professional society

- maintaining active membership in professional societies
- contributing to technical (e.g., digital/electronic) projects
- contributing to dialogue on professional issues for a general audience (such as articles or interviews in newspapers or magazines; interviews or op-ed pieces on radio or television)

Community Level

- invited or elected service on a local, state, and/or national organization or commission in recognition of the faculty member's professional standing;
- community involvements drawing upon disciplinary expertise; or \
- community involvements reflective of the faculty member's engaged citizenship.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Each member of the Department of English is hired with either a scholarly or creative focus. Although the department recognizes that faculty might productively cross over between these two types of work, it is expected that the majority of a faculty member's work will align with their primary focus.

For scholarly work, the English Department values peer-reviewed publications, whether in print or digital venues. The English Department values sole and coauthored publications, and it is incumbent upon the faculty member to demonstrate the value of his or her contribution to coauthored essays.

For creative work, the English Department values the traditional genres of fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry, as well as hybrid and innovative forms. The department values publications in established and reputable venues. Self-publishing, while not entirely discouraged, will be given minimal value in the unit system.

The file should contain evidence of the faculty member's scholarly and/or creative productivity. In applying the unit system, faculty and reviewers should take into account quality, influence, and/or recognition for each piece as relevant to rank. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to articulate their scholarly and creative work in terms of these qualities. Files can demonstrate quality, influence, and/or recognition with information such as acceptance rates, audience, reviews, citations, awards, and/or impact factors.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The English Department provides discipline-specific elaboration on that basic ranking as described below. The following list is illustrative rather than exhaustive:

Major Publications

• A scholarly book published by a recognized academic press	≤ 6 units
• A book-length creative work published by a reputable press	≤ 6 units
• A textbook book that establishes directions for developing research in the field	≤ 4 units
• An edited scholarly book published by a recognized academic press	≤ 4 units
• Ongoing editing of a journal so as to establish directions for developing research in the field	≤ 4 units
• A novella or chapbook published by a reputable press	≤ 3 units
• A peer-reviewed article in an academic journal	≤ 2 units
• A short story, literary nonfiction essay, or series of poems in a reputable publication	≤ 2 units
• A scholarly essay in a peer-reviewed edited collection or conference proceedings	≤ 2 units
• A textbook used for classroom teaching	≤ 2 units

Other Scholarly and Creative Activity

• A regional, national, or international conference presentation in the faculty member's disciplinary specialty	≤ 1 unit
• A regional, national, or international reading of creative work	≤ 1 unit
• A book review	≤ 1 unit
• Non-refereed articles	≤ 1 unit
• An entry in a reference work or encyclopedia	≤ 1 unit
• Substantial and sustained online activities (e.g. a well-read academic blog or contribution to a substantial disciplinary website)	≤ 1 unit
• Successful intramural grants	≤ 1 unit
• Successful extramural grants	≤ 2 units
• Design and/or development of film, video game, or other media	≤ 2 units
• An accumulation of local scholarly or creative presentations	≤ 1 unit

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. The English Department adopts that description of the venue, the impact of products and artifacts, and the recognition of peers external to UAA.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Productivity

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. While these are general guidelines, the English faculty have established the following thresholds for research and creative activity:

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for Promotion to Associate Professor*

In the English Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure or promotion should – under the assumption of workloads consisting of 20% research – demonstrate achievement of 10 research units, with a minimum of 6 units of major publications. Works in progress may be included if they are near final publication.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for Promotion to Professor*

In the English Department, Associate Professors who stand for promotion should – under the assumption of workloads consisting of 20% research – demonstrate achievement of an additional 10 research units, beyond the benchmark achieved for promotion to Associate Professor, with a minimum of 6 units of major publications. Works in progress may be included if they are near final publication.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE PLACED ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The English Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The English Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix F: Department of Geography and Environmental Studies Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Geography and Environmental Studies.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is Doctor of Philosophy or a Doctor of Education in geography, environmental science, environmental studies, environmental planning, environmental policy, tourism, or closely related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of “promise” in the Department is below.

A. **To show promise in teaching**, a faculty member in the department will engage in High Impact Practices (HIPs) such as service-learning and undergraduate research; ensure that students graduating with a degree in Environment and Society have met the student learning outcomes defined for the major; advise and participate extracurricular activities that encourage students to pursue prudent career paths and thoughtful reflection on environmental issues.

B. **To show promise in research**, a faculty member in the department will participate in community-engaged research and, to some extent serves the public interest; and are expected to have been engaged in an active program of scholarly enquiry since appointment at UAA, as evidenced by the following types of products:

First tier: Refereed publications including primary research articles in journals, chapters in peer-reviewed/edited books, refereed reviews and invited papers, refereed conference proceedings, peer-reviewed books.

Second tier: Reports written for government agencies, technical reports, research tools and programs. In addition, this tier might also include standard un-refereed publications. Internally refereed or non-refereed technical reports written for government agencies, funding agencies, or community partners; research tools and/or programs; or invited contributions to reputable, non-scholarly periodicals. The nature of our disciplines and the department’s focus on community-engaged research (see below) ensures that most faculty members will produce a body of second-tier publications that will factor in decisions on promotion.

Third tier: Funding proposals, conference presentations and posters, editorial work, research conference organization and participation, publically available datasets, other outreach products, development of formal citizen science program framework and data collection protocols.

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to all of the categories listed above, productivity must include first-tier publications. A portion of the refereed publications must be first-authored or derived from work originating directly from the faculty member’s efforts. Peer-reviewed publications must be in well-respected disciplinary journals or published by well-respected publishers in the discipline.

Note that the publication of a book requires significantly more time and editorial review than a journal article and will be granted greater weight accordingly. Further, articles accepted by major journals in the faculty member's field should also be accorded greater weight than publications in minor journals. A portion of the refereed publications must be first-authored or derived from work originating directly from the faculty member's efforts. Peer-reviewed publications must be in well-respected disciplinary journals or published by well-respected publishers in the discipline.

- C. **To show promise in service**, faculty members will participate in the assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting that focuses on the department's GER courses, the Environment and Society major, and minors in Environmental Studies and Geography; focus on curricular improvement in departmental courses and major and minor programs; and participate in professional service that results in community engagement, opportunities for students in service-learning, community-based research, and/or internships.

1.4 "MARKED STRENGTH" IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

- A. The Department's definition of marked strength is teaching is:
 - Innovative and thoughtful use of HIPs to ensure student success in departmental course work and/or in the Environment and Society degree program. Faculty with a marked strength in teaching will show a significant commitment to HIP pedagogy beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member in the department. Faculty that consider teaching to be their marked strength must provide at least three examples of how they have successfully used HIPs in their teaching activities.
- B. The Department's definition of marked strength in service is:
 - A significantly active service agenda, beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member in the department, with a focus on community engagement activities.
- C. The Department's definition of marked strength in research or creative activity is:
 - Research activity that is beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member in the department as measured either by a production level 50% above the standards set for promotion or through the publication of products, and includes a mix of Tier I, II and III research products. The expected number of Tier 1 products varies based on appointment type and status of and/or progress towards promotion (see section 3.3.3).

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of “sustained and/or continuous” in the Department is described below. The department’s definition of sustained and/or continuous activity in:

- A. The area of teaching is:
 - A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, as demonstrated by the faculty member. This record will be demonstrated by evidence of a command of the subject matter being taught, continuous growth in the subject field, and the maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.
- B. The area of service is:
 - Public, professional, and university service activities that are exemplified by evidence of a developing record of service that has a demonstrable, positive impact or outcome and has a community engagement focus.
- C. The in the area of research or creative activity is:

Engagement in the dissemination of knowledge within the discipline, which will be exemplified by high-quality products in geography, environmental studies, or an allied discipline and/or interdisciplinary research that builds strong links between the department and allied disciplines, programs, and agencies, both within and without the university. They will actively pursuing a research agenda through the preparation of first-, second-, and third-tier research products.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Sociology, Political Science, Journalism & Communication, and/or Anthropology.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for teaching, service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of “effectiveness in teaching” for the Department is *developing* pedagogy that employs the HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research. In addition, they should be actively pursuing strategies for measuring and reflecting on student learning outcome achievement in their courses, as well as creating mechanisms to enhance student critical thinking and problem solving skills. Assistant Professors should be developing skills as advisors and finding positive ways to engage students in meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

The department engages in a process of peer review of teaching to help the chair determine effectiveness and excellence in teaching and the promotion of an environment that encourages achievement of student learning outcomes in courses and in the Environment and Society major and minor programs in Environmental Studies and Geography.

Each professor who is to be reviewed will arrange a peer reviewer in consultation with the chair of the department. The ‘reviewee’ and the peer reviewer will arrange a convenient schedule for the peer review process. The peer review process contains six stages:

1. The reviewee and the peer reviewer will meet to decide which course(s) are to be reviewed and when.
2. The reviewee will provide the reviewer with the course syllabus, course assignments, and other relevant documents for review. The reviewer will compare these documents to the course content guide.
3. The reviewee will allow the reviewer to sit as a guest in her/his class. Prior to this class, the reviewee will brief the reviewer as to lecture/class content and objectives. The reviewer will observe the reviewee to give comments and critique.
4. The reviewer will meet briefly at the end of class with students, without the reviewee present, to gain insight into the teaching strengths and weaknesses of the reviewee.

5. The reviewer will meet with the reviewee and summarize her/his findings. In addition, the reviewer will produce a short report for the reviewee, which s/he may or may not choose to include in the reviewee's file but will also be submitted to the department chair to aid in evaluation.
6. The reviewee has the right to write a response to the report and/or ask the chair to have the process repeated one time with a new reviewer.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of "continuing or advancing effectiveness in teaching" for the Department is the employment the HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research in their courses. In addition, they should have established strategies for measuring and reflecting on student learning outcome achievement in their courses, as well as having created mechanisms to enhance student critical thinking and problem solving skills. These strategies should inform and improve the major and minors offered by the department. Associate Professors should be effective advisors in the department and be actively mentoring students through advising, HIPs and other meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of "excellence in teaching" for the Department is evidence of a sustained and continuous record of effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by the faculty member. This record will be demonstrated by evidence of a command of the subject matter being taught, continuous growth in the subject field, and the maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes. Professors are expected to show leadership in the use of HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research in their courses. In addition, they should show leadership in the measurement of and reflection upon on student learning outcome achievement in their courses and in the major and minor programs in the department. Professors should be leading advisors in the department and be actively mentoring students through advising, high impact practices and other meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. In addition, the department values:

- Participation in the assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting that focuses on the department's GER courses, the Environment and Society major, and minors in Environmental Studies and Geography.
- Activities focused on curricular improvement in departmental courses and major and minor programs.
- Professional service that results in community engagement and opportunities for students in service-learning and community-based research.
- Professional service that develops linkages between the department and organizations engaged in environmental work, particularly linkages that lead to student opportunities in internships, undergraduate research, and service learning.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. In addition, the department values service activities that meet needs of the community and expects greater leadership in such activities as a faculty member moves up in rank.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies particularly values interdisciplinary and community-engaged research that builds strong links between the department and allied disciplines, programs, and agencies, both within and without the university.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. In the Department, faculty member are expected to dissemination knowledge within the discipline, producing high-quality products in geography, environmental studies, or an allied discipline.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. The Department adopted that description of the venue, the impact of the product, and the recognition by peers external to UAA.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following:

As a minimum requirement, faculty members must have published three tier-one products and a reasonable body of products drawn from tier-two that demonstrates the faculty member is actively engaged in research activities that serve the public interest. In addition, faculty members should be actively engaging in work that produces tier-three products. A faculty member's research agenda must show the promise of continuing achievement. Additionally, a portion of the refereed publications must be first-authored or derived from work originating directly from the faculty member's efforts. Peer-reviewed publications must be in well-respected disciplinary journals or published by well-respected publishers in the discipline.

Associate Professors with a workload more heavily weighted towards research than a standard 20% research appointment are expected to produce research products greater than those described above, dependent on their faculty workload. However, the department recognizes that faculty members with a heavily weighted research workload will be involved in the production of a substantial number of professional reports and requests for external funding. As a result, the number of tier-one products may be somewhat diminished. Notwithstanding this caveat, faculty members with a workload more heavily weighted towards research must publish more tier-one products than their colleagues with standard tri-partite appointments, somewhat proportional to their workload.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for promotion should – under the assumption of 20 % research -- demonstrate the following:

As a minimum requirement, faculty members must have published six tier-one products and a substantial body of tier-two products that demonstrate a significant engagement in research activities that serve the public interest. In addition, faculty members will be actively engaged in work that produces tier-three products. A faculty member's research agenda must show the promise of continuing achievement.

Professors with a workload more heavily weighted towards research than a standard 20% research appointment are expected to produce research products greater than those described above, dependent on their faculty workload. However, the department recognizes that faculty members with a heavily weighted research workload will be involved in the production of a substantial number of professional reports and requests for external funding. As a result, the proportional number of tier-one products may be somewhat diminished. Notwithstanding this caveat, faculty members with a workload more heavily weighted towards research *must* publish more tier-one products than their colleagues with standard tri-partite appointments, somewhat proportional to their workload.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. In addition, departmental endorsement must come from a current departmental faculty member.

Appendix G: Department of Geological Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

The Department of Geological Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty, used in conjunction with the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Procedures for Progression toward Tenure, Promotion, Tenure, and Periodic Review (CAS-FEP). The information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for review and by those responsible for assessing review files. It applies to the evaluation of tenure-track, tenured, and eligible non-tenure track term faculty from this department on UAA's main campus and community campuses. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' (BOR) Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (FEPP), and the UNAC Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). In the event of a conflict between the Department of Geological Sciences Faculty Review Guidelines or the CAS-FEP and the University of Alaska Anchorage FEPP or the CBA, the University of Alaska Anchorage FEPP, BOR Policy, and CBA will prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS

1.1 Terminal Degree

Tenure-track and tenured faculty in Geological Sciences must hold a doctoral degree (e.g., PhD, DPhil) in geology, geological sciences, or a closely related field. Non-tenure-track term faculty must hold a doctoral degree in geology, geological sciences, or a closely related field in order to be eligible for promotion. Non-tenure-track term instructors must hold a master's degree (e.g., MS, MSc) in geology, geological sciences, or a closely related field.

1.2 Workloads

In the specific guidelines that follow, it is presumed that the typical faculty appointment is 'tripartite' with teaching, research and service components; Sections III and IV of this document apply to tripartite faculty. Faculty with 'bipartite' appointments have two workload components, such as teaching and service components with no formal or contractual research component. Other allocations of a bipartite workload are possible. Sections III (a) and III (b) apply to bipartite faculty.

An example of a bipartite workload is (other combinations are possible):

4:0:1 appointment (80% teaching; 0% research; 20% service)

Examples of tripartite workloads are the following (other combinations are possible):

3:1:1 appointment (60% teaching; 20% research; 20% service)

2:2:1 appointment (40% teaching; 40% research; 20% service)

1:3:1 appointment (20% teaching; 60% research; 20% service)

1.3 Faculty Evaluation

The faculty evaluation process is described in the University of Alaska Anchorage FEPP (Section VI: Evaluation Process and Review Cycle) for all types of evaluation, including:

- Annual review;
- Comprehensive review for progress toward tenure;
- Tenure review;
- Promotion review; and
- Post-tenure review.

1.4 Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure

Mandatory tenure review timing is described in the University of Alaska Anchorage FEPP (Section V: Academic Rank, Appointment and Tenure).

1.5 Refereed Publications

Prior to publication, refereed manuscripts undergo a process of detailed review by independent experts in the field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes; a recommendation for immediate publication; or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book to which the manuscripts were submitted.

1.6 Editor Reviewed Publications

Editor-reviewed manuscripts are reviewed by one or more editors. Examples may include (but are not limited to) final reports, technical reports, and conference publications.

1.7 Non-Refereed Publications

These publications are not subjected to rigorous scientific review. Examples of non-refereed publications may include (but are not limited to) the following:

1. Research articles in non-refereed journals,
2. Technical reports,
3. Non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials,
4. Articles in popular magazines that serve to enhance public support for scientific research.

2.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The following guidelines were carefully developed and unanimously adopted by the full-time, tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Geological Sciences at UAA. The guidelines are intended for use in the evaluation of non-tenure-track, tenure-track, and tenured faculty in the Department of Geological Sciences at UAA. A major goal of these guidelines is to provide faculty members with departmental standards and expectations, and guide them to successful promotion, tenure, or post-tenure performance. This document is intended to help a faculty member identify potential problems during each review period, and to offer guidelines for improvement prior to submitting their file for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates who receive feedback suggesting the need for improvement in any areas during pre-tenure or pre-promotion reviews are encouraged to provide detailed evidence of progress in those areas during subsequent reviews. Another goal is to inform other reviewers (e.g., Dean, CAS Peer Review Committee, etc.) about the unique expectations of UAA's Department of Geological Sciences.

Evaluation of a faculty member's file in accordance with the University of Alaska Anchorage FEPP document will result in an assessment of the faculty member's performance in all relevant workload components for bipartite and tripartite faculty. Reviewers are encouraged to note any changes or improvements required for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and continued professional growth. Reviewers are encouraged to conclude with a recommendation for or against retention/tenure/promotion.

The following guidelines apply to each of the three workload components as indicated.

3.0 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

3.1 Overview

Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. In addition to the documents specified in the CAS Faculty Evaluation Procedures, a faculty member under review in the Department of Geological Sciences may also compile a teaching dossier that includes sample syllabi, homework, projects, quizzes, exams, and other relevant material for inclusion in the review file to establish a basis for evaluating course content and structure. Additional metrics to establish the effectiveness for success in teaching can include a faculty member's list of courses taught, list of graduate students, student evaluations, peer-evaluations of classroom teaching (see below), innovative techniques and pedagogies, curriculum development, and notable student successes. In addition, the department Director or another faculty member may observe faculty teaching for the purpose of direct peer evaluation of appropriate and effective teaching methodology, delivery, course content, or other relevant information. The peer observer will subsequently provide the faculty member with a written summary of these observations and any

recommendations for improvement. The faculty member should then include the peer reviewer's written summary in the review file (and their response, if any, to this review).

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (with tenure for tenure-track faculty, and without tenure for non-tenure-track faculty) requires evidence of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Candidates should provide such evidence in their self-evaluation of teaching in the files they submit for retention, promotion, tenure, and periodic (post-tenure) review.

IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports: Other data such as IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports in the form of the course numerical summary sheets may need to be included as part of a faculty member's teaching evaluations (as outlined in Section VI of the FEPP). However, caution must presently be exercised in using the student evaluations for a variety of reasons including the adequacy of: a) sample size; b) student response rates; and c) the IDEA course database. Given the adoption of the IDEA course assessment tool at UAA (since Fall 2007), statistical temporal comparisons involving the same faculty teaching the same course(s), different faculty teaching the same course(s), and comparisons of faculty teaching similar courses at other university campuses may not be wholly reliable.

Mentoring academic research: Mentoring research is defined as the teaching of academic research and is properly considered a teaching responsibility. Faculty in the Department of Geological Sciences should mentor and involve undergraduate and/or graduate students in their research. Faculty having research workloads should include any combination of undergraduate students and/or graduate students in their research programs to assist in the production of refereed publications. Metrics of successful mentoring (research) include a faculty member's students garnering competitive scholarships and fellowships; completing their degree; completing honors and graduate theses; publishing in peer-reviewed literature; delivering presentations at regional, national and international conferences; going on to advanced professional training; and attaining employment within their field. Mentoring research will be judged commensurate with a faculty's teaching workload.

3.2 Annual Reviews of Assistant Professors

Non-tenure-track term assistant professors are reviewed annually on their workload performance. Tenure-track faculty are also reviewed annually on their teaching workload performance and on their progress toward tenure. Evaluation of the teaching component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the CBA, the UAA FEPP, and the CAS-FEP.

Criteria for a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor are:

- 1) a command of the subject matter;
- 2) continuous growth in the subject field; and

- 3) maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of the student learning outcomes.

In addition to these general criteria, a sustained record of effectiveness will also include mentoring undergraduate and graduate research. Reviewers are encouraged to consider all the data in the review file in building a case for a recommendation for retention based on a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. Reviewers are also encouraged to clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before the next review, in the event that such steps are necessary.

3.3 Comprehensive Review of Tenure-track Assistant Professors (to demonstrate a sustained record of effectiveness)

Tenure-track assistant professors who undergo a comprehensive review must meet CAS requisites for teaching as defined in the CAS-FEP. Criteria for a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor are noted above and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

3.4 Review of Teaching for Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Assistant Professors who have teaching components in their workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Associate Professor (with or without tenure) should demonstrate a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon and that reviewers detect no significant concerns with teaching or research mentoring activities. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusion.

Criteria for a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching at the rank of Associate Professor are:

- 1) a command of the subject matter;
- 2) continuous growth in the subject field;
- 3) maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of the student learning outcomes;
- 4) involvement in instructional activities such as curriculum development, mentoring, technology innovation, or other high-impact teaching practices; and
- 5) increasing involvement in review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

3.5 Review of Teaching for Promotion to Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Associate Professors who have teaching components in their workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Professor (with or without tenure) must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching.

Criteria for a sustained record of excellence in teaching at the rank of Associate Professor are:

- 1) a command of the subject matter;
- 2) continuous growth in the subject field;
- 3) maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of the student learning outcomes;
- 4) leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technology innovation, or other high-impact teaching practices; and
- 5) leadership in the definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is one of the highest academic ranks the University can bestow, so additional material which may lend support to a sustained record of excellence should be included in the file. Such additional material may include (but should not be limited to): official recognition by teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty and students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring research by graduate and undergraduate students, and/or other professional recognition of teaching.

4.0 EVALUATION OF SERVICE

4.1 Overview

Evaluation of the service component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the CBA, the UAA FEPP, and the CAS-FEP. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the faculty for high-quality contributions to the institution and high-quality and significant contributions of service to the profession, craft, or academic field, with recognition by peers outside the institution. Reviewers are encouraged to clearly specify any problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before the next review, assuming concerns exist.

Service includes a combination of departmental, college, university, and professional activities, and all faculty members are expected to contribute service at the departmental, college, and university levels. Moreover, it is anticipated that Geological Sciences faculty will regularly attend and participate in Departmental meetings and committees, and consistent with the Bylaws, perform other duties that the Director periodically requests. Reviewers should note that professional service of faculty who serve as referees or as members of review committees for journals/books/grant proposals/research programs necessitates substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute or replace departmental or institutional service.

4.2 Annual Reviews of Assistant Professors

Non-tenure-track term assistant professors are reviewed annually on their workload performance. Tenure-track faculty are also reviewed annually on their service workload

performance and on their progress toward tenure. Assistant professors undergoing annual reviews are expected to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness in university, professional, and public service. Metrics for a developing record of effectiveness should include a continuing record of service to the Department's academic and professional development, and contributions to college and university committees. Other metrics for a developing record of effectiveness can include contributions to national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and activities related to the faculty member's profession/professional development.

4.3 Comprehensive Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors (to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness)

Tenure-track assistant professors undergoing comprehensive review are expected to demonstrate evidence of a developing record of effectiveness in university, professional, and public service. Metrics for a developing record of effectiveness should include a continuing record of service to the Department's academic and professional development, contributions to college and university committees. Other metrics of service with potential for success can include: contributions to the public and the profession, such as lectures for the public or schools; national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines; reviewing proposals for funding agencies; hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings; reviewing textbooks; and activities related to the faculty member's profession/professional development.

4.4 Review of Service for Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Assistant Professors who have service components in their workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Associate Professor (with or without tenure) are expected to demonstrate an increasing record of effectiveness in service. This record will be exemplified by evidence of an increasing involvement in selected areas of service that results in a positive impact or outcome. The minimum level of successful service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong and continuing commitment to departmental service as a consensus-builder and team-player in the Geological Sciences' academic and professional development. Other metrics of an increasing record of effectiveness in service can include guiding contributions to the department, college, university and to the faculty member's profession/professional development. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments for funding agencies, chaired sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and holding office in one's professional societies.

4.5 Review of Service for Promotion to Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Associate Professors who have service components in their workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Professor (with or without tenure) are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of effective leadership in service. The minimum level of service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership role in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities.

5.0 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

5.1 Overview

To assist reviewers in ascertaining the faculty member's academic research accomplishments during the review period, faculty are encouraged to include copies in their review files or links to all manuscripts that are in preparation, submission/review, in press/accepted for publication, or published. In assessing performance, primary emphasis will be placed on refereed manuscripts; editor-reviewed and non-refereed research products are considered to be a secondary level of research productivity and will not be acceptable as sole criteria for assessing the faculty member in the research component of the workload or to determine progression towards promotion and/or tenure.

The hallmark for demonstrating research success is obtaining external research support and peer-reviewed publication of one's research results. Therefore, faculty who have research workloads are expected to submit research proposals and obtain external funding and to publish in the peer-reviewed literature while at UAA. In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity.

Since research faculty (any faculty with a research component in the workload) are expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis, faculty may include evidence of these submissions in the review file. In reviewing funding activity, external competitive grant proposals that are funded will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, awards of experimental time, and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit.

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to promotion will be expected to generate and disseminate research products. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate high-quality and significant contributions to the profession that have the emerging recognition of peers outside the institution, in addition to demonstrating a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In cases where a faculty member undergoes changes in

workload distribution (e.g., changes from 3:1:1 to 2:2:1), research productivity should be judged on a pro-rated basis, taking into account the time allotted in each category of the annual workload agreements.

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. This productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success in obtaining external funding, publishing in peer reviewed journals, and maintaining an active research program that includes undergraduates and/or graduate students. Each discipline has established appropriate measures for meeting this high standard, keeping in mind that the rank of Professor is one of the highest ranks the University can award to faculty. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the CBA. Achieving promotion to the rank of Professor is not a hurdle; rather, it is another level of performance. The Department of Geological Sciences has crafted specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in research. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Research in the Department of Geological Sciences is expected to yield the following products:

- 1) Externally funded grants; and
- 2) Refereed publications and, optionally, non-refereed publications.

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to both of these categories, productivity must include obtaining external funding and publishing in refereed journals. Refereed publications in peer-reviewed journals are expected to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory or research space; such publications serve as a representation of the faculty member's ability to design, conduct, and mentor novel research at UAA.

Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the authorship standards associated with their particular disciplines.

The level of research productivity over a particular interval being reviewed for retention, tenure, and/or promotion will be defined primarily by the existence of external funding and the number and quality of publications (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.). The expected output will be dictated by the workload agreement assigned to the faculty member as well as the faculty member's rank. The projected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for retention, promotion and tenure.

5.2 Annual Reviews of Assistant Professors

Non-tenure-track term assistant professors are reviewed annually on their workload performance. Tenure-track faculty are also reviewed annually on their research workload

performance and on their progress toward tenure. Assistant professors undergoing annual reviews are expected to have begun the process to generate and disseminate research products. At this level, they must show evidence of achievement or definite promise in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high quality and significance. Metrics for potential success will include proposals submitted and funded for external funding, manuscripts submitted or published, students (graduate or undergraduate) engaged in research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

5.3 Comprehensive Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors (to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness)

Tenure-track assistant professors who undergo a Comprehensive Review are expected to have demonstrated ability to generate and disseminate research products. At this level, they must show evidence of achievement or definite promise in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high quality and significance. To demonstrate the developing recognition of peers outside the institution in addition to a record of emerging professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in Research, a faculty member undergoing 4th Year Comprehensive Review on a workload of:

3:1:1 should have a record of one peer-reviewed publication per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. Additionally, there should be funded external grants to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

2:2:1 should have a record of two peer-reviewed publications per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. Additionally, there should be funded external grants to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

1:3:1 should have a record of three peer reviewed publications per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. Additionally, there should be funded external grants to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

Expectations for research productivity in the form of peer-reviewed publications may differ from those described above commensurate with the specific workload distributions and cumulative expectations outlined in annual workload agreements.

5.4 Review of Research for Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Assistant Professors who have research components in their

workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Associate Professor (with or without tenure) must demonstrate high-quality and significant contributions to the profession, with an emerging recognition of peers outside the institution, as well as a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in Research. The minimum research productivity required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for a faculty member on a workload of:

3:1:1 is a record of one peer reviewed publication per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. External research funding will have been obtained to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

2:2:1 is a record of two peer-reviewed publications per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. External research funding will have been obtained to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

1:3:1 is a record of three peer-reviewed publications per year derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory. External research funding will have been obtained to support the research. In addition to publications and grants, it is encouraged that undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

Expectations for research productivity in the form of peer-reviewed publications may differ from those described above commensurate with the specific workload distributions and cumulative expectations outlined in annual workload agreements.

5.5 Review of Research for Promotion to Professor

Tenure-track and non-tenure track Associate Professors who have research components in their workload agreements and who are standing for promotion to Professor (with or without tenure) need to demonstrate a sustained and extensive record of the generation and dissemination of high-quality and significant research products. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate that they have gained the recognition of professional peers outside of the institution in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Geological Sciences. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA, recognizing what level of research support has been developed within a particular researcher's lab, Department, and College. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only. The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of external funding and rate of peer reviewed publication as outlined by their workload category in order to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The rank of Professor is an indication of the stature of the scientist among their peers, so evaluation by researchers external to UAA must be sought, where reviewers should weigh both the number and quality (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.) of refereed publications produced, plus external research funding received, and/or other support awarded over the individual's career to determine whether promotion to Professor is warranted. This is very much a professional judgment issue, best left to peers for determination since quality of research can really only be judged by others in the field.

6.0 CRITERIA FOR EMIRITUS /EMIRITA STATUS

The Geology Department has not defined special standards for Professor Emeritus/Emerita in Geological Sciences.

Appendix H: Department of History Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of History in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of History.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is Doctoral level degree in the discipline of History.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. The Department has not yet defined its standards for marked strengths in teaching, service or research/creative activity.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: History, Languages and Philosophy.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The department recognizes that these guidelines represent just the beginning of its responsibility to mentor department faculty over the course of their careers. They also guide reviewers outside the department so they may make appropriate evaluations of department faculty performance. These represent general guidelines only and cannot cover all situations or eventualities. Each individual faculty member undergoing review will present a unique record of accomplishment and specialization. In particular, these guidelines are no substitute for an authoritative review of individual faculty members' performance as demonstrated in review files prepared by them for appropriate levels of review.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

Teaching and mentoring students is the *raison d'être* of the university. No faculty activity has a greater impact on the lives of our students and community than this. Teaching is more than time spent in class with students; it encompasses a range of activities including, but not limited to, mentoring, promoting student excellence, curriculum and resource development, and the improvement of pedagogy. Through these activities department faculty create and maintain an instructional environment which promotes learning and the attainment of department and university Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). The department encourages faculty to engage in development opportunities to broaden and deepen their command of the field and their pedagogy to improve teaching.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of "effectiveness in teaching" for the Department includes effectiveness in mentoring and promoting student excellence, curriculum and resource development, the improvement of pedagogy or other activities promoting attainment of SLO's.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

The life of the university cannot be sustained without the ongoing involvement of faculty in service activities at the department and university level. Additionally, activities beyond the university enhance the scholarly, professional and local communities of which they are a part. The border between service and other activities is permeable, however. Curriculum and resource development, assessment of SLO's, etc. enhance teaching and also provide useful service to departments and the university. Service to the scholarly or professional community may involve the generation of research product or enhance teaching. The multivalent nature of service activities should be recognized and appreciated by reviewers.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

The pursuit of research keeps our faculty engaged with the wider scholarly community through publications and presentations, enriches teaching by bringing scholarship into the classroom, and informs our service activities. In order to fulfill the research component of their workload, department faculty with research in their workloads must demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality scholarship manifested through various products and outcomes.

Reviewers must note research is a time consuming and solitary pursuit for historians, frequently taking them far away to locate materials which may be difficult to access, often in foreign languages. These must be synthesized and assembled into the various forms listed above, also taking time and done alone. Finding and acquiring materials often depends on securing funds from outside organizations. Assimilating and shaping them into products and finding a place for them in appropriate, highly competitive venues (conferences, journals, publishers) requires time, both prior to publication - to write, to secure publishers, to review the work and make revisions - as well as after - for critical reviews and assessment of the work to become available. At best this process takes years (even without issues on the publisher's end) and, especially in the case of collaborative work, is subject to long delays. The department expects faculty to be engaged scholar-teachers, fulfilling their obligations for a considerable teaching load (generally three/three with 25 to 45 students per class) as well as shouldering significant service responsibilities. To pursue research agendas in addition to this, with only occasional opportunities for sabbatical leave or course releases, requires heavy investment of time, energy and effort as Teaching and Service Activities allow.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The consensus within our discipline is that these criteria are met when faculty with research in their workloads engage in ongoing efforts to conduct and disseminate their research among their fellow historians, students, and the general public. This engagement covers a wide and diverse spectrum of products such as: books; or articles in peer reviewed journals (print or electronic); or chapters contributed to edited volumes; or co-authored or edited books or collections; or works in translation; conference papers presented internationally, nationally, regionally or locally; or public presentations. The ability to secure funding for such projects, post on academic websites, edit a journal, or prepare a museum exhibit also indicate the successful pursuit of a research agenda.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. In History, the value of the faculty member's expertise or product must be recognized by their peers within the field beyond the University. The consensus within our discipline is that such recognition can be demonstrated by, among other things, the appearance of favorable comment or reviews, nominations for awards or winning awards for one's scholarship, invitations to engage in collaborative work, invitations to review or edit the works of others, invitations to have one's works translated into another language, invitations to present one's work at conferences, workshops, public lectures, nomination for or serving in office in professional organizations, receipt of major funding for the pursuit of research, or the solicitation of the faculty member's views or observations, either for fellow scholars or the broader public, based on their expertise.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following: In order to stand for promotion and tenure the faculty member must demonstrate a record of scholarly accomplishment through the generation of research products. Such products include the submission or acceptance for publication of an individually written book manuscript based on original research; a full length co-authored book based on individual research; the acceptance for publication of two articles in peer reviewed journals or a similar number of book chapters (or combination thereof); editorship of a collection of essays or a significant annotated collection of documents. This list constitutes a general framework and the product of each individual faculty will vary in terms of the quality of various publishers or the impact of particular scholarship which should be addressed in the review materials. These may be supplemented by additional products such as completion for publication of book or article manuscripts, appearance of scholarship in translation, placement of substantive works on academic websites, editing a journal, the preparation of a museum exhibit, the receipt of significant outside funding to pursue research, and presentation of such research as papers at major conferences. These together demonstrate consistent high-quality scholarship contributing significantly to the university and gaining for the individual faculty member recognition by the scholarly community as outlined above.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following: continued and sustained production of scholarly products and recognition of those products or the faculty member's scholarship by the wider professional community. Such products should extend beyond the body of work submitted during the promotion and tenure review and show progress towards completion of a second book manuscript or corpus of work through publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in edited volumes, presentation of new research at professional conferences, and application for and awards of competitive research grants.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to

support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. Although faculty are encouraged to seek external funding for projects, the Department recognizes the dwindling resources available to faculty in the Humanities. It applauds those who seek and obtain research grants but recognizes the contingent factors which mean many worthwhile projects do not gain funding due to a lack of resources. It further recognizes that funds secure are highly unlikely to result in any significant indirect expense return for the university.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix I:
Department of Journalism and Communication
Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Department of Journalism and Communication, in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), has adopted the following guidelines for evaluating faculty for progression toward promotion, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. This document was prepared by the faculty of Journalism and Communication in January 2018 and revised again in March 2018. Its purpose is to:

1. To explain the expectations for progression toward promotion, promotion tenure, and post-tenure review to new hires.
2. To help faculty make progress to tenure and promotion.
3. To provide clear guidelines for candidates who are submitting a file.
4. To assist reviewers in making fair and appropriate judgments about candidates in Journalism and Communication.

These discipline-specific guidelines are in accord with the University of Alaska Anchorage University-wide Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs) and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs). The following document is designed to provide guidance to all faculty in Journalism and Communication. Nothing in this document shall be construed as removing or modifying the guarantees provided by the above-mentioned documents or the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the faculty unions and the UAA administration concerning tenure and promotion. Moreover, this document should not be taken to be exhaustive in describing ways that faculty can meet university standards for promotion, tenure and progression toward tenure. Because of the diversity inherent in the fields of journalism and communication, the possibility exists that the candidate's academic research/creative activity, teaching and service will not fall within the range of the suggested criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify the unique circumstances and the complexities of their particular workloads when appropriate.

2.0 OUR MISSION

The Department of Journalism and Communication prepares students for professional careers and graduate study while conveying an understanding and appreciation of the vital role that free expression and mass communications play in a global society. Through teaching, research, creative activities, and community engagement, we enrich our community and our profession. As noted in the CAS FEGs, the review process must emphasize the quality and significance of faculty creative activity and scholarship and not necessarily the quantity of work done. Therefore, throughout the review process, university and professional peers should assess the candidate on the discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation, and interpretation of knowledge. Faculty in this unit emphasize the teaching of professional skills.

As a scholarly professional program, Journalism and Communication finds that professional achievement of faculty members in their specific communication areas (journalism, strategic communications, telecommunications and film, digital media, graphic and web design, etc.) is indispensable for the proper education of students, the health of the program, and its acceptance by various constituencies. Because of the professional nature of the program, evidence of faculty achievement includes, but is expanded beyond, the traditional research criteria to include creative activity and professional achievement. The three primary missions of the University and Department are teaching, research/creative activity, and service. In any promotion review, consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. This Department is committed to excellence in all three areas, but we recognize that equal excellence in each of them in individual cases is rare.

The UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) guidelines call for indications of **“marked strength”** in teaching, research, or service. The Department interprets “marked strength” to indicate achievements in teaching, research or service exceeding those required for a given rank. Marked strength in teaching may be demonstrated by exemplary performance in the classroom, significant enhancements to curricular offerings of the department, or notable recognition of or accomplishments by students. Marked strength in research may be demonstrated by exceeding required standards in research or publication or in recognition of research or publication. Marked strength in service may be demonstrated by exceeding standards in service to the department, the university and the public.

3.0 APPOINTMENT CRITERIA

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty in the Department of Journalism and Communication for the review of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. The guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located.

The Department of Journalism and Communication must attract and retain faculty members who are accomplished practitioners. All prospective faculty members should have significant professional experience. As an academic unit within a university, we also want to attract and retain faculty members who are accomplished scholars. Our criteria for hiring and successful promotion and tenure in the case of tenure-track faculty must accommodate the diversity of individuals needed in our program. We shall seek candidates who have a doctoral degree in journalism, communications, or fields noted in the appointment criteria. A master’s degree or J.D. will be accepted in lieu of a doctorate if the candidate has seven years or more professional experience that closely parallels classroom instruction and includes substantial accomplishments (holding of significant professional media positions, national distribution of materials produced, national awards for professional media work, etc.). Exceptions to the

requirement of the terminal degree for appointments to professorial ranks may be made for individuals whose experience and accomplishments compensate for, or make irrelevant, the lack of a terminal degree. A request for an exception is subject to approval by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Provost following receipt of supporting documentation and the recommendation of the dean.

3.1 CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The rank of assistant professor is the primary entry-level position for employment as a tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty member in Journalism and Communication. Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold the appropriate professional or terminal degree in the discipline. In Journalism and Communication, the terminal degree is normally the doctoral degree. However, the Department makes exceptions for candidates with a master's degree (or a J.D.) with seven or more years of professional experience that closely parallels what is done in the classroom and includes substantial accomplishments that are relevant for the Department's mission. The candidate must also show evidence of sustained professional growth and contributions of high-quality and significance to the profession and the University.

The possible types of master's degrees or doctorates that a candidate can hold in order to successfully be appointed to the faculty of the Department of Journalism and Communication are varied, just as the field is varied. Below is a list, though it is not exhaustive. Closely related disciplines may also qualify. The Department also recognizes that these terms vary by country.

Doctorates (e.g., Ph.D., D. Phil, etc.)

- Communication/Communications
- Journalism
- Public Policy
- Political Science
- Sociology
- Anthropology
- Rhetoric
- Public Relations
- Information/Library Sciences
- Marketing

J.D. or Master's degrees with seven or more years of professional experience with substantial accomplishments that are related to the Department's mission

- J.D. or equivalent legal doctorate
- M.A., Communication/Communications
- M.S., Communication/Communications
- M.A., Journalism
- M.S., Journalism

- M.B.A.
- M.F.A., Nonfiction/Graphic Design

3.2 CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The rank of associate professor is the mid-career faculty rank at the University. 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 and professional 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 the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution. Tenure-track faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure.

3.3 CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR

The rank of professor is the highest rank at the University. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor must hold a terminal degree in the discipline or have been granted an exception in lieu of the terminal degree by demonstrating they earned a master's degree (or J.D.) and have seven or more years of professional experience that closely parallels what is done in the classroom and includes substantial accomplishments that are related to the Department's mission. They 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 the unit. Candidates must have gained recognition in their professional, craft, or academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution 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 a range of professional service activities; 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. This will usually be in the area of their primary responsibility, or through their integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components. A candidate's area of marked strength is one that draws on his or her talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution.

3.4 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 or University Professor is considered to be a rare and special achievement. Candidates to be considered for award of the title 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. The Department may take a role in this designation by initiating the recommendation through a formal request prepared and endorsed by one or more faculty members other than the faculty member proposed for the designation; and by reviewing a recommendation submitted by other faculty members. Departmental expectations for recommendation of a faculty member for this designation entail outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and service beyond those required for promotion to professor.

3.5 PROFESSOR EMERITUS/EMERITA

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. This honor is not an automatic recognition of services rendered. Candidates for Emeritus appointment must be full-time faculty members who have attained the rank of professor and who have retired after a minimum of 10 years at the University of Alaska immediately prior to retirement. Consultation with the Department is required prior to submission of an emeritus nomination. Following the consideration and recommendation of the faculty review process, the Chancellor, or president, or Board of Regents will confer the honor. The Department can recommend this status be awarded to outstanding retirees and to assist them as much as possible in preparing the file required for applying for this status. The chair or a designated faculty member in the Department has chief responsibility for making such recommendations and, with aid from administrative staff and faculty colleagues, providing such assistance to outstanding retiring faculty members who have been recommended.

4.0 PROMOTION CRITERIA

Because the Department of Journalism and Communication encompasses many fields and the faculty of the Department have wide professional backgrounds, this document should not be taken to be exhaustive in describing the ways that faculty can meet university standards for promotion, tenure, and progression toward tenure. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make the best case in building his or her promotion file. Evidence of the effectiveness in each area below — teaching, service, and research/creative activity—includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. In joint endeavors, the extent to which each person contributes should be identified.

4.1 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Teaching students to think, write, make ethical judgments, and do the kinds of work that professional practitioners in our disciplines conduct is essential to our program. We also seek to develop in students the desire and skills necessary to continue learning. Teaching occurs in and beyond the classroom. We recognize contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarship and professional experience. Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following aspects.

4.1.1 Instruction and Learning Experiences

Teaching students in courses, laboratories, field experiences, clinics, studio classes, or in web-based environments; teaching participants in workshops, retreats, seminars; managing a course [student assessment, student records, learning experiences]; applying effective instructional design strategies to teaching and learning; providing capstone, honors, service learning, or community-engaged learning opportunities and other high-impact teaching practices; incorporating active learning and/or research experiences in the curriculum.

4.1.2 Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources

Developing and revising outcomes-based curriculum and assessment; shaping teaching materials, manuals, software; designing and implementing new or varied delivery modes, including web-based and new media technologies; constructing resources to support distributed education and independent learning; selecting, organizing, and providing access to information resources in support of learning goals.

4.1.3 Mentoring Students

Advising students for academic success and career planning; providing opportunities and supporting students' research and scholarship; providing one-to-one instruction or tutoring; guiding capstone, service learning, and independent study opportunities; and supervising research assistants and teaching assistants.

4.1.4 Advancing Teaching Excellence

Mentoring colleagues and observing their teaching; reviewing current literature and national standards in subject areas; planning and contributing to professional development activities related to teaching; shaping and improving assessment methods; consulting with colleagues on the selection and use of instructional tools, resources, and materials; conducting instructional and classroom inquiry; implementing ideas from professional development activities; using student feedback and self-reflection to enhance or change instructional practices.

4.1.5 Advancing Student Excellence

Writing letters of recommendation or nominating students for scholarships and awards; supporting students' accomplishments, such as Student Showcase, Undergraduate Research

Grants, or presentations at professional conferences; and serving as chair of graduate or undergraduate theses, and graduate or honors or capstone project committees.

4.1.6 Progression toward Promotion to Associate Professor

An assistant professor is expected to have evidence of achievement or a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. He or she should demonstrate professional growth and promise for continued growth in the field of teaching. A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of

- command of subject matter,
- continuous growth in subject area, and
- development of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes,
- increasing responsibility in mentoring and advising students,
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in teaching.

The IDEA student evaluations currently in place cannot or should not be the sole evidence provided in the file.

4.1.7 Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for promotion to associate professor is expected to have evidence of achievement or a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. He or she should demonstrate professional growth and continued growth in the field of teaching. Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of

- command of subject matter
- continuous growth in subject area
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes
- involvement in instructional activities (such as curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices),
- increasing involvement in review and assessment of student learning outcomes,
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in teaching.

4.1.8 Promotion to Professor

A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor requires an extensive record of excellence and sustained professional growth in teaching, with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in teaching beyond the accepted level for the rank of associate professor. Reviewers should recall that the rank of professor is the highest academic rank the university can bestow. Sustained record of excellence demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence of

- command of subject matter,
- continuous growth in subject area,
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes,

- leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices,
- leadership in definition, review, and assessment of student learning outcomes,
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in teaching.

4.2 EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY/PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Inquiry and knowledge dissemination are central functions of the University. Faculty members are to engage with new ideas, to develop new interpretations of established theories and ideas, and to participate in the application of new ideas. Consequently, faculty should conduct research or engage in creative activities appropriate to a journalism and communication program and they should disseminate their work through channels appropriate to their areas of expertise. When considering candidates for promotion in the Department, the research/creative activity component of the standard may be met through academic research, creative activity, professional achievement, or preferably a blend that includes impressive achievements in one area as well as credible work in the other. While it is customary for most university faculty members to publish in refereed research publications, the Department of Journalism and Communication accords equal value to professional or creative activity within our disciplinary domains.

The UAA FEPPs define scholarship as “characterized by creative intellectual work reflective of a high level of professional expertise. It is communicated so that others may benefit from it, and peers reflectively critique and evaluate it. It also supports the fulfillment of the mission of the University.” J&C intends for its faculty’s academic research and creative activity to advance the mission of the University. The unit embraces an expanded definition of what constitutes academic research and creative activity, including discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation. Research and creative activity contribute to the generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline, craft or professional field as defined by the respective scholarly community. We emphasize that faculty members be encouraged to work in collaborative, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary ways to extend the benefit of creative intellectual work.

4.2.1 Conducting and Disseminating Academic Research

- Conducting basic and applied research and inquiry; community-engaged or participatory action research that appears in books, book chapters, reviews, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals, discipline-specific publications (i.e. law reviews), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, and research notes.
- Editing books, book chapters, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals and conference proceedings, manuscripts, and research notes.
- Serving as a member of an editorial board reviewing publications.

- Funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
- Writing translations, abstracts and reviews.
- Involving undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research.
- Presenting research efforts at refereed national conferences.
- Presenting research before technical and professional meetings.
- Serving as an elected or appointed officer on committees of professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer review as related to research and other creative activities.
- Receiving honors or awards for scholarship and creative activity.
- Earning grants and contracts, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering grants and contracts.
- Applying research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, or educational institutions.

4.2.2 Producing, Editing and/or Managing Creative Works

- Publishing original reporting projects in news media organizations consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high levels of professionalism.
- Producing audio, video, and film projects consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high levels of professionalism.
- Producing creative works in advertising, public relations and/or strategic communications materials consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high levels of professionalism.
- Producing multimedia graphics, photojournalism, photography, or electronic communication, including computer-based communications, consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high levels of professionalism.
- Publishing in journalism and mass communication reviews and other publications of analyses and critical reviews on professional topics.
- Producing other original works that demonstrably advance the state of the art or otherwise exhibit a high level of achievement and garner significant peer recognition.
- Presenting on professional topics at national and international symposia and conferences that demonstrate high standards of professionalism.
- Securing funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.

4.2.3 Engaging in Professional Achievement

- Participating in juries or review panels judging journalistic work.
- Other evidence of impact on society of research scholarship and creative accomplishment.
- Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms, citation index analysis).
- Transferring or adapting technology transferred or adapted in the field.

- Participating in seminars and workshops (include short descriptions of activity, with titles, dates and sponsor); indication of role in seminar or workshops (e.g. leader, participant).
- Engaging in outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (e.g. consultant, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journal, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions).
- Developing new computer software, video or multimedia programs.

4.2.4 Developing and Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations

- Developing and disseminating creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including publication or presentation at professional meetings
- Developing software and other technologies that advance student learning
- Writing grant proposals for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques • Participating in the supervision of student research or independent study, capstone projects, and the mentoring of students that leads to the presentation of academic research and other creative works.

4.2.5 Developing and Disseminating Innovations in Clinical and Craft Practice

- Developing and disseminating novel or creative approaches in clinical or craft practices, including publication or presentation at professional meetings
- Developing, producing, and disseminating tools, technologies, or methods that enhance clinical or craft practice.

4.2.6 Leading and Managing Funded Research Projects, Contracts and Creative Projects

- Leading research projects or contracts, including multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative projects task forces.
- Writing proposals to funding agencies (private, public, and internal).
- Managing budgets of grants and contracts.
- Selecting and supervising staff.
- Preparing required reports.

4.2.7 Progression toward Promotion to Associate Professor

Generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by:

- products, artifacts, creative works consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high standards of professionalism; and • evidence of a scholarly research agenda; and
- emerging participation in the daily intellectual life and activities of the University.

4.2.8 Progression toward Promotion to Associate Professor

Generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by:

- products, artifacts, creative works consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high standards of professionalism; and

- evidence of emerging recognition by academic and professional peers either as scholars or professionals who have made an impact on their field; and
- sustained and significant production; and
- full participation in the daily intellectual life and activities of the University, and
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in research/creative activity.

4.2.9 Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for promotion to associate professor is expected to have evidence of achievement or a sustained record of effectiveness in research, creative activity and/or professional achievement. He or she should demonstrate professional growth and continued growth in research and/or creative activity. Sustained record of effectiveness in research and/or creative activity may be demonstrated by evidence of

- products, artifacts, creative works consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high standards of professionalism; and
- evidence of emerging recognition by academic and professional peers either as scholars or professionals who have made an impact on their field; and
- sustained and significant production; and
- full participation in the daily intellectual life and activities of the University, and
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in research/creative activity.

4.2.10 Promotion to Professor

Extensive and sustained generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by:

- products, artifacts, creative works consistent with national and international standards that demonstrate high standards of professionalism; and
- recognition by professional peers external to the institution; and
- systematic and significant production;
- likelihood of maintaining stature conferred by professional peers external to the institution; and
- full participation in the daily intellectual life and activities of the University, and
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in research/creative activity.

4.3 EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Service to society refers to the function of applying academic and/or professional expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. The members of the Journalism and Communication faculty recognize the responsibility of service to the profession, to the campus, to the residents of Alaska, and to the regional and national journalism and mass communications organizations. Journalism and Communication faculty members define service as professional/media participation and leadership in campus, regional, and national academic organizations. The UAA FEPP states, "Public, professional and university service can generally be demonstrated through the following broad categories. However, service activities within these categories can take a number of forms beyond those listed below."

4.3.1 Public Service

Service to Society

Writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to specialized audiences; guiding technology transfer activities; collaborating or partnering with governments, education, health, cultural, or other public institutions; committing expertise to community agencies or civic groups; testifying before legislative or congressional committees; providing public policy analysis, program evaluation, technical briefings for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies; serving on public boards, task forces, or committees; developing and offering training or professional development workshops and other demonstrations or dissemination of professional methods or techniques.

Community-Engaged Service

As a form of public service to society, community-engaged service is distinguished by its focus on collaborative, jointly developed projects designed to apply concepts, processes, or techniques to community-identified issues, concerns, or problems, which result in community change and development. It should be noted here, however, that the nature of community-engaged practice is often integrative across the components of one's work in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service. Therefore, depending on the breadth, form, and focus of the work, a community-engaged service activity may combine with or result in scholarly outcomes or products that could additionally or alternatively be represented as an aspect of teaching, or within a category of academic research and creative activity.

4.3.2 Professional Service

Faculty members engaged in professional service use their academic training, professional expertise, and experience to serve the discipline or society, while contributing to the institutional mission. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty expertise and experience, leads to many different forms of professional service. In general, this kind of work uses a faculty member's academic, craft, or professional expertise; contributes to the discipline, craft, or professional field and/or the audience or clientele; and demonstrates a clear relationship between the service activities and the goals and mission of the department, college, campus, or University.

Service to the Discipline, Craft, or Professional Field

Writing peer reviews for discipline, craft, or professional publications and funding organizations; performing editorial assignments for discipline, craft, or professional publications; participating in academic, craft, or professional conferences as panel organizer and/or discussant; providing professional reviews or critiques of materials at the request of discipline, craft, or professional colleagues at other universities or institutions; serving as an officer, or in another leadership capacity, for local, state, or national discipline, craft, or professional organizations or associations.

4.3.3 University Service

University service includes service to the department, college, campus, or University. Faculty members engaged in university service contribute to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities, including:

Governance: Fulfilling administrative or other directed responsibilities at the department, college, campus or university level, such as department chair, academic program coordinator, or center director; contributing to department, college, campus or University policy development and governance activities; collaborating within and across campus communities on projects, initiatives, and other University-wide activities.

Academic and Faculty Development: Mentoring other faculty members; participating in faculty, administrator, or staff search committees; organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development activities; organizing, directing, and/or implementing academic development activities; and participating in academic program development and accreditation activities.

Student Success Support: Sponsoring student organizations; developing outreach activities and programs that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body; developing and maintaining services and programs that support student engagement with the curriculum; facilitating activities that integrate residential living and learning on campus, or engage nonresident students in campus activities.

4.3.4 Progression toward Promotion to Associate Professor

Service activities appropriate to discipline, mission and rank as exemplified by

- developing record of departmental, university, professional, and public service; and
- positive impact or outcome.

4.3.5. Promotion to Associate Professor

Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission and rank as exemplified by evidence of

- increasing involvement in selected areas of service; and
- positive impact or outcome, and
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in service.

4.3.6 Promotion to Professor

Effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of professional service activities as exemplified by evidence of

- leadership in selected areas of service
- positive impact or outcome; and
- contributions through their work to thoughtful discussion of topics of major concern in the Department and in the wider community, and
- multiple other illustrations of effectiveness in research/creative activity.

Appendix J: Department of Languages Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Languages in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Languages.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is Ph.D./D.Phil. in the specific language(s) or related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “marked strength” generally across the College. The Department interprets “marked strength” to indicate achievements in teaching, service, or research exceeding those required for a given rank. Marked strength in teaching may be demonstrated by exemplary performance in the classroom, significant enhancements to curricular offerings of the department, or notable recognition of or accomplishments by students. Marked strength in service may be demonstrated by exceptional and effective leadership in departmental, college, and University affairs and the community. Marked strength in research may be demonstrated by exceeding required standards in research or publication or in recognition of research or publication.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Languages, English, History, and/or Philosophy.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

All bipartite and tripartite faculty are required to show evidence of effective teaching in their files. Excellence and a sustained effectiveness with depth and scope in teaching underline the Department of Languages' mission. Foreign language proficiency requires faculty to work closely with students. The Department of Languages' faculty strive to guide and motivate students by constantly improving their own methods of teaching and by maintaining scholarship, enhancing their knowledge, and contributing to the department's teaching mission, and/or the pedagogy of the academic discipline as a whole. The Department recognizes demonstrated evidence of student success within and beyond UAA (e.g. intellectual progress and professional development).

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration and encourages faculty to provide sufficient data on which to evaluate their effectiveness in teaching.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. In addition, faculty are encouraged to discuss their efforts and achievements in their self-evaluation. However, it is expected that each file provides sufficient documentation that supports the candidate's own view of his/her teaching. Such documentation will yield a more complete portrayal of the faculty's contributions to teaching. Faculty are required to include all institutionally-endorsed student evaluations and representative syllabi for the period under review in their files. However, additional evaluation of the teaching performance may take

many different forms. The following document provides a list of activities by which faculty members may demonstrate “excellence in teaching”:

- evidence that the faculty member’s instructional methods support the students’ achievement of the Student Learning Outcomes for each course;
- evidence that the faculty member promotes and maintains a diverse and inclusive learning environment which displays appreciation for an international and intercultural world and heightens the awareness of the need for cross-cultural understanding;
- evidence of effective teaching in helping students enhance and expand content development in foreign languages, also called the 5 C’s of foreign language education (Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities);
- evidence of effective mentoring and advising of students that leads to notable academic student success or achievement (e.g. national and international scholarship awards, honors, undergraduate student research, acceptance to graduate schools, continuation with advanced studies, and publications);
- description of writing intensive courses/methods that effectively enhance students’ critical and analytical skills;
- peer evaluation of instruction;
- supplemental course evaluation procedures tailored by the faculty member;
- development of curriculum and assessment, new course preparations, major course revisions, and independent/directed studies;
- development of innovative teaching materials and effective pedagogical methods
- directing undergraduate theses or serving as reader for undergraduate theses across the academy (intra-institutionally or extra-institutionally);
- evidence demonstrating the creation of student interest and involvement by being a faculty advisor to student organizations such as language clubs and language tables;
- organizing and leading extracurricular cultural and scholastic events and coordinating program activities that enhance student learning and contribute to the development of the program;
- evidence of successful student outcomes in the implementation of service learning;
- awards and recognitions for teaching-related activities and citations for excellence in teaching; or
- evidence of contributions to teaching effectiveness and improvement of pedagogical methods that are achieved during a sabbatical leave.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member’s workload.

All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

While faculty members are expected to demonstrate an increased involvement in service activities, the Department of Languages advises its faculty, especially those with a research component, to choose the amount and nature of service activities judiciously.

The following is a list of valued service activities. The list, however, is not exhaustive:

Departmental Level:

- chairing the Department of Languages;
- coordinating Language programs within the Department;
- chairing the Department of Languages Curriculum Committee;
- coordinating the Outcomes Assessment Committee;
- serving on a faculty hiring committee;
- serving on an *ad hoc* departmental committee (e.g. scholarship committee); or
- mentorship of other faculty (in the department).

University and College Level:

- directorship of institutes (e.g. Confucius Institute, Japan Center etc.);
- chairing or co-chairing of Faculty Senate committees;
- chairing or co-chairing a CAS committee;
- participating in faculty governance (e.g. being a member of the Faculty Senate);
- serving on CAS committees appointed by the Dean (e.g. peer-review committees);
- participating in faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
- serving on Student Award Selection committees (e.g. Undergraduate Research and Scholarship, Student Club Council and Leadership, Office of the Dean of Students etc.);
- mentoring other faculty (outside the department);
- contributing to technology-related projects (e.g. e-portfolio);
- delivering university-wide lectures; UAA bookstore presentations; or
- giving guest lectures in classes across the University.

Professional Level:

- serving as an officer in a professional or scholarly organization;
- editing a professional publication;
- organizing interdisciplinary conferences, colloquia, and workshops;
- attending professional workshops at UAA or outside;
- maintaining an active membership in professional societies;

- evaluating manuscripts for publishers and journals; or
- acting as an evaluator/judge on nationwide scholarship committees.

Community Level:

- organizing activities for the pupils and teachers of the Anchorage School District;
- acting as a liaison between a language program in the Department and the Anchorage School District;
- leading or being part of conversational language tables that are open to the community;
- invited or elected service on a local, state, and/or national organization in recognition of the faculty member's professional/disciplinary standing (e.g. linguistic and cultural consultant to a community organization).

Service that is particularly valued includes also:

- participation in accreditation activities;
- participation in advancement and resource development activities;
- professional service that brings prestige to UAA; or
- public service that brings prestige to UAA.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Faculty with a tripartite contract are expected to engage in research and disseminate their work in the form of papers presented at national or international conferences and peer-reviewed

publications in print or digital format. Peer-reviewed publications may include articles, monographs, books, book reviews, essays in edited collections or conference proceedings, entries in encyclopedias or other reference works. Publications may be in the language of the faculty's choice. Additionally, the department recognizes scholarly work done as editor of a peer-reviewed journal or a book.

The department recognizes that revised and expanded versions of conference papers are often published as articles either in conference proceedings or peer-reviewed journals, and the department values the topicality of research associated with conference presentations and peer-reviewed articles. The importance of sustained research that leads to publication of monographs and books is also duly recognized.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The department describes those standards in the following sections.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration on the quality and significance of disseminated products is described below. The following is offered as a guide:

Faculty are required to document evidence of research productivity in their files submitted for evaluation. The Department of Languages has developed the following criteria for evaluation of research and scholarship for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Points will be assigned for research work as follows:

- | | |
|---|----|
| • an academic book or a textbook published by a reputable academic press | 15 |
| • an edited book published by a reputable academic press | 12 |
| • editing a journal for a minimum of one year | 8 |
| • a peer-reviewed article published in a national or international academic journal | 5 |
| • a chapter published in an edited book | 5 |
| • an essay published in a collection or conference proceedings | 3 |
| • a paper presented at a national or international conference | 2 |
| • an entry in a reference work or encyclopedia | 2 |
| • a book review published in a national or international academic journal | 1 |

While the list is not exhaustive, it includes the most common forms of disseminating scholarly work.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20 % research -- demonstrate the following:

- A minimum of 25 points are required for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- A minimum of an academic book, textbook, or three peer-reviewed articles (15 points), and a minimum of two papers presented at national or international conferences (4 points) are required.
- The remainder (6 points) may be obtained from any combination of research products in the eight categories listed above.

3.3.3.2 Benchmark for promotion to Professor

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following:

- A minimum of 27 points are required for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- A minimum of an academic book, textbook, or three peer-reviewed articles (15 points), and a minimum of three papers presented at national or international conferences (6 points) are required.
- The remainder (6 points) may be obtained from any combination of research products in the eight categories listed above.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration. The chair or a designated faculty member in languages has chief responsibility for making such recommendations with aid from faculty colleagues. Departmental expectations for recommendation of a faculty member for this designation entail outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and service beyond those required for promotion to professor.

Appendix K: Department of Mathematics & Statistics Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Mathematics & Statistics.

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

Tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is a Ph.D. or DPhil in Mathematics, Statistics, Applied Mathematics, Applied Statistics, or Biostatistics, or a Ph.D. in Mathematics Education with a significant number of graduate-level courses in mathematics. A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity. The Department has not yet defined the standards for marked strengths in teaching, service or service.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a single-department committee.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

Teaching is the art and science of sharing knowledge or skills and creating a setting that leads to student learning and the creation of student knowledge. Teaching may occur in a formal setting, such as in direct instruction of regular courses, special topics courses, and other special major courses (e.g., MATH 264 and MATH 496); or as “informal” activities, such as coaching students in regional and national mathematics competitions (e.g., the annual MAA Putnam exam). Teaching activities and teaching effectiveness must be addressed in the teaching performance review.

Although there is no precise formula for teaching activities and outcomes required for specific ranks, there is the expectation in the department that faculty members at higher ranks, or aspiring to higher ranks, will demonstrate leadership in program-level curriculum development or revisions, provide consistent contributions to student learning in established courses, and engage in mentoring and advising students. We refer to the CAS FEG for further details on items to be considered as evidence for teaching performance.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member’s workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public,

professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Each tripartite faculty member at UAA is expected to engage in academic research. 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. Academic research will be judged for importance, originality, and quality, with emphasis on high quality research rather than a heavy production rate of low quality research. The work must be presented in a public forum where its contribution can also be judged by peers external to UAA, the primary mode of which is through peer-reviewed publications in research journals.

The expectations outlined herein reflect national norms for faculty workloads in mathematics/statistics departments similar to ours. As indicated in two statements made by the American Mathematical Society (AMS)^{1,2}, the rate of publication amongst mathematics/statistics faculty at PhD-granting research institutions is one to two (or fewer) refereed papers per year.

1. The Culture of Research and Scholarship in Mathematics: Teaching Loads in Mathematics, AMS, 2011
<http://www.ams.org/profession/leaders/culture/CultureStatement11.pdf>
2. The Culture of Research and Scholarship in Mathematics: Rates of Publication, AMS, 2015 <http://www.ams.org/profession/leaders/culture/RatesofPublicationfinal.pdf>

Such faculty carry on average a teaching workload of approximately 9 credits per year, often have a lower service component than at UAA, and tend to be supported in their teaching mission by teaching assistants and/or graders. New tenure-track faculty in such departments frequently receive a significant reduction in teaching duties early in their appointment to help establish their research programs. Given that the standard tripartite workload in our

department includes 18 credits of teaching per year and a higher service component (20%), and given the high expectation for quality teaching at UAA, our research expectations are consistent with national norms and their emphasis on quality of research over quantity as reflected in the AMS statement.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The departmental standards are described below.

The practice of listing coauthors who have contributed little to a publication is uncommon in the mathematical sciences. Except in unusual circumstances, each coauthor will have made a significant contribution. Coauthors are often listed alphabetically in journals of the mathematical sciences if each coauthor has made an equal contribution. For purposes of clarification, the faculty member is encouraged to include a description of his or her contribution to any coauthored project.

Publications in interdisciplinary journals should be considered as equal to publications in mathematics or statistics journals, especially when the article concerns an application of mathematics or statistics. The term ‘interdisciplinary journal’ includes, but is not limited to, two classes of journals, namely (1) journals whose content primarily lies directly between two or more disciplines (e.g., Journal of Mathematical Physics, Journal of Mathematical Biology, etc.) and (2) journals whose content primarily lies in a discipline outside of mathematics/statistics (e.g., physics, chemistry, biology, engineering, computer science, economics, etc.).

Additional evidence of research performance that is valued highly includes:

- a. invitations to speak or present research in symposia, workshops, colloquia, special lectures, or other research conferences;
- b. writing or editing published books, book chapters, or monographs;
- c. receiving competitive research funding, grants, awards, or fellowships;
- d. presenting research in contributed talks or posters at professional conferences;
- e. developing ideas, methods and results associated with undergraduate student research.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration on the quality and significance of disseminated products is described below.

The impact of the candidate’s research may be demonstrated, for example, through citations of scholarly publications, e.g., MathSciNet, Science Citation Index (SCI), Google Scholar, etc.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- publish (i.e., having a paper accepted in a reputable, peer-reviewed journal) at a rate of approximately one paper every three years.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- publish (i.e., having a paper accepted in a reputable, peer-reviewed journal) at a rate of approximately one paper every three years.

It should be emphasized that this is an approximate goal. This rate may be modified on a case-by-case basis by the Peer Review Committee. In such a case, the Peer Review Committee should comment directly on why an adjustment to the rate is deemed necessary.

Considerations for adjustments may include the workload allocation to research, the particular field of mathematics, type, depth, or impact of research projects, and individual circumstances that may be raised by the candidate in the self-narrative. External reviewers should comment on the productivity of the faculty member, including the number, depth, and impact of the research projects and taking into account the faculty workload at UAA and the field of mathematics. The impact of the candidate's research may be demonstrated, for example, through citations of scholarly publications, e.g., MathSciNet, Science Citation Index (SCI), Google Scholar, etc.

As an illustration, an assistant professor with a 3:1:1 appointment coming up for promotion and tenure in the sixth year should have at least one paper accepted or published in a reputable peer-reviewed research journal. In addition, the faculty member should be able to provide evidence of continued scholarly production, which could include one or more additional papers in the review process, submission of a proposal for external funding, evidence of collaborative work, conference presentations, preparation of technical reports, etc.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to

support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix L: Department of Music Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Music in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Music.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is a doctoral-level degree in Music (e.g., PhD, DMA, DME, D Mus, EdD) or closely-related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an

appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

A marked strength in the Department is demonstrated by achievements that exceed those required for a given rank. These achievements should include evidence of recognition and leadership.

The Department provides the following benchmarks for its faculty who have designated a marked strength in teaching:

- For promotion to Associate Professor: evidence of a growing reputation as a leader and innovator that brings distinction to the department, College and University. (see 3.1.4 of the CAS FEGs for examples);
- For promotion to Professor: evidence of leadership and innovation through the use of highly-valued practices that is recognized by peers in the discipline, bringing distinction to the department, College and University. (see 3.1.4 of the CAS FEGs for examples).

The Department provides the following benchmarks for its faculty who have designated a marked strength in service:

- For promotion to Associate Professor: evidence of significant contributions that includes highly-valued service areas in either the departmental, College, University, public, or professional arenas. (see 3.2.3 of the CAS FEGs for examples);
- For promotion to Professor: evidence of leadership in a focused area of service that is recognized by peers in either the departmental, College, University, public, or professional arenas. (see 3.2.3 of the CAS FEGs for examples).

The Department provides the following benchmarks for its faculty who have designated a marked strength in research/creative activity:

- For promotion to Associate Professor: evidence of a strong focus in one tier or productivity across both tiers that brings distinction to the department, College and University (see 3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs for examples);
- For promotion to Professor: evidence of a high level of productivity that is recognized by peers in the discipline, bringing distinction to the department, College and University. (see 3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs for examples).

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Music, Fine Arts and Theatre/Dance.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department. It is important that faculty provide in their self-evaluation substantive evidence of their high-quality and significant accomplishments, including peer and student evaluations. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to:

- self-generated student surveys and peer evaluation of instruction;
- innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
- curriculum development and program planning activities;
- new course preparations or major course revisions;
- teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student academic achievements, (e.g. awards, publications, competitions, or other academic or professional recognition;

- teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student musical achievements
- (e.g. participation in additional master classes, participation in and/or winning musical competitions, or performing in ensembles or operatic roles outside of the University);
- discussion of the selection of texts and/or music for a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- discussion of grading in a course or a performance and the pedagogy behind it;
- awards and recognition received by the faculty member;
- involvement in student career-development (e.g. providing references or introductions);
- high-impact teaching practice (e.g. undergraduate student research, writing intensive courses, service learning, courses offering an international or intercultural perspective).

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the Department provides the following benchmarks for its faculty seeking promotion:

- For promotion to Associate Professor: evidence of a growing reputation as a leader and innovator that brings distinction to the department, college and university. (see 3.1.4 of the CAS FEGs for examples);
- For promotion to Professor: evidence of leadership and innovation through the use of highly-valued practices that is recognized by peers in the discipline, bringing distinction to the department, college and university. (see 3.1.4 of the CAS FEGs for examples).

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. Service in the Department can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to:

Departmental level

- chairing a Department committee;
- coordinating a Department program;
- serving on a hiring committee (both within the Department or for another department);
- serving as a member of a Department committee;
- serving on an ad hoc Departmental committee;
- chairing a faculty search committee;
- preparing student soloists or ensembles to perform at a University-wide function;
- departmental recruitment;
- student advising;
- service as a faculty advisor to a student club or organization within the Department;
- serving on a student recital jury or on an end-of-semester final examination jury for a division of the Department.

College level

- serving as Chair of the Department;
- serving on a college committee;
- chairing a college committee;
- participation or leadership roles in a reaccreditation process;
- mentoring a junior faculty from another department in the college;
- performing at a college function.

University Level

- serving on Faculty Senate or equivalent governance or curriculum review bodies;
- serving on United Academics Board, Grievance Committee or other UNAC appointments
- chairing or serving on a University-wide committee;
- performing at a University-wide function (e.g. commencement, freshman convocation, graduate hooding ceremony, etc.).

Professional Level

- organizing/facilitating conferences, colloquia, master classes and workshops;
- managing professional/organizational webspaces;
- evaluating manuscripts for publishers, journals or other professional materials;
- serving as a panel chair at a professional conference;
- serving as an officer or board member of a professional society;
- maintaining active membership in professional societies;
- adjudicating Solo and Ensemble festivals at both the district and state levels;
- adjudicating entries for All-State or All-Northwest ensembles;
- performing/giving master classes at public schools.

Public Level

- serving on a local, state, and/or national organization;
- organizing activities for the pupils and teachers of the Anchorage School District, or districts throughout the state;
- acting as liaison between the Department and the Anchorage School District;
- involvement in community events or panels that draw upon disciplinary expertise;
- service on a board or as an advisor to an external organization.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. In addition, the Department provides the following benchmarks for its faculty seeking promotion:

- For promotion to Associate Professor: evidence of significant contributions that includes highly-valued service areas in either the departmental, College, University, public, or professional arenas. (see 3.2.3 of the CAS FEGs for examples);
- For promotion to Professor: evidence of leadership in a focused area of service that is recognized by peers in either the departmental, College, University, public, or professional arenas. (see 3.2.3 of the CAS FEGs for examples).

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Most Department faculty are primarily trained in the evaluation and preparation of creative works that lead to performance, although some faculty engage in research and scholarly writing, or recording, composing, arranging, etc. Faculty involved in performances should address in their self-evaluation the importance of the activity, their contribution to it and its relationship to their professional development. It is important to note that opportunities for faculty may vary greatly depending on the instrument performed.

In evaluating research and creative activity, reviewers will want to consider the following:

- intent and scope of the work and the nature of the projected audience;
- critical responses to the work (e.g. judgments of recognized experts; judgments and opinions of peers; published reviews of the work; other types of public recognition);
- sphere of influence of the performance or publication;

- significance of the collaborating artist or professional musical organization;
- quality and stature of the performing venue or scholarly institution;
- financial support of the creative activity or scholarly work;
- role of the performer or scholar in the activity.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. Therefore, the Department would like reviewers to note that critical responses to research/creative activity take many forms beyond the traditional written review, and other forms of public recognition should be acknowledged. These may include impactful testimonies from peers, performers, audience members, funding agencies, collaborators, etc.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska.

The following list is given to provide a framework for evaluation. These professional activities are divided into two tiers with Tier I being the highest level of merit. Tier I activities are given more weight in decisions regarding promotion than ones in Tier II, however greater amounts of Tier II activity may be considered the equivalent to fewer Tier I contributions.

Though these guidelines are designed to give greater clarity in evaluating professional activity and its relative merit, faculty are encouraged to thoroughly document in their self-evaluation the significance of each accomplishment to assist reviewers in making an accurate assessment of the importance of the contribution.

TIER I PERFORMANCE

Instrumentalists:

- solo recital at a significant local venue or at the national or international level;
- featured soloist with a significant local ensemble or at the national or international level;
- section leader (i.e. principal player) with a significant local ensemble or at the national or international level;
- member of an established professional chamber ensemble.

Vocalists:

- major role in an opera with a significant local company or with a national or international company;
- solo recital at a significant local venue or at the national or international level;
- featured soloist with a significant local ensemble or at the national or international level.

Conductors:

- conducting a significant local ensemble or at the national or international level;
- preparing a significant local ensemble for performance or at the national or international level;
- music directing an opera or musical-theatre work with a significant local company or at the national or international level;
- appearing as a guest conductor with a significant local ensemble or at the national or international level.

Accompanists:

- accompanying a professional soloist or ensemble in a full-length program at a significant local venue or at the national or international level;
- serving as rehearsal pianist/coach for a professional soloist, ensemble or opera/musical-theatre company on an on-going basis at the local level.

Other:

- serving as artistic director of a festival or concert series with a significant local organization or at the national or international level;
- stage directing an opera or musical-theatre work with a significant local company or at the national or international level.

TIER I MUSICOLOGY/PUBLICATIONS

Scholarly Publications:

- authoring a peer-reviewed book;
- authoring an article in a peer-reviewed journal;
- authoring a book chapter with a recognized publisher;
- editing a peer-reviewed publication;
- editing a musical score of substantial nature with a recognized national publisher;
- reviewing a book, musical score or recording with a recognized national publisher;
- organizing a society conference;
- initiating a local chapter of a musicological society conference.

Compositions/Arrangements:

- composition/arrangement commissioned by a significant ensemble. (Merit also determined by quality, medium, length, number of performances, reviews, etc.);
- composition/arrangement created for publication that has been peer-reviewed,

disseminated by a nationally-recognized publisher and/or has significant reach and impact. (Merit also determined by quality, medium, length, number of performances, reviews, etc.);

- composition/arrangement performed in a venue at the national or international level.

Recordings:

- performer or composer/arranger on a professionally-produced recording released by a recognized distributor;
- performer or composer/arranger on a self-produced recording that has been peer-reviewed and/or has significant reach and impact.

Other:

- clinician or presenter of research at the national or international level;
- invited keynote speaker at the national or international level;
- placement in a national competition or receipt of a national award;
- funded grant, research award or fellowship from sources outside the University.

TIER II PERFORMANCE

Instrumentalists:

- solo recital at the local level;
- featured soloist with a non-professional ensemble at the local level;
- section player (i.e. non-principal player) in an ensemble at the local level;
- member of a non-professional chamber ensemble.

Vocalists:

- solo recital at the local level;
- featured soloist with a non-professional ensemble at the local level;
- secondary role or chorus with an opera or musical-theatre company at the local level.

Conductors:

- music directing an opera or musical-theatre work with a non-professional company at the local level;
- conducting a non-professional ensemble at the local level;
- preparing a non-professional ensemble for performance at the local level;
- appearing as a guest conductor of a competition or festival at the local level.

Accompanists:

- accompanying a non-professional soloist or ensemble in a full-length program at the local level;
- serving as rehearsal pianist/coach for soloist, ensemble or opera/musical-theatre company at the local level on an ad hoc basis.

Other:

- serving as artistic director of a festival or concert series with a non-professional local organization;
- stage directing opera or musical-theatre work with a non-professional company at the local level.

TIER II MUSICOLOGY/PUBLICATIONS

Scholarly Publications

- authoring an article in an academic journal;
- presenting at an academic society;
- invited keynote speaker or presenter at the local level;
- program notes, reviews, articles or papers in a local publication;
- poster presentation at a local conference;
- co-presenter at a local conference;
- editing a musical score for performance at the local level.

Compositions/Arrangements:

- composition/arrangement commissioned by a local ensemble. (Merit also determined by quality, medium, length, number of performances, reviews, etc.);
- composition/arrangement that has not been peer-reviewed or has minimal reach and impact. (Merit also determined by quality, medium, length, number of performances, reviews, etc.);
- composition/arrangement performed in a venue at the local level.

Recordings:

- performer or composer/arranger on a recording that has not been peer-reviewed or has minimal reach and impact.

Other:

- workshop leader or presenter of research at a local or regional level;
- procuring grants from within the university;
- placement in a local competition or receipt of a local award;
- manuscript or composition/arrangement in progress for future publication.

Works in progress or those that are not published may be considered for review depending on the professional relevance, impact and visibility of the artifact. It is up to the candidate to make the case for inclusion in the review process.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for

promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research/creative activity – demonstrate the following:

Focused productivity in one tier, or activities across both tiers, that demonstrate an emerging recognition in the field. Faculty should have established a positive and visible profile at the local and state level by the time of promotion.

3.3.3.2 Benchmark for promotion to Professor

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research/creative activity – demonstrate the following:

A high level of productivity across both tiers that demonstrates an established and sustained recognition by peers in the discipline. Performances or dissemination of research at the national or international level are encouraged. The faculty member should be recognized as an artistic and pedagogical leader in the community.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. Reviewers should be aware that, unlike funding in the sciences, grants awarded in the arts are traditionally modest, and the dollar amount should not reflect negatively upon the quality or significance of the work or performance.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix M:
Department of Philosophy
Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

The goals for the Philosophy Department's Promotion, Tenure, and Progression towards Tenure Guidelines are:

1. To inform new hires of expectations for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion.
2. To help faculty make progress towards tenure and promotion.
3. To provide clear guidelines for candidates who are submitting a file.
4. To assist reviewers in making fair and appropriate judgments about candidates in philosophy.

These guidelines are intended to be the Philosophy Department's authoritative interpretation of university and college guidelines for faculty in philosophy. The examples or lists given are meant to be suggestive, and not exhaustive, of the ways to provide the relevant evidence. This document should not be taken to be complete in describing the ways that faculty can meet university standards for promotion, tenure, and progression towards tenure. Each faculty member has unique strengths and abilities and may take a unique path through promotion and tenure. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make the best case that she can in building her tenure and promotion file. In cases where faculty members have unexpected opportunities and atypical workloads, departures from the guidelines are both expected and allowable.

These guidelines, in conformity with the University Faculty Policies and Procedures (FEPPs), recognize that there is some overlap in the workload areas of research, teaching, and service. In cases of overlap, the faculty member must choose towards which area he/she would like the activity to count. For instance, if a faculty member organizes the Annual Undergraduate Philosophy Conference, this may count as departmental service or as teaching (in the category of advancing student excellence).

These guidelines can be modified annually. Any faculty member in the Philosophy Department is welcome to propose changes, subject to approval by a full departmental vote and subsequent approval through CAS, peer review committees, and the Provost.

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty in the Department of Philosophy for the review of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. The guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located.

A. Overview of Standards for Promotion by Rank in Philosophy

1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Tenure

“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 and professional 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 the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advance the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.” (FEPPs p.21-2)

In order to be promoted from assistant professor to associate professor, faculty members must have:

- a) A Ph.D. in Philosophy or appropriate terminal degree (e.g. DPhil), or if regarding an appointment in Religion, a Ph.D. in Religion or another appropriate terminal degree (e.g. DPhil, Ph.D. in Religious Studies).
- b) A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching
- c) Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank
- d) Generated and disseminated disciplinary knowledge of high quality and significance
- e) A marked strength in at least one component of faculty responsibility
- f) Promise of future accomplishments.

Candidates can establish that they hold the terminal degree in the discipline by inclusion of official transcripts from their institution of study indicating that a Ph.D. or another appropriate terminal degree as described above has been conferred. If UAA already has such documentation on file a corroborating document indicating this fact is sufficient.

A tenure-track assistant professor who is promoted to associate professor in philosophy is also granted tenure.

2. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

“At the rank of Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; contribution 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 a range of professional service activities; and a record of sustained professional growth with the promise of 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.” (FEPPs p.21)

In order to be promoted from associate professor to professor, faculty members must demonstrate:

- a) A sustained record of teaching excellence
- b) Contribution of high-quality and significant scholarship or creative activity to the field
- c) A record of effective leadership in university affairs and professional service activities
- d) A record of sustained growth with the promise of continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements,
- e) A marked strength in one of the components of faculty responsibilities.

3. Emeritus Criteria for Candidacy and Appointment

Appointment to Emeritus status is granted commensurate with the Board of Regents Policy and Regulation 04.04.070 and upon satisfaction of the University of Alaska's criteria for candidacy.

B. Departmental Standards in Teaching, Research and Service

1. A Sustained Record of Teaching Effectiveness

The touchstone in teaching effectiveness is the ability to create an environment for student success. Faculty and reviewers should bear this in mind and create and review the file with an eye to the evidence of creating such an environment. Faculty should make effective use of the self-evaluation as an essential area for demonstrating teaching effectiveness.

UAA's faculty evaluation guidelines specify six aspects of teaching: instructional and learning experiences, librarianship, curriculum development, mentoring, advancing teaching excellence, and advancing student excellence. (Consult FEPPs 13-4 for complete descriptions of each.) Faculty members undergoing review are free to include all aspects of teaching as evidence of their teaching effectiveness. Given the Philosophy Department's role and mission in the university, it is essential to demonstrate effectiveness in instruction and learning experiences and mentoring. Though not essential, it is important to demonstrate effectiveness in advancing teaching excellence and advancing student excellence. Librarianship and Development of curricula are important aspects of teaching in which not every faculty member has the opportunity to engage. Thus, these areas are not emphasized for all faculty, though they may be very important for those faculty who have the opportunity to engage in these aspects of teaching and learning.

These guidelines provide a quantitative evaluation for faculty. We attempt to assign points to all foreseeable activities, but do not claim to be exhaustive or comprehensive. If a faculty member has engaged in activities not listed in this document, they should find an equivalent item that is listed and explain in the self-evaluation why this is so and how the unlisted activity should count towards promotion and tenure.

Faculty eligible for promotion are strongly encouraged to have regular visits from the department chair or tenured faculty members who can evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and provide helpful feedback for their continued development.

a. Instruction and Learning Experiences

In Philosophy, instruction and learning experiences include classroom and web-based teaching and may involve service learning, community-engaged learning, and incorporating active learning and student research in instructional design. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated through:

1. Reflective responses to student evaluations (2 pts per instance)
2. Reflective responses to peer review of teaching (2 pts per instance)
3. Clear and well organized syllabi (2 pts)
4. Incorporation of innovative pedagogical techniques (3 pts per instance)
5. Revision of course materials, (2 pts per instance)
6. Development of new course materials, i.e. a new prep (3 pts per instance)
7. Teaching a variety of courses (2 pts)
8. Participation in workshops and CAFÉ events on pedagogy with impact from workshop demonstrated in the self-evaluation (1 pt per workshop)
9. Development of new pedagogical strategy (3 pts per instance)

Faculty standing for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must achieve at least 15 points in this category during the period under review to demonstrate a sustained record of teaching effectiveness.

Faculty standing for promotion to Professor must achieve at least 20 points in this category to demonstrate a sustained record of teaching excellence.

b. Mentoring

Academic advising is a key to student success. All full-time members of the Philosophy Department are expected to be active in advising students. Effectiveness in advising and mentoring will mostly be demonstrated anecdotally in the self-evaluation. Mentoring can be done through:

1. Academic advising (1 points per year)
2. Thesis supervision (2 pts per project)
3. Tutoring (1-3 pts)
4. Independent or directed study supervision (2 pts per course)
5. Assisting students as they apply to graduate school and other professional careers (2 pts per student)
6. Participation in philosophy club events (1 pt per event)
7. Being faculty sponsor of philosophy or other student club (5 pts)

c. Advancing Teaching Excellence

In addition to the methods for pursuing excellence in their own instruction (outlined in section a) faculty members can demonstrate that they advance teaching excellence by:

1. Mentoring colleagues (3 pts per mentoring relationship)
2. Providing peer review of colleagues' teaching (1 pt per review)
3. Planning, leading, or contributing to professional development activities related to teaching (3 pts per instance)
4. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning (3 pts per activity)
5. Disseminating information from pedagogical literature or workshops, (2 pts per instance)

d. Advancing Student Excellence

Whereas the vast majority of mentoring and advising fosters student success, in exceptional cases, faculty members have the opportunity to advance student excellence. This can be done by:

1. Writing letters of recommendation (1 pt per letter)
2. Nominating students for awards (1 pt per student)
3. Supervising research that wins awards (or is presented/published) (3 pts per instance)
4. Convening the annual undergraduate conference (5 pts per instance)

To demonstrate effectiveness and qualify for promotion to associate professor, a tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty member must have a total of 35 points for the period under review with at least 15 of those points coming from the first category, i.e., Teaching Effectiveness.

To demonstrate a sustained record of teaching excellence and qualify for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have a total of 45 points for the period under review with at least 20 in the first category, i.e., Teaching Effectiveness.

Marked Strength in Teaching

For faculty members choosing to demonstrate a marked strength in the teaching component of their workload at the level of Assistant Professor, the following are among the ways to demonstrate this. In addition to meeting the requirements for demonstrating a sustained record of teaching effectiveness, faculty with a marked strength in teaching will demonstrate leadership as teachers. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including but not limited to:

1. Supervision of undergraduate research (2 pts per project)
2. Being awarded grants for undergraduate research as faculty supervisor (4 pts per award)
3. Development of new curriculum (3 pts per item)
4. Updating existing curriculum (1-2 pts per item)
5. Attending a week long teaching intensive (3 pts per instance)

6. Leading a CAFÉ or equivalent session on pedagogy (3 pts per instance)
7. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning (3 pts per instance)
8. Supervision of service learning projects (2 pts per project)
9. Integration of community engagement into course (2 pts per project)
10. Engaging in collaborative teaching (1-4 pts depending on extent of collaboration)

To demonstrate a marked strength in teaching at the level of assistant professor, a faculty member must have a total of at least 8 points from at least 2 different categories listed above in addition to the 35 points required to demonstrate effectiveness.

To demonstrate a marked strength in teaching at the level of associate professor, a faculty member must have a total of at least 10 points from at least 3 different categories listed above in addition to the 45 points required to demonstrate a sustained record of teaching excellence. (To be clear, the required total is 10, but those 10 points must be derived from at least 3 different categories. We are not requiring 30 points with 10 from each of 3 categories.)

2. Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank

Contributions to the discipline include departmental and professional service. Departmental service includes:

1. Assisting with the planning and execution of departmental events, (2 pts per event)
2. Attending philosophy club events, (1 pt per event)
3. Supervising philosophy club (6 pts per year)
4. Serving on a search committee (3 pts per instance)
5. Chairing a search committee (5 pts per instance)
6. Assisting with development of curriculum, (2 pts per instance)
7. Serving as chair (12 pts per year)
8. Departmental assessment coordinator (4 points per year)
9. Departmental library liaison (2 points per year)
10. Directing the UAA Ethics Center (8 pts per year)
11. Planning the undergraduate conference (5 pts per instance)

For promotion to associate professor, with or without tenure, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate departmental service by achieving 20 points for the period under review.

For promotion to professor, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate contribution to discipline by achieving 30 points for the period under review, but at least 15 points have to come from taking a leadership role in planning events, supervising philosophy club, chairing a search committee or chairing the department.

Professional service includes:

1. Convening a conference (5 pts per instance)
2. Chairing a conference session (1 pt per instance)

3. Serving as a referee (3 pts per instance)
4. Organizing a panel for a conference (3 pts per instance)
5. Reading and commenting on colleagues' unpublished work (3 pts per instance)

University service includes:

1. Participating in governance (3 pts per year)
2. Serving on a university wide committee (2 pts per instance)
3. Serving on UAB, CAS CC, or other "high demand" committee (3 pts per instance)
4. Chairing a committee (2 pts per instance in addition to pts for being on committee)
5. Non-departmental work on assessment/accreditation (4 pts per year)
6. Giving talks on campus for UAA audience (2 pts per instance)
7. Serving on search committees outside the philosophy department (3 pts per instance)

Community service includes:

1. Serving on community task forces/committees/boards (3 pts per year)
2. Chairing community task forces/committees/boards (5 pts per year)
3. Giving public talks off campus or on campus for a community audience (2 pts per talk)
4. Being a consultant for community organizations or businesses (2-4 pts per year depending on extent of partnership)
5. Leading workshops for professionals or community members (3 pts per workshop)
6. Planning or participating in events for secondary school students (3 pts per event for planning, 2 pts for participating)

For promotion at the assistant professor level, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members can demonstrate appropriate non-departmental service by achieving 60 points for the period under review. At least 20 points must be for departmental service and at least 20 points must be for service outside the department. The other 20 points can come from any category. To demonstrate a marked strength at this level, faculty members must achieve 75 points.

For promotion to professor, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate non-departmental service by achieving 80 points for the period under review. 30 points must come from departmental service and 30 points must be from outside the department. At least 20 points must be earned through leadership, e.g., chairing a committee, being department chair, being a governance officer, or convening a conference.

To demonstrate a marked strength at the assistant professor level, faculty members must achieve at least 75 points for the period under review.

To demonstrate a marked strength at the associate professor level, faculty must achieve at least 100 points with at least 30 points earned through leadership.

3. Generated and disseminated disciplinary knowledge of high quality and significance

Research in Philosophy can incorporate any of the five forms of scholarship in the University FEPPs (p.8). However, the discipline of Philosophy places an emphasis on discovery, integration, and engagement. Though there are many ways to disseminate research in Philosophy, the discipline places value in refereed journal articles, articles in edited books, conference presentations, and book reviews. Translations, formulation of reports and guidelines and books are less common but also typical of Philosophy research. Given the goals of the department and university, the Philosophy Department also places emphasis on community-engaged research and products resulting from community partnerships which may include codes of ethics, guidelines for professions, and a variety of other forms.

An assistant professor should have compiled a research record that shows continuous output, development, and impact or significance.

To show continuous output, faculty members are expected to engage in approximately one research activity a year, though this isn't a strict rule. Research activities include conference presentations, scholarly publications, and community-based or collaborative products of varied forms.

To show development, faculty members are expected to demonstrate having a research record that has evolved in one of three ways, by moving from one topic to another, by becoming more deeply embedded within a topic, or by finding a new application for previous research. New applications can involve applying previous discovery to community problems or issues, as well as moving to an interdisciplinary application of previous discovery.

To show impact or significance, faculty members are expected to build a research record that:

- Has a broad audience
- Is peer reviewed
- Is cited by others
- Is innovative
- Has breadth and complexity
- Is interdisciplinary
- Involves community engagement
- Results in invitations to present or referee
- Is published or presented in significant venues

Obviously, no candidate for promotion to associate professor is expected to have research that incorporates all of the listed signifiers of impact. Faculty members must make the case for their particular file based on these indicators (and perhaps others). Given the mission of the philosophy department, consideration should especially be given to research that is peer reviewed, has breadth and complexity, involves community engagement, or is interdisciplinary.

Research that meets these standards reveals both a greater amount of effort and a higher quality outcome than is typical of other research.

Products of Research

- a. Authoring a book published through a recognized academic press (24 pts)
- b. Authoring a textbook through a recognized publisher (16 pts)
- c. Refereed journal articles (8 pts)
- d. Edited book (5-8 pts)
- e. Book reviews (3 pts)
- f. Encyclopedia entries (2-5 pts)
- g. Non-refereed articles (2-5 pts)
- h. Case studies (2 pts)
- i. Article in conference proceedings (2 pts)
- j. Presentation at national or international conferences (4 pts)
- k. Presentation at regional conferences (2 pts)

For publications of the following sort, two additional points should be given.

- l. Interdisciplinary publications
- m. Community based/engaged research
- n. Collaborative publication

For promotion to associate professor, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members must achieve a total of at least 36 points with at least 24 points coming from categories a, b and c.

For promotion to professor, faculty members must achieve a total of at least 44 points with at least 24 points coming from categories a, b, and c. Additionally, at least 8 points must come from invited activities to demonstrate recognition of peers outside the institution.

For faculty members to demonstrate a marked strength in the research component of their workload at the rank of assistant professor, they must achieve a total of at least 44 points with at least 32 points coming from categories a, b, and c.

For faculty members to demonstrate a marked strength in their research component of their workload at the rank of associate professor, they must achieve a total of 52 points with at least 32 points coming from categories a, b, or c, and at least 12 points coming from invited research activities.

Summary of PTR Guidelines for Philosophy

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with and without tenure

- 1. Teaching effectiveness
 - a. Total of 35 points with at least 15 points earned in the category of Instruction

- and learning experiences.
- b. Marked strength: at least 8 points from at least 2 categories under “Marked Strength in Teaching”.
- 2. Service appropriate to discipline, mission and rank
 - a. Total of at least 60 points with at least 20 points earned in departmental service and at least 20 points earned in service outside the department.
 - b. Marked strength: Total of at least 75 points.
- 3. Research and Scholarship
 - a. Total of at least 36 points with at least 24 points from categories a-c under “Products of Research”.
 - b. Marked strength: total of at least 44 points with 32 points coming from categories a-c under “Products of Research”.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

- 1. Teaching excellence
 - a. Total of 45 points with at least 20 points earned in the category of Instruction and Learning Experiences.
 - b. Marked strength: at least 10 points from at least 3 categories on under “Marked Strength in Teaching”.
- 2. Service appropriate to discipline, mission and rank
 - a. Total of at least 80 points with at least 30 points earned in departmental service, at least 30 points earned in service outside the department, and at least 20 points earned through leadership (These are not 20 additional points but 20 of the 80.).
 - b. Marked strength: Total of at least 100 points with at least 30 points earned through leadership.
- 3. Research
 - a. Total of at least 44 points with at least 24 points from categories a-c under “Products of Research” and 8 points from invited research activities.
 - b. Marked strength: total of at least 52 points with 32 points coming from categories a-c under “Products of Research” and 12 points of invited research activity.

Scorecard for reviewers

For Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, with and without tenure

Teaching

Area	Points earned	Associate	Full
(a) Instruction and learning		15 required	20 required
(b) Mentoring			

(c) Advancing teaching excellence			
(d) Advancing student excellence			
total		35 total points required	45 total points required
Marked strength categories		8 points (in addition to the above 35) from at least two categories under “Marked Strength in Teaching”	10 points (in addition to the above 45) from at least three categories under “Marked Strength in Teaching”
points			

Service

Type	Points	Associate	Full
(a) Departmental leadership		20 required	30 required
(b) Professional		At least 20 required from categories b-d	At least 30 required from categories b-d
(c) University			
(d) Community			
(e) leadership (a-d)			20 required
total		60 total	80 total
Marked strength		75 total	100 total, 30 leadership

Research

Type	Points	Associate	Full
Categories a-c (under “Products of Research”)		24 required	24 required
Categories d-k			
Categories l-n			
Invited			8 required
Total		36 required	44 required
Marked strength		44 total, 32 from (a)-(c) under “Products of Research”	52 total, 32 from a-c, 12 invited

(a) Departmental		20 required	30 required
leadership			15 required
(b) Professional		At least 20 required from categories b-d	At least 30 required from categories b-d
(c) University			
(d) Community			
(e) leadership (a-d)			20 required
total		60 total	80 total
Marked strength		75 total	100 total, 30 leadership

Research

Type	Points	Associate	Full
Categories a-c (p.8)		24 required	24 required
Categories d-k			
Categories l-n			
Invited			8 required
Total		36 required	44 required
Marked strength		44 total, 32 from (a)-(c)	52 total, 32 from a-c, 12 invited

Appendix N: Department of Physics and Astronomy Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Physics and Astronomy in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. They apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the faculty member is located.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS

1.1 TERMINAL DEGREE IN PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

A Ph.D., or international equivalent, is the terminal degree. Because Physics/Astronomy is a broad field, the precise title can have variations, for instance: Physics, Theoretical Physics, Experimental Physics, Applied Physics, Engineering Physics, Astronomy, Astrophysics, etc. The judgement of whether or not a particular degree qualifies as Physics or Astronomy is best left to the department faculty.

1.2 "PROMISE" IN PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

For department-specific guidelines on "promise" in the context of research specifically (for retention reviews in particular), see Section 3.3: Research.

Other than these, the Physics and Astronomy Department adopts CAS definitions without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0: PEER-REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Physics and Astronomy opts for a multi-disciplinary committee.

3.0: GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The most important criterion for evaluating teaching in physics is the category *Instruction and Learning Experiences*, which is the practice of our craft of teaching (whether it is in a lecture, or lab, etc.). Qualities of a good physics or astronomy teacher include:

- Complete and in-depth coverage of the material of the course
- Clarity of delivery of the material
- Command of their subject matter
- Enthusiasm and humor
- Motivating and inspiring students
- Accepting questions and answering them clearly
- Uniform application of standards when grading
- Consistency of standards with others in the department
- Ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning
- Thoughtful use of technology
- Discussion of real-world examples
- Willingness to enact changes in order to improve as a teacher

Physics and Astronomy candidates should include in their file whatever materials they feel can identify or highlight these qualities, to the standards outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (FEPP's).

Review file items which can substantiate sustained excellence include (but are not limited to): teaching awards (or other professional recognition of teaching), letters of commendation from other faculty or students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring undergraduate research, and publication of papers related to physics pedagogy. An excellent teacher also “leads by example” with his or her peers, and so candidates may include evidence demonstrating leadership in teaching, such as (but not limited to): design of effective teaching strategies that are shared and discussed with other faculty, identifying and initiating solutions to challenges in teaching, chairing peer mentoring committees, or participating in peer review of teaching.

At a minimum, physics candidates at *any* level of review should include documentation of the following aspects of their teaching:

- Summary of classes taught, including a brief description of each course, and approximate enrollment
- Syllabi from each course taught

- Student evaluations
- Peer review: evaluations of the candidate's teaching by other faculty members from Physics and Astronomy

... and, optionally:

- Examples of assignments or tests given
- Examples of classroom materials (such as handouts, etc.)
- Examples of measures of student outcomes (such as grade distributions, etc.)
- Results of national standardized learning assessment tools (such as the Force Concept Inventory)

There are very few national, standardized learning assessment tools for physics. The most well-known one, the Force Concept Inventory, only covers a small part of what a student should be learning. In the absence of such objective criteria, the best measure of instructor quality is peer review.

Student evaluations of physics teaching present special challenges to interpret. Physics classes, when taught to generally-accepted standards at the University level, are challenging and difficult. This causes many of our classes to receive student evaluation scores lower than University averages, no matter the quality of the teacher. For this reason, results of student evaluations should be considered in the context of the particular class: in particular, its level of difficulty and the attitudes of the students entering. Also, as the IDEA instrument in particular rarely provides enough statistics for a both a representative and reliable evaluation, alternative student evaluation instruments may be used by the candidate.

Physics and Astronomy candidates are also encouraged to participate in the aspect of *Mentoring Students*, usually through the involvement of students in research. Candidates may demonstrate this aspect of their teaching with documentation of student research activities (in particular, products of student research projects such as papers or presentations at conferences, etc.)

A candidate may include evidence of any of the other aspects of teaching from the FEPP's, but these are not mandatory. For Physics and Astronomy, examples of such evidence include (but are not limited to):

Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources

- Written course materials written or revised by the candidate (such as lab manuals)
- Examples or descriptions of online/software/computer materials (such as software for running lab equipment or analyzing lab data, instructional animations, applets, apps, etc.)
- Curriculum documents from CIM

Advancing Teaching Excellence

- Summary of the candidate's professional development activities related to improving teaching
- Summary of how weaknesses in teaching were identified by the candidate, and steps taken to make improvements
- Evidence of participation in peer evaluation activities

Advancing Student Excellence

- Copies of recommendation letters written for students
- Grant applications submitted by students advised by the candidate
- Documents related to serving on a thesis committee for a student
- Documentation of advising

In addition to these specific examples, any other evidence relevant to the description of these teaching aspects from the FEPP's may be considered.

Librarianship is minimally relevant to Physics and Astronomy as a criterion for evaluation.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Because the Physics and Astronomy Department normally functions as a "committee of the whole", a candidate at *any* level of review is expected to be an active participant in department-level decisions involving issues such as curriculum, scheduling, recruitment of faculty, and department procedures and policies.

Examples of evidence include (but are not limited to):

Public Service

- Participation in science fairs
- Speaking with K-12 students about science or careers in science
- Public talks or other public outreach promoting science or the University
- Outreach activities to local industry

Note: Non-discipline-related Public Service activities (such as volunteering or charity fundraising, not related to science) is minimally relevant to Physics and Astronomy as a criterion for evaluation.

Professional Service, and Service to the Discipline, Craft, or Professional Field

- Refereeing publications, or serving as editor, for a peer-reviewed journal
- Refereeing research proposals (e.g. for a funding agency)
- Activity related to governance of a professional organization (e.g. the APS or AAPT)
- Organizing meetings and conferences
- Maintenance and Operations for a collaborative experiment
- Monitoring shifts for a collaborative experiment
- Service observations at a telescope facility

University Service

- Serving on University committees
- Participation in faculty governance
- Fundraising or advocating for the department or the University
- Additional departmental service (such as search committees)

In addition to these specific examples, any other evidence relevant to the description of these service aspects from the FEPP's may be considered.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

Research in physics and astronomy is expected to yield the following results:

Primary:

Refereed publications which shall consist of research articles in recognized journals or books in the field.

Secondary:

Non-refereed publications.

- Conference proceedings.
- Conference presentations.
- External grants or funding.
- Internal grants or funding.
- Patents or other commercializable technology
- Resources at a facility granted through a competitive process (such as telescope, accelerator, or supercomputer time).

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to both primary and secondary categories, productivity must include publishing in refereed journals or books and seeking research support in the form of direct funding and/or support from national or international labs.

For publications, the level of productivity necessary for retention, tenure, and/or promotion should depend on the quality of publications and the faculty workload category. Faculty should demonstrate the quality of their work. There are many ways of demonstrating quality. Examples include (but are not limited to): prestige or impact factor of the journal, citations, and impact in the field of study. In addition, faculty members publishing in large collaborations should demonstrate that they have made a significant contribution to the collaboration. For example, supporting letters from the leader(s) of the collaboration would be sufficient.

Research Standards for 1st Year Retention Review

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member undergoing 1st year retention review must demonstrate definite promise or evidence of achievement in research. This could best be accomplished by having a minimum of one manuscript in preparation for submission to a refereed publication. However, this recommendation is flexible, allowing for new faculty startup time. Reviewers should look for indications of real potential in this critical year and offer guidance where possible, especially by noting areas where improvement is needed.

Research Standards for 2nd Year Retention Review

By the end of the 2nd year, a **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member should demonstrate definite promise or evidence of achievement by having at least one manuscript submitted to a refereed publication. Faculty should demonstrate beginning the pursuit of funding for their work as an indicator of potential for success in research. Reviewers should continue to note areas where improvement is needed, and to acknowledge progress made from the previous year.

Research Standards for 4th Year Comprehensive Retention Review

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member undergoing 4th year comprehensive review should be able to show a definite promise or evidence of achievement as a research faculty. At the time of this review, faculty should have at least one refereed manuscript accepted for publication as well as at least one additional manuscript in preparation for submission to a refereed publication. The faculty member should demonstrate attempts to obtain internal and/or external funding in order to maintain their research program. Successful applications for funding will be considered meritorious as will successful applications for experimental/computing time at national facilities. Reviews at this time should indicate any remaining areas of needed improvement as the faculty member approaches the critical review for tenure and promotion.

Research Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor

A faculty member should demonstrate evidence of high-quality and significant achievements in research in order to be awarded promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Success in research in physics and astronomy should minimally be indicated:

For a **3:1:1** faculty member:

- a) by having at least three* manuscripts accepted for publication in refereed journals during employment by UAA, and
- b) by obtaining either internal or external funding to support research activity, or actively seeking external funding and demonstrating high evaluations on proposals by external referees.

For a **2:2:1** faculty member:

- a) by having at least four* manuscripts accepted for publication in refereed journals during employment by UAA, and
- b) by obtaining external funding to support research activity.

* These numbers are a guideline, with flexibility allowed for candidates that can demonstrate very high quality or impactful publications.

Non-monetary or in-kind support received from national or international laboratories to enable research programs may also be given as evidence in support of research success.

Research Standards for Promotion to Professor

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member must demonstrate evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant accomplishments in research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Physics and/or Astronomy. Reviewers should weigh both the number and quality of refereed publications produced plus research funding received and/or support awarded at national labs. In consideration for this rank, reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only.

The rank of Professor is an indication of the stature of the scientist among his/her peers, and letters from external reviewers can be used to determine whether the candidate has achieved recognition in the field. This is very much a professional judgment issue, best left to peers for determination since quality of research can really only be judged by others in the field.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUES ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The Physics and Astronomy Department's guidelines regarding extramural funding are addressed as part of the above section (3.3: Research).

4.0: EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY

There are no discipline-specific criteria for promotion to Emeritus, beyond what is in the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (FEPP's).

Appendix O: Department of Political Science Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Political Science in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually, and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs) and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Political Science.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., DPhil) in political science or closely-related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, a NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “marked strength” generally across the College. The Department interprets “marked strength” to indicate achievements in teaching or research exceeding those required for a given rank. Marked strength in teaching may be demonstrated in by exemplary performance in the classroom, significant enhancements to curricular offerings of the department, or notable recognition of or accomplishments by students. Marked strength in research may be demonstrated by exceeding required standards in research or publication or in recognition of research or publication.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography & Environmental Studies.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The inter-related nature of “faculty scholarship” in the UAA FEPPs mutually reinforces this attribute in the Department. This integrative aspect of scholarship— “discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation” —is at the heart of political science, a social science with “perhaps the least definite boundaries and the widest concerns” of any. As noted in the UAA FEPPs, the review process must emphasize the quality and significance of faculty scholarship and not necessarily the quantity of work done. Therefore, throughout the review process, university and professional peers should assess the candidate on the basis of each of the UAA FEPPs’ criteria outlining the nature of faculty scholarship.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department. High-quality and effective teaching is important, and the Department expects faculty to have a solid record of teaching in order to be recommended for tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to professor. Given the importance of teaching faculty in the Department, thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this component of each faculty member’s workload is critical. Candidates are encouraged to have a separate section in their review files that provides a comprehensive self-evaluation offering substantive evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in relation to teaching.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration, and encourages faculty to provide sufficient data on which to evaluate their effectiveness in teaching.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effective of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. As evidence of excellence in teaching, faculty in the Department are encouraged to submit teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty members or from students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, evidence that the faculty member’s teaching has contributed to student success, or other professional recognition of teaching.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs listed myriad ways of teaching that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depths of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload.

All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service.

In the Department, an important dimension of service is engagement, which is defined as involvement in one's scholarly work beyond the university and serving the broader interests of society or significant segments thereof. The category of public service or service to society should be broadly understood to encompass activities related to popular and non-academic initiatives, publications, audiences, and other institutions beyond the university.

We recognize that public good products may take diverse and plural forms. They may include local, regional, national, or international projects. Public goods may include workshops, programs, archives, centers, electronic resources, or other projects that sustain community partnerships and contribute to disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge. Non-university partners may include government agencies, public stakeholders, civil society, news and on-line organizations, non-profit stakeholders, and other educational institutions, e.g., K-12 public and private schools. Examples may include collaborating or partnering with governments, inter-governmental, educational, or other public institutions; offering expertise to community agencies or civic groups; testifying before legislative or congressional committees; providing public policy analysis; program evaluation; technical briefings for local, state, national, or inter-governmental agencies; serving on public boards, task forces, or committees; and offering and developing training or professional development workshops.

Professional service should be broadly understood to include activities that serve the discipline of political science or society as a whole, while at the same time contributing to the institutional mission of the university. Service to the professional discipline of political science will also be an element for review and evaluation for progression towards tenure, promotion, and tenure.

Again, university service is an important element of the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty of the department. Service to the department, college, and campus or university system will be given consideration, including administrative responsibilities, governance activities, faculty development, advancing teaching excellence, and advancing student excellence.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs listed myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Reviewers should understand that the broad boundaries of political science may mean that faculty in the Department will publish articles, books, or chapters that might be considered history, literature, classics, philosophy, natural science, economics, legal studies, etc., and that all those publications are a legitimate and recognized part of political science, which does not respect narrow disciplinary boundaries. Reviewers, including those outside the department, should not discount such work by ascribing narrower boundaries to political science.

In the field of political science, peer-reviewed publications are understood to be manuscripts that, prior to publication, undergo a process of detailed review by experts in this field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes, a recommendation for immediate publication, or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book for which the manuscripts were submitted.

Non-peer-reviewed publications are manuscripts not subjected to review by an external reviewer or experts in this field of study and are considered to be a secondary level of research. Examples of non-peer-reviewed publications may include but are not limited to (a) research articles in non-refereed journals; (b) technical reports; (c) non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials; (d) presentations at conferences; and (e) articles in popular magazines which serve to enhance public understanding of politics.

Political science faculty should recognize that their reviewers (even other political scientists) may not fully appreciate the significance of their scholarly accomplishments. Therefore, political science faculty are advised to use their self-evaluations to educate their reviewers about that significance. To assist reviewers in ascertaining the faculty member's research and scholarly accomplishments during the review period, the faculty in the Department are encouraged to include copies in his or her review file of all manuscripts that are in preparation, submitted, under review, or published.

The following is based on the assumption that 20% of the workload is devoted to research or creative activity.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. In the Department, academic research and scholarly activity should advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the production of knowledge “in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society.” In all cases, the candidate should provide evidence of scholarly research and publication that extends and reaches beyond her or his dissertation research. In subsequent years, political scientists often continue to do research in the same field as their dissertation. Such a research program is entirely appropriate, provided that the candidate has extended or deepened the research after completing the dissertation.

In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity. Faculty members should always be evaluated on the basis of the whole body of their research to date. Reviewers should note, however, that such earlier work does not satisfy any requirement to demonstrate local research activity while at UAA.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska.

In the Department, foremost among the peer-reviewed publications that faculty members should have for review for progress towards promotion, promotion, and tenure are:

- Books and monographs
- Book chapters
- Edited books, e.g., annotated editions or books with several contributors
- Articles, including substantial essays and commentaries
- Book reviews

Among works in this first category, other things being equal, those which make the greatest contributions to scholarship in political science are more significant for review than lesser works; those with substantial scholarly writing by the faculty member under review are more significant than briefer works; co-authored works are less significant than single-authored works, depending on the contributions made by each author; and peer-reviewed works are more significant than non-peer-reviewed works. Research published in this category of publications is essential for promotion and tenure.

In a second category of lesser publications that, together with publications in the first category, contribute to a faculty member's record of published research are the following:

- Columns and op-ed pieces
- Occasional writings
- Brief, informal essays
- Reports, professional and technical

Some journals that publish articles by faculty members in political science solicit contributions from qualified authors but do not subject these contributions to peer review (though they are subject to expert editorial review), yet are as reputable and influential as leading peer-reviewed journals in political science. Reviewers should treat articles and book reviews published by political science faculty members in such prestigious journals (e.g., *The American Scholar*, the *Claremont Review of Books*, *Commentary*, *Foreign Affairs*, the *Wilson Quarterly*, etc.), which may be more “public” in nature than peer-reviewed scholarly journals, as being just as significant as research published in peer-reviewed journals—an exception to the general rule that peer-reviewed publications are more significant than non-peer-reviewed publications.

Similarly, on the more public side, publishing in *The New York Times* or *The Wall Street Journal* (or other such newspapers with an international reputation) is clearly more significant than publishing in the *Anchorage Daily News*, although both kinds of contributions contribute to a faculty member's overall record of research.

A third category of scholarly accomplishments should also be considered in the evaluation of faculty in the Department. These might include, for example, success through basic and applied research; community engaged or participatory action research; involvement of undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research; supervision of senior essays, theses, and other student research; capstone projects; mentoring of students that leads to presentation of their academic research; editorship of academic or scholarly publications; organization of scholarly conferences or symposia; successful applications for external grant support; leadership in multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative research projects; private, public, or internal proposal-writing; and other forms of recognition by external peers.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

The minimum standard for promotion to associate professor is at least one published book or completed book manuscript accepted for publication or a strong, substantive body of scholarly articles published in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Such criteria should have primary emphasis for purposes of evaluation. Other scholarly publications, such as chapters in books, especially in refereed volumes, and edited volumes, should also be considered in promotion and/or tenure evaluation.

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

For promotion to the highest rank, productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success—beyond the rate required for promotion to associate professor—in publication of books, refereed publications, or other fruits of scholarly research.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing the funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The chair or a designated faculty member in political science has chief responsibility for making such recommendations with aid from faculty colleagues. Departmental expectations for recommendation of a faculty member for this designation entail outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and service beyond those required for promotion to professor.

The Department will also follow the above process and standards for the designation of Distinguished Professor of Political Science.

Appendix P: Department of Psychology Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually, and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs) and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Psychology.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD, Ph.D., DPhil, or Dr.Phil.) in psychology, Doctor of Education (EdD, Ed.D., DEd, or DE.d.), or Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D., D.Psych,) or closely-related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, a NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an

appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “marked strength” generally across the College. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of “marked strength” in the Department is that the faculty member exceeds departmental expectations for years in rank in some component of the workload (viz., teaching, research, or service).

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a single-department committee that, if needed, will add members from one of the following disciplines: Sociology, Anthropology, Political Science, Geography & Environmental Sciences and/or Biological Sciences.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The Psychology Department's Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (PFEPPs) are designed to prepare faculty members for successful tenure and promotion reviews across their careers. These guidelines are intended to help faculty members document their achievements in teaching, research, and service at each stage of career development. The department's expectations for tenure and promotion, therefore, are very developmental in nature. They emphasize professional growth across the career.

The PFEPPs detail the standards and expectations regarding teaching, research, and service for faculty members at each level of review; they present typical paths to tenure and promotion. A faculty member can make the case, however, for an alternative path as long as it meets the faculty evaluation guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Rating Scale to be used for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

The following rating scale will be used by the Department Director and Psychology Department Peer Review Committee when evaluating each component of a faculty member's workload:

- 5 = candidate far exceeds Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload (shows clear evidence of a marked strength in area)**
- 4 = candidate exceeds Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload (shows some evidence of a marked strength in area)**
- 3 = candidate shows evidence of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload**
- 2 = candidate has not shown evidence of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload, but does show promise of meeting expectations**
- 1 = candidate has not shown evidence or promise of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload or has failed to effectively document achievements**

A rating of '3' means that the faculty member is meeting the department's expectations in teaching, research, and/or service for their assigned workload; ratings of '4' or '5' provide evidence of a marked strength. Therefore, candidates for promotion need to achieve a minimum rating of '4' or '5' in one component of their assigned workload and a minimum rating of '3' in the other component(s) of their assigned workload.

There are three charts in this document that outline the Psychology Department's expectations in teaching, research, and service by years in rank. The charts are color coded according to the following legend:

Chart row color legend:

Blue indicates that all faculty, regardless of rank, need to meet row expectations (a minimum rating of '3').

Purple indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') beginning in 2nd year as Assistant Professor.

Green indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') beginning in 3rd year as Assistant Professor.

Pink indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') when they stand for promotion to Associate Professor.

Peach indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') when they stand for promotion to Professor.

Khaki indicates what is necessary to receive a designation of a marked strength (a minimum rating of '4').

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. In addition, the Department faculty should do the following to provide evidence of “effectiveness in teaching” through the following documentation.

- (1) Summarize courses taught during the review period (including semesters and sections) and note:
 - a. new course preparations
 - b. major revisions to course or syllabus
- (2) Include the most recent syllabus (including a detailed description of all major course assignments and projects) for each course taught during the review period. If a significant change in a course has been implemented, an older version of a syllabus should be included. The syllabus will be reviewed to determine whether or not it:
 - a. Adequately reflects the course description, instructional goals, and student learning outcomes specified in the Course Content Guide (CCG)
 - b. Includes appropriate and rigorous methods to assess individual differences in student mastery of course material as specified in the CCG.
 - c. Assigns reading from textbooks, journal articles, monographs, and/or other sources appropriate for the level and content of the course.
 - d. Contains clear and objective grading criteria for all components of the grade, including exams, papers, projects, presentations, and in-class participation (if specified in the CCG). *Note: extra credit should not be in excess of 3% of total course grade, and faculty should avoid awarding points for mere attendance.*
 - e. Contains all necessary information about the course including course number, section, days and times, and prerequisites.
 - f. Contains all necessary information about the Instructor including phone number, e-mail address, office location, and in-person and/or online office hours.

- g. Contains information about how academic dishonesty, plagiarism, or other unethical behavior will be handled
 - h. Contains information about how late work or missed exams will be handled.
 - i. Contains information about professional student conduct.
- (3) Include copies of all student course evaluations for all sections taught during the review period and summary table(s) and or graph(s) to organize course evaluation data. *Note: If you are missing course evaluations for one or more sections, explain why these evaluations are missing.*
- (4) Include copies of any peer evaluations from the review period.
- (5) Include additional materials in support of teaching effectiveness (e.g., a link to an instructor eportfolio, brief videos of classroom demonstrations or discussions).

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. In addition, the discipline-specific elaboration of “continuing or advancing effectiveness in teaching” for the Department is described in detail below.

Faculty members whose workloads include teaching must document that they are meeting the Psychology Department’s expectations for years in rank and workload. The chart below outlines teaching expectations for faculty in the Psychology Department. The chart and Sections 3.1.1 through 3.1.4 that follow will assist faculty in documenting their teaching activities. These guidelines should be used in conjunction with the CAS FEPPs to document teaching accomplishments and write the self-review of teaching.

In the chart below, an ‘X’ indicates that a faculty member needs to demonstrate that they are meeting departmental expectations for the teaching activities listed for their rank. Faculty members who provide evidence in their files of successful teaching activities in each of the boxes with an ‘X’ in the chart below will earn a minimum rating of ‘3’ from the rating scale provided above. A faculty member who exceeds the expectations listed in the chart (either by engaging in activities that are only expected at a more advanced rank or engaging in more activities than expected) will be given a ‘4’ or a ‘5,’ which can contribute to the designation of a ‘marked strength’ in teaching. A rating will be assigned to each row in the chart by the Department Director during his or her review. If the candidate receives a rating below a ‘3’ in any are on a review that is pre-tenure or in anticipation of promotion, the Department Director will make suggestions about how to improve the rating in subsequent reviews.

Teaching Activities	Psychology Department Teaching Expectations for Years in Rank				
	evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	Evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	clear and convincing evidence of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching	clear and convincing evidence of an extensive and sustained record of excellence in teaching
	<i>Assistant Professor Year 1</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Year 2</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Years 3+</i>	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor</i>	<i>Promotion to Professor</i>
Demonstrate <u>rigorous course-based instruction</u> through carefully prepared syllabi, appropriate and challenging course work and assignments, and adequate student course evaluations (see Section 3.1.1 above)	X	X	X	X	X
Engage in <u>at least one</u> professional development activity that promotes teaching excellence <u>each academic year</u> (see Section 3.1.4.1 below)	X	X	X	X	X
Engage in individualized instruction or mentoring of <u>at least one student</u> per semester that promotes student excellence (see		X	X	X	X

Section 3.1.4.2 below)					
Engage in <u>at least one</u> activity that advances or promotes teaching excellence per year (see Section 3.1.4.3 below)			X	X	X
Engage in <u>at least one</u> activity aimed at building/developing curricula and/or learning resources per year (see Section 3.1.4.4 below)				X	X
Hold <u>at least one</u> major department, campus, or disciplinary leadership position in teaching or curriculum development (e.g., Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Dishonesty, Chair of UAB or GAB, Curriculum Review for APA, Accreditation efforts)					X
Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in teaching				Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a	Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a

				significant contribution to the University's teaching mission	significant contribution to the University's teaching mission
--	--	--	--	---	---

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs listed myriad ways of teaching that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the following list includes teaching activities that are of particular value to the Psychology Department.

3.1.4.1: Documenting Activities Contributing to Your Professional Development as an Instructor

- (1) Summarize consultation with peers/mentors in the Psychology Department at UAA or elsewhere to improve your syllabus, assignments, and other course materials.
- (2) Summarize attendance at workshops, teaching intensives, or conferences (e.g., Blackboard or eLive courses, CAFÉ presentations, Difficult Dialogues, Terman Teaching Conference) directed toward improving teaching.
- (3) Summarize readings and research completed in support of professional development as an instructor.

3.1.4.2: Documenting Individualized Instruction or Mentoring that Promotes Student Excellence

- (1) Summarize any work you did mentoring students during the review period, including:
 - a. Serving as the Chair or Committee Member for:
 - i. senior theses,
 - ii. master's theses
 - iii. doctoral dissertations
 - b. Supervising independent research projects or independent study courses (please list them)
 - c. Supervising teaching or research assistants. *Note: If you have mentored numerous students during the review period in differing roles please create a table summarizing your mentoring work with students across the review period.*

- (2) Summarize any work you did to advance student career development such as:
- a. Writing grants that included undergraduate or graduate student support
 - b. Assisting students in writing and submitting their own intramural or extramural grant proposals
 - c. Writing letters of recommendation for undergraduate (e.g., Nursing), graduate programs, scholarships, or jobs
 - d. Submitting nominations of students for awards or scholarships
 - e. Assisting students with preparation of conference presentations or publications.
 - f. Assisting students with development or preparation of eportfolios, curriculum vitae, or applications to graduate school or for internships.

3.1.4.3: Documenting Activities that Advance and Promote Teaching Excellence

- (1) Summarize any involvement in and recognition for activities that advanced or promoted teaching excellence in Psychology courses or elsewhere in the University during the review period such as:
- a. high-impact teaching practices you have incorporated into your own teaching
 - i. service-learning or community-engagement
 - ii. involving undergraduates in research
 - iii. teaching writing-intensive courses with more than 25 pages of graded written work per student
 - b. Innovative teaching strategies such as incorporating interactive theater or indigenous teaching practices into your coursework
 - c. Mentoring colleagues or other professionals in your discipline such as:
 - i. conducting workshops for faculty or professionals in your field (e.g., CAFÉ workshops, creating and/or serving on a panel on teaching at a conference)
 - ii. providing clinical supervision for colleagues
 - iii. observation and evaluation of peers' teaching
 - iv. consulting with colleagues on selection and use of instructional materials, tools, and resources related to teaching
- (2) Publications on effective pedagogy that you have produced during the review period such as writing articles, books, or book chapters on teaching effectiveness or strategies
- (3) Documentation of SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Activities) such as implementing new teaching methods (e.g., problem-based learning), the development of innovative assignments and grading techniques, content analyses of teaching materials, the utilization of student focus groups within classes, formal reflections on teaching experiences and innovations, and research on the effectiveness of teaching innovations

- (4) Teaching awards, fellowships, grants, or other forms of internal or external recognition for teaching activities
- (5) Involvement or leadership roles in regional, national, or international teaching conferences or programs

3.1.4.4: Documenting Activities Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources

- (1) Summarize any involvement in curriculum development work conducted on behalf of the Psychology Department or other department(s) across campus during the review period. This would include activities such as:
 - a. Revising or developing new courses, programs, or degrees
 - b. Creating teaching manuals, materials, or software
 - c. Setting up or enhancing laboratories or equipment for teaching
 - d. Developing new instructional delivery platforms (e.g., distance or web-based environments).
 - e. Playing a leadership role in one of the department's curriculum committees (Undergraduate Studies Committee; Clinical Training Committee; PhD Committee) or subcommittees
 - f. Leadership in definition, review, and assessment of student learning outcomes in Psychology or UAA (such as serving as the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator for the BA/BS, MS, or PhD program, serving as Chair of CAS Course and Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Academic Board, or Chairing the ad hoc Faculty-Senate Committee on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism)
 - g. Involvement in or playing a leadership role in external curriculum review (such as being asked to serve as an external reviewer of a new Honors college at another university or being asked to review curriculum for an external program undergoing APA accreditation).

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depths of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

The following section presents expectations for service for faculty members in the Psychology Department with 20% of total workload devoted to service. Expectations will be adjusted for faculty members who have more or less of their workloads devoted to service as negotiated with the Dean of CAS.

The Psychology Department recommends that service activities be restricted in the years prior to applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, with expectations increasing with advancement in rank. A faculty member who is exceeding expectations for years in rank is likely showing a marked strength in service. An 'X' in the box below indicates that a faculty member should be engaged in the minimum amount of service activity in that area to achieve a '3' on the rating scale.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. In addition, the following section presents expectations for service for faculty members in the Psychology Department with 20% of total workload devoted to service. Expectations will be adjusted for faculty members who have more or less of their workloads devoted to service as negotiated with the Dean of CAS.

The Psychology Department recommends that service activities be restricted in the years prior to applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, with expectations increasing with advancement in rank. A faculty member who is exceeding expectations for years in rank is likely showing a marked strength in service. An 'X' in the chart below indicates that a faculty member should be engaged in the minimum amount of service activity in that area to achieve a '3' on the rating scale.

Service Activities	Psychology Department Service Expectations for Years in Rank				
	Evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Evidence of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	A demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities

	<i>Assistant Professor Year 1</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Year 2</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Years 3+</i>	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor</i>	<i>Promotion to Professor</i>
Engage in student support activities including, <u>at a minimum, academic and career advising</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in Governance activities, including, <u>at a minimum, attendance and participation in bi-weekly department meetings</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in <u>at least one</u> of the Department's Standing Committees (Undergraduate Studies Committee, Clinical Training Committee, or Ph.D. Committee)	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in <u>at least one</u> additional Departmental Committee (e.g., BSCN, a search committee,		X	X	X	X

Website committee, subcommittees such as the Adjunct Faculty Approval Committee, eportfolio Group, ad hoc Committee on Student Professional Conduct)					
Engage in <u>approximately one hour per week</u> of professional service to the community or discipline			X	X	X
Leadership of <u>at least one</u> Departmental Committee or Subcommittee (e.g., chair Undergraduate Studies Committee, serve as Outcomes Assessment Coordinator, Ph.D. Outcomes Committee Chair, a search committee chair, or BSCN Coordinator)			X	X	X
Membership <u>on at least one</u> college- or				X	X

university-wide committee (e.g., serving as a member of IRB, IACUC, the Undergraduate Research Task Force, Faculty Senate, a Faculty Senate standing or ad hoc committee)					
Demonstrate significant disciplinary or campus leadership (e.g., Department Director, CTC Coordinator, PSC Director, IACUC or IRB Chair, UAB or GAB Chair, Faculty Senate President or officer, Chair of Faculty Senate standing or ad hoc Committee, Chair of the CAS Curriculum Committee, chair of a community advisory board)					X
Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in service				Exceed departmental expectations	Exceed departmental expectations for years in

				for years in rank or make a significant contribution to the University's service mission	rank or make a significant contribution to the University's service mission
--	--	--	--	--	---

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs listed myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. In addition, the chart in the previous section details the kinds of service of particular value to faculty in the Psychology Department.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Faculty members whose workloads include research activity must document that they are actively conducting research and disseminating the findings through publication and presentation. The chart below communicates the Psychology Department's expectations for research productivity at each career stage. Sections 3.3.1 to 3.3.3 that follow the table explain how to document research productivity.

In the chart below, an 'X' indicates that a faculty member needs to demonstrate that they are meeting departmental expectations for the level of research productivity listed at the given rank. Faculty members who provide evidence in their files of successful research activity in each area with an 'X' in the chart will earn a minimum rating of '3' from the rating scale provided earlier. A faculty member who exceeds expectations listed in the chart (either by engaging in activities expected at a more advanced rank or engaging in more activities than expected) will be given a rating of '4' or a '5,' which can contribute to the designation of a 'marked strength' in research. A rating will be assigned to each row in the chart by the Department Director during his or her review along with suggestions about how to improve the rating if necessary.

The following is based on the assumption that 20% of the workload is devoted to research or creative activity. (See next page.)

Research Activities	Psychology Department Research Expectations for Years in Rank				
	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research within their academic field with an emerging recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution	clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research within their academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution
	<i>Assistant Professor Year 1</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Year 2</i>	<i>Assistant Professor Years 3+</i>	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor</i>	<i>Promotion to Professor</i>
Conduct a program of high-quality and significant academic research; involving students in one's research and efforts towards securing funding for research are highly encouraged (see 3.3.3.1 below)	X	X	X	X	X
Disseminate research through		X	X	X (accumulate at least 6 RPs)	X (accumulate at least 12

presentations at professional conferences and publication in peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, monographs, and grants (see 3.3.3.1 below)				per 20% of workload – see Table in 3.3.3.1 below)	RPs per 20% of workload – see Table in 3.3.3.1 below)
Gain recognition from professional peers or community members external to the institution as a researcher or scholar within one's academic specialty (see 3.3.2 below)			X (provide evidence of emerging recognition within field)	X (demonstrate the development of recognition within field)	X (demonstrate clear recognition within field)
Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in research				Exceed departmental expectations for RPs at rank or make a significant contribution to the University's research mission	Exceed departmental expectations for RPs at rank or make a significant contribution to the University's research mission

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The department describes its standards in the following sections.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska. In addition, quality and significance of research is illustrated through the following ways.

- a. having sole-authored publications;
- b. publishing an article with extraordinary impact (document journal impact factor; number of citations, number of downloads);
- c. earning external research awards;
- d. being awarded extramural grants;
- e. serving as an editor, associate editor, or article editor for a peer-reviewed journal;
- f. being invited to give an address to a national or international conference, another university, or community organization;
- g. conducting research-related service (e.g., journal reviewer);
- h. including external review letters in file (especially those from reviewers who are not research collaborators or mentors as per the CAS FEPPs);
- i. having one's research highlighted in news or other publications or outlets external to the university;

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Products and artifacts of academic research*

1) Activities related to the development and maintenance of an active program of research leading to peer-review publications are highly valued in the Department. Activities leading to peer-reviewed publications include:

- a. conducting basic and/or applied research and inquiry;
- b. conducting community-engaged or participatory action research;
- c. developing infrastructure to facilitate data collection for multiple researchers (e.g., acquiring/preparing lab space, software, and other equipment);

- d. involving undergraduate or graduate students in conducting research, assisting with data collection, lab maintenance, data analysis.

2) Additionally, all activities related to developing and maintaining a program of funded research are also highly valued, including:

- a. leading research projects or contracts, including multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative projects task forces;
- b. writing proposals to funding agencies (private, public, and internal);
- c. being awarded funding including research grants and contracts;
- d. managing budgets of grants and contracts;
- e. selecting and supervising research staff;
- f. preparing reports for funding bodies.

The Psychology Department has quantified research activities and products according to the following table. (See next page.)

Research Point Assignment Guidelines

<i>Tier I Research Category</i>	<i>Type of Research Product</i>	<i>Research Point Value</i>
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (PRAs):	Peer-reviewed journal article	1.0
	PRA with student 1 st author	1.25
	PRA in high impact journal (IF 3+)	1.5
Books:	Book 1 st or 2 nd author	3.0
Includes textbooks but not instructor's manuals or other ancillary teaching materials, which are given credit in Tier II)	Book later author	1.5
	Book 1 st or 2 nd editor	2.5
	Book later editor	1.5
	Chapter 1 st author	0.75
	Chapter later author	0.5
Extramural Grants:	Funded multi-year project	2.5
	Funded 1 year project	1.5
	Student grant funded	1.0
	Proposal not funded	0.5
<i>Tier II Research Category</i>	<i>Type of Research Product</i>	<i>Research Point Values</i>
International conference presentation:	1 st author or student as 1 st author	0.25
	Later author	0.20
Regional conference presentation	1 st author or student as 1 st author	0.20
	Later author	0.10
State or local conference presentation	1 st author or student as 1 st author	0.10
	Later author	0.05
Intramural grants:	Funded	0.25
	Student grant funded	0.10
	Not funded	0.10
Innovations in clinical practice or research:	Published treatment/test/assessment/manual	1.00
	Patented material	1.50

Publication in a journal or other periodical that is not peer-reviewed:	Author of a test bank or instructor's manual	0.10
	Published book or film review	0.10
	Newspaper editorial	0.10
	Article in professional newsletter	0.10
	Invited comment in a journal	0.10

3.3.3.3 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

Of the 6 RPs required (per 20% of workload) for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

- at least 3 RPs must be earned for research products in which the candidate is the first author;
- at least 4 RPs must be earned for research products completed after joining the faculty at UAA and with UAA as the candidate's institutional affiliation;
- at least 4 RPs must be earned for research products listed in the Tier I category, and
- no more than 2 RPs can be earned for research products from the Tier II category.

3.3.3.4 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

Of the 12 RPs required (per 20% of workload) for promotion to Professor:

- at least 6 RPs must be earned for research products in which the candidate is the first author;
- at least 8 RPs must be earned for research products completed after joining the faculty at UAA and with UAA is stated as the candidate's institutional affiliation;
- at least 8 RPs must be earned for research products listed in the Tier I category, and
- no more than 4 RPs can be earned for research products from the Tier II category.

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing the funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emera status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix Q: Department of Sociology Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Sociology in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Sociology.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. In the Department, the terminal degree that is required for promotion is a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD, Ph.D., DPhil, or Dr. phil.) in Sociology.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

The Department defines marked strengths in each area as:

Teaching:

A marked strength in teaching is exemplified by exceptional pedagogical activities that promote an instructional environment supporting student achievement. These could include:

- exceptional application of high-impact teaching practices in the classroom;
- exceptional contributions to program curriculum;
- mentoring of undergraduate research;
- recognition by the university or external constituencies;
- student achievement recognized by the university or external constituencies.

Research/Creative Activity:

A marked strength in research is exemplified by exceptional work recognized by professional peers, community members, or other constituencies external to the institution. These could include:

- research activities that have exceptional reach or impact within the discipline;
- research activities that have exceptional reach or impact across the broader academic community;
- research activities that have exceptional reach or impact across the broader society.

Service:

A marked strength in service is exemplified by exceptional contributions to the university, profession, and society. These could include:

- effective leadership in university affairs and professional activities;
- contributions to university affairs, professional organizations, or community partners.

The Department defines teaching, research/creative activity, or service as “exceptional” if the activity is particularly innovative, influential, effective, and/or productive relative to the other components of the faculty member’s workload. If a faculty member exceeds the departmental standards required for a workload component the Department encourages that faculty member to document this as evidence of a marked strength.

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College. The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, the Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Geography and Environmental Studies, Political Science, and/or Anthropology.

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

These departmental guidelines presume a tripartite faculty workload comprised of 60% teaching, 20% academic research and creative activity, and 20% service. However, faculty workloads often deviate from this distribution of components. For example, bipartite faculty may have no research component in their workload and tripartite faculty may have a larger service component due to important service assignments. Additionally, faculty workload distributions may shift over time due to changing priorities within the department, college, or university. Faculty undergoing review should clarify their workload distribution for reviewers and highlight any changes to that distribution during the review period.

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

Teaching is fundamental to the mission of the Department of Sociology. The Department educates students in the empirical study of society. This includes the systematic and evidence-based interpretation and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. We value instruction that is innovative, rigorous and demonstrates the empirical methods and theoretical traditions of sociology. The Department shares the pedagogical commitments of the University and College.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching.

Teaching activities are evaluated according to their scope and effectiveness. Faculty members are expected to provide high-quality instruction that reflects the most current standards in our field. Teaching assignments can include some combination of introductory courses, GER courses, core sociology courses, honors seminars, cross-listed courses, and elective upper-division offerings. The Department recognizes that faculty may at times specialize in some forms of teaching to the exclusion of others.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. Teaching practices that are highly valued in the Department include:

- Mentoring undergraduate research
- Developing, supervising internships and/or practica
- Including students in ongoing research
- Community engaged learning projects
- Book of the Year activities
- Writing intensive classes (at least 25 pages of graded writing)
- Hosting guest speakers and serving as guest lecturer

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the

College and Department.

Faculty service activities are crucial to UAA's mission. They support the discovery and dissemination of knowledge, community engagement, and shared governance of the University. While all faculty members are expected to engage in university, professional, and community service activities, we expect that faculty members will at times emphasize some service activities and perhaps exclude others. This often reflects the changing needs of the university, college, and department. The Department shares the service commitments of the University and the College.

Service activities are evaluated according to their scope, duration, and significance. In general, faculty are expected to progress toward increasingly responsible service assignments. Service assignments will be particularly valued to the extent that they demonstrate the application of substantial professional expertise and leadership. The Department recognizes that some service commitments are more demanding than others. All faculty members are encouraged to engage in a variety of activities involving service to the university, community, and the profession.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service.

Faculty members are expected to document the outcomes of their service endeavors. The Department anticipates that evidence of service activity will appear in a variety of forms, including but not limited to:

- authorship of policies, procedures, reports;
- letters of acknowledgement, thanks and support from professional colleagues;
- letters of acknowledgement, thanks and support from students and community members;
- evidence of service-based presentations in local, regional, national, or international events;
- evidence of organizational efforts leading to presentations, conferences, symposia, and other events that enhance the prestige of UAA.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College.

Service activities that are highly valued in the Department include but are not limited to those that involve:

- leadership in significant professional and/or university service;
- community service;
- outreach to underserved communities;
- promoting and enhancing undergraduate research;
- enhancing UAA's local, national, or international reputation;
- enhancing UAA's reputation in the discipline of Sociology.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Academic research is crucial to UAA's mission to discover and disseminate knowledge. The Department shares the research goals of the University and the College.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. In the Department, faculty members are expected to document the outcomes of their research endeavors. The Department anticipates that evidence of research productivity will appear in a variety of forms, organized into two tiers of products listed below:

Tier I:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles;
- Peer-reviewed book chapters;
- Other major research products or creative works (e.g., books, edited volumes, grants, films, etc.)

Tier II:

- Grant proposals;
- Research reports;
- Book reviews;
- Published conference proceedings;
- Presentations at local, regional, national, or international conferences;
- Presentations at public forums;
- Essays or articles in unrefereed venues;
- Unpublished manuscripts under review;
- Products of student research (e.g., presentations, reports, posters, etc.) conducted under the direct supervision and/or mentorship of the faculty member.

The Department recognizes that articles in peer-reviewed journals are the basic benchmarks for academic productivity in the discipline. Thus, they are included in the top tier of research products along with book chapters. Tier I also includes other major research products which could take the form of books, edited volumes, major grants, films, or other substantial and consequential achievements in research or creative activity. It is more than likely that the development and dissemination of certain major research products (e.g., a book) requires more time and energy than a typical peer-reviewed journal article and has the potential for a larger impact. In these cases, the faculty member is encouraged to make a case to reviewers that the research product in question should count more heavily than a single Tier I product. Tier II products are ranked lower than peer-reviewed publications and other major research products but are still important indicators of an ongoing scholarly research agenda.

To allow both flexibility in pursuing a scholarly agenda and some consistency in disciplinary expectations, the Department has established research evaluation standards that include a combination of products from Tier I and II.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska.

In reviews of faculty research productivity, the quality and significance of all research products should be given careful consideration. Evidence of the quality and significance of research and/or creative work may include:

- Quantity, trends, and sources of citations to published work;
- Reprints of published work;
- Awards and other forms of recognition;
- Funding awarded for grant proposals;
- Reputation of journal, publisher, or funding source;
- Work appearing in a publication sponsored by a national or regional sociological association;
- Collaborative publications, presentations, proposals, reports that cross disciplinary boundaries;
- Sole or first-authorship of publications, proposals, reports, etc.;
- Media coverage of research activities.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs describe a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and

achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 *Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor*

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following:

- evidence of emerging recognition by professional peers or community members external to the institution
- evidence of a scholarly research agenda
- at least six research products, three of which must be from Tier I

3.3.3.2 *Benchmark for promotion to Professor*

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate the following:

- evidence of recognition by peers or constituencies external to the institution
- evidence of an extensive and sustained scholarly research agenda
- at least 15 research products, six of which must be from Tier I

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

Appendix R: Department of Theatre and Dance Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty from the Department of Theatre and Dance in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for the review of its tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. These departmental guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank (namely, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) (BOR Policy 04.04.040) with at least 51% appointments directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity.

The document describes the discipline-specific standards used to evaluate departmental faculty annually and for major multi-year reviews: comprehensive pre-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews for emeritus status.

This document is to be used in conjunction with relevant statewide policies (viz., Collective Bargaining Agreements [CBAs] and the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies), University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures (UAA FEPPs), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs), and other relevant institutional policies. Unless further guidelines specific to this Department are detailed in this appendix, the Department adopts statewide, UAA-wide, and College-wide guidelines without elaboration. If there is a conflict between those guidelines and this document, statewide, University-wide, and College-wide policies and procedures prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

Throughout this appendix “Department” means the “Department of Theatre and Dance.”

1.1 FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

Tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments in the Department follow the guidelines in Section 1.1 of CAS FEGs, and apply equally to faculty in this discipline regardless of the UAA campus where the appointment is located.

1.2 TERMINAL DEGREE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

As described in the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs, the terminal degree in CAS is typically a doctoral degree in a department’s discipline, sub-discipline, or related field as defined by the department. For Theatre and Dance scholars, the terminal degree is a Doctoral level degree. However, Theatre Artists and Dancer/Choreographers (defined below) must have an MFA-level degree. Additionally, the Department makes exceptions for candidates with seven or more years of nationally or internationally recognized professional experience that closely parallels what is done in the classroom and includes substantial accomplishments.

1.2.1 Terminal Degree for Theatre Scholars

The terminal degree is a doctoral-level degree for all theatre-related fields except Theatre Artist (Defined to include: Playwrights, Directors, Actors, and Designers of scenery, costumes, sound, lighting, projections, technical directors, and stage/production managers). The terminal degree for Theatre Artist (defined above) is a MFA-level degree in a related field.

1.2.2 Terminal Degree for Dance Scholars

The terminal degree is a doctoral-level degree for all dance-related fields except Dancer/Choreographer (Defined to include: Dancers of any style/specialization and Choreographers of any style/specialization, including Aerial Artists. The terminal degree for a Dancer/Choreographer (defined above) is a masters-level degree in a related field.

A terminal degree in one of these areas is not required for NTT faculty who teach exclusively at the lower-division level. However, an NTT faculty member in the Department must possess an appropriate graduate degree or professional training in one of the above disciplines, sub-disciplines, or closely-related field.

1.3 “PROMISE” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “promise” generally across the College. *The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.*

1.4 “MARKED STRENGTH” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

The UAA FEPPs state that to be promoted faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the workload. Furthermore, CAS guidelines state that faculty must identify their own marked strength and that departments are encouraged to define the disciplinary standards for marked strengths in teaching, service, or research/creative activity.

D. The Department’s definition of marked strength in teaching:

- *For Associate Professor level: Recognition outside of the department as an innovative or renowned teacher/educator.*
- *For Professor level: Achieving a reputation that goes beyond CAS as an innovative or renowned teacher/educator.*

E. The Department’s definition of marked strength in service:

- *For Associate Professor level: Recognition outside of the department in the areas of university, college, or departmental service.*
- *For Professor level: Achieving a reputation that goes beyond CAS in one or more of the areas of university, college or departmental service.*

F. The Department’s definition of marked strength is research or creative activity:

- *For Associate Professor level: Recognition outside of the university setting for their work on research in the field or for their contributions in creative activity in the community.*
- *For Professor level: recognition of their contributions at a national or international level achieving a positive reputation for UAA or the department.*

1.5 “SUSTAINED AND/OR CONTINUOUS” IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines “sustained and/or continuous” generally across the College.

The Department adopts that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

1.6 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the kind of external reviewers whose reviews will likely carry the most weight.

The Department adopts that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

2.0 PEER REVIEW IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 2.0 of the CAS FEGs spells out two options for the formation of peer-review committees: forming either a multi-disciplinary or a single-department committee. While reserving its right to reconsider its choice in the future, *The Department opts for a multi-disciplinary committee that, when possible, includes faculty from the following disciplines: Theatre/Dance, Music, and Art.*

3.0 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT

Section 3.0 of the CAS FEGs recognizes that expectations for service and research/creative activity should be commensurate with the proportion of workload that is allocated to these activities. Additionally, the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides general, college-wide criteria and values for teaching, service, and research or creative activity. The current section provides discipline-specific guidelines and values.

The UAA Department of Theatre & Dance subscribes to the principles of promotion and tenure as outlined by the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE). ATHE provides guidelines for most theatre positions, and it’s important to note that our faculty have assumed hybrid positions, combining elements of multiple positions to meet departmental needs.

This abbreviated list of what the candidate’s submitted materials should show is from ATHE’s Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. Faculty in the Department should show:

- **Production Expertise:** This demonstrates in a professional manner the candidate’s artistry, creativity, and organization and management skills; strengths in their area of specialization (i.e. lighting designer, costume designer, director, choreographer, vocal coach); knowledge of materials and methods in design and production; overall understanding of the theatrical process; safety procedures, regulations, and ethical

standards; knowledge of new technologies; knowledge of history, literature, history, analysis, period styles, etc.

- Personal and Process Skills: This demonstrates communication, collaborative, and supervisory and management skills; planning, procedural, and fiscal management skills.
- External recognition: Faculty should show evaluations by peers in the areas of specialization, such as outside work with other professionals, and evidence of other outreach activities such as seminars, conference presentations, publications, awards, honors, and reviews (though it should be noted that very few productions are currently reviewed in Anchorage).

3.1 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Although some faculty in the Department might have less teaching than others, all faculty who teach should meet the following standards and are encouraged to use some form of teaching that is highly valued by the College and Department.

In Theatre and Dance there are two forms of teaching which must be considered: formal and informal. Formal teaching would include traditional lecture and studio classes, seminars, labs, and independent studies. Informal teaching would include rehearsals and performance; working alongside students as a guest artist; advising, coaching, designing, and mentoring. Within this context it is expected that the candidate exemplifies the qualities of artistic excellence, collaboration, ethical integrity, as well as being an effective teacher. At UAA there is clearly crossover between teaching and creative assignments, which is to be expected in a department that defines production as the “heart” of its program.

3.1.1 Effectiveness in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for the foundation of effective teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.2 Continuing or Advancing Effectiveness in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description for continuing or advancing effectiveness of teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.3 Excellence in Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs provides a College-wide description of excellence in teaching. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.1.4 Highly-Valued Teaching in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad teaching activities that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects the breadth and depth of service expectations with the amount of time for service in a faculty member's workload.

All Department faculty who have service in their workload should be evaluated with the following standards and are encouraged to engage in a form of service that is valued by the College and Department.

While service is essential to the successful candidate, it is probably the most difficult to assess as it relates to UAA's Theatre & Dance program for the following reasons.

- 1) Theatre labs are held on Fridays when students are out of class. Sets and costumes are built with manpower and Fridays are the days when that manpower is available. Additionally, much of the work done by students in the shops involves chemicals, paints, and power tools, which translates to the need for supervision. These two factors combined often make it difficult for theatre faculty involved with the technical side of theatre to sit on traditional committees which typically hold meetings on Fridays which are convenient to the majority of other university faculty members.
- 2) Anchorage has a unique theatre community and each faculty member's relationship to local theatres may be defined differently in a professional sense. Some faculty members are not union members (AFTRA/SAG, AEA) and consequently will have an easier time of finding service opportunities within the local theatre community. Other faculty members may be union members as a proviso to their being hired at UAA and will find restrictions when it comes to working without a contract. In this same regard, goals of faculty members may vary. One faculty member may be in the position of helping a particular theatre grow, bringing attention to the university and providing additional creative outlets for students. Another faculty member may focus on helping local theatre grow as a profession overall, in part through union membership and education so as to create more paying job opportunities. Both of these goals serve a valuable function. While there are no resident union or commercial theatres operating in Anchorage (occasional visits by the Perseverance Theatre coming closest) it is important that students be instructed according to what they will encounter in the profession nationally, as opposed to one set of rules for the profession, while observing another set of rules for Anchorage. This disparity would also apply to members of the technicians' union (USITT) as well as the Designers union (USA). Union membership and the ethical constraints it can impose on a candidate must be given consideration just as it is in other disciplines, professional ethical guidelines must be adhered to, even though the lower forty-eight is 2000 miles away. Distance does not equate to a different set of rules.
- 3) There are community productions which may be regarded as service and it is up to the candidate to identify those projects and define in what ways those projects fall within the parameters of university service.
- 4) While all professors spend time in service to their students, that commitment is often inordinate within the performing arts. Developing artistic skills and coaxing out talent is often a time consuming prospect. Long hours are devoted to rehearsals for

productions, and faculty prepare students for auditions for graduate school and the profession, often some years after actually graduating from the institution. The faculty adheres to the idea that their responsibility to the artist does not end when that student graduates, but continues on until the student finds their way to their next stepping stone.

5) Volunteering in professionally related organizations outside the university (i.e. ACTF, ACDF, The Northwest Drama Conference, LDI, USITT, etc.), as well as committee work within the university and department (i.e. peer review, search committees, adjudication, etc.) also represent significant components of the candidate's portfolio.

3.2.1 Public, Professional, and University Service

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs defines College-wide expectations for public, professional, and University service. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.2. Service Appropriate to Rank

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes College-wide expectations for service as faculty rise in rank. The Department adopted that definition without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.2.3 Service Values in the Department

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs lists myriad forms of service that are highly valued in the College. The Department adopted that list without discipline-specific elaboration.

3.3 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs connects expectations for the dissemination of research or creative activity with the amount of time for such activity in a faculty member's workload. All Department faculty who have research/creative activity in their workload should be evaluated with the following departmental standards and are encouraged to engage forms of dissemination that are most valued by the College and Department.

Research for theatre professors is broken down into the two most traditional forms, that leading to publication, and that leading to creative production which can include dancing, choreography, acting, directing, designing, playwriting, stage management, technical direction, etc.

"The production of plays and performances and the study thereof constitute the discipline of theatre. In recognition of the artistic component of theatre, institutions of higher education include creative achievement as an official component for promotion and tenure consideration." (ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 3). NAST (the National Association of Schools of Theatre) states in their accreditation guidelines that "creative activity must be regarded as being equivalent to scholarly efforts and publication when the institution has goals and objectives for the preparation of theatre professionals in practice-oriented

specializations.” The Department specifically recognizes the equivalence of the products of traditional research and creative activity.

Evaluation must also be done in the context of the department’s overall goals. In the case of UAA’s Department of Theatre & Dance, those goals would include (1) the development of new talent; (2) training of theatre and dance artists for the profession or to teach; (3) preparation of students for graduate training; (4) opportunities for students to experience all aspects of theatre production; (5) service as a cultural resource to the university and state-wide community.

3.3.1 Generation and Dissemination of Disciplinary Knowledge

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance of dissemination, and the importance of departments defining the disciplinary standards for dissemination. The discipline-specific elaboration for Theatre and Dance research includes, but is not limited to, publication of books, journal articles, performance reviews, or authorship of original plays or screenplays, presentations at professional conferences, writing grants, and editing journals.

In preparing works for public exhibition, theatre artists and dancers meet the requirements of research and creative production as they create, collect, analyze, and synthesize data while working collaboratively with other artists. Documentation of these efforts which take place before and during the rehearsal period can include, but is not limited to, designs, drawings, models, photos, recordings, and prompt books, as well as interviews, reviews, and evaluations related to a production by qualified professionals.

3.3.2 Quality and Significance of Products, Artifacts, or Creative Work

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the importance given to the significance of the venue, the quality of disseminated products of research and creative activity, its impact, and its ability to gain recognition outside of the University of Alaska.

The Department adopted that description of the venue, the impact of the product, and the recognition by peers external to UAA.

3.3.3 Values for Research or Creative Products

Sections 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.2 of the CAS FEGs described a broad range of scholarly works, but that range is general and does not establish benchmarks or targets for the dissemination of research or creative activity. The current section, therefore, provides the benchmarks for the dissemination of research/creative activity in the Department, describing the benchmarks for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for faculty with research/creative activity in their workloads. The following are general guidelines. Although there are numerous ways that a faculty member can disseminate their work, show quality and significance of their work, and achieve increasing professional recognition outside of the University of Alaska, the following is one way.

3.3.3.1 Benchmark for promotion to Associate Professor

In the Department, Assistant Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under

the assumption of 20% research/creative activity – demonstrate recognition in the field outside of the university setting for their research and creative activity via some combination of products including, but not limited to, the following:

- Direction of a play or performance
- Lighting, set, costume, sound, automation, or projection design
- Writing an original play, film, screenplay, or adaptation
- Choreography or movement direction
- Fight choreography
- Devising an original production
- Performance of a role in a production
- Technical direction of a production
- Stage management of a theatre production
- Book (authored or edited)
- Refereed monographs
- Funded research proposals
- Refereed journal articles
- Articles/chapters in edited books
- Non-refereed monographs
- Non-refereed journal articles
- Reviews of productions, publications or presentations
- Reviews of electronic media
- Paper presented at a professional meeting or conference
- Newspaper editorials or articles on professional topics
- Editing a theatre or dance journal

3.3.3.2 Benchmark for promotion to Professor

In the Department, Associate Professors who stand for tenure and promotion should – under the assumption of 20% research -- demonstrate recognition of their research and creative activity at a national or international level achieving a positive reputation for UAA or the department via some combination of the items in 3.3.3.1 (above).

3.4 DEPARTMENTAL VALUE ON ACTIVITIES TO OBTAIN EXTRAMURAL FUNDING

The corresponding section of the CAS FEGs describes the value placed on extramural funding to support all areas of research, recognizing that funding opportunities differ across disciplines. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

4.0 EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS IN THE DEPARTMENT

In the corresponding section of the CAS FEGs the college stipulates that to be eligible for emeritus/emerita status, eligible faculty must have contributed sustained excellence across their years in the College to CAS or one of its departments. In addition, such faculty must receive the endorsement of their department. The Department adopted that description without discipline-specific elaboration.

This section describes for reviewers of faculty in the Department the various roles and positions that departmental faculty might hold. The section is offered so that reviewers better understand the nature of the service and creative works in Theatre and Dance.

ACTOR/ACTING INSTRUCTOR

A stage actor is an artist who studies a role in a play, builds a character based on the playwright's script and the stage director's concept, and then interprets that character in public performance. The actor may also be a creative participant in the developmental process in devised work where the performance is created with or without text. The responsibilities of the actor include rehearsing the play with the director and creative ensemble (which may include the dramaturge, music director, choreographer, fight coordinator, vocal coach, etc.) and performing the role in a public performance. Stage actors often also perform in media such as television and film. Although accomplished actors vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the actor includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in play analysis and character study, with the ability to explore, comprehend, and portray a variety of complex personalities.
2. Skilled in using the imagination and in storytelling and in interpreting diverse characters and roles.
3. Ability to portray emotional range and control and have presence in live performance.
4. Excellent vocal range, fluidity and control; knowledge of vocal anatomy and physiology and principles of sound production such as dynamic and tonal quality.
5. Skilled in vocal approaches to character and style and in stage dialects, verse and classic and contemporary dialogue.
6. Ability to effectively interpret the character through physical gesture, dance, stage combat, and movement with skills such as strength, flexibility, and stamina.
7. Ability to make effective use of costume in character interpretation.
8. Skilled in concentration, observation and physical relaxation techniques.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, from classic to contemporary genres.
2. Excellence in textual and structural analysis of characters and stories.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting and costume.
4. Knowledgeable about actor training methods such as Stanislavski, Strasburg, Meisner, Michael Chekhov, etc.
5. Knowledge of current performance trends including theories of acting and performance style.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
2. Excellence in working within the theatrical creative process, exhibiting promptness, preparedness, flexibility, and a responsible attitude toward the creative work.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

DIRECTOR/DIRECTING INSTRUCTOR

The stage director is an artist who is responsible for preparing a theatre production for public performance by researching, casting, rehearsing, staging, collaborating with designers and the production team, and managing the time and (in some cases) the budget. The director develops the stylistic interpretation of the drama unique to the production in collaboration with the acting and production ensemble. The production should be accessible to the audience. Though accomplished stage directors vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the stage director includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in play analysis and conceptualization and ability to articulate ideas in appropriate terms for actors, choreographers, musical directors, playwrights, dramaturgs, voice and movement directors, designers, and public relations staff.
2. The ability to develop over time a unique director's aesthetic that can be evidenced through a portfolio of creative work.
3. Skill at stage composition and picturization; ability to tell a story through effective staging and storytelling techniques.
4. Knowledge of movement, including period movement, for acting, dance, and stage combat, and the related spatial requirements.
5. Ability to demonstrate clarity of expression and to create a visual and aural atmosphere that illuminates the world of the play.
6. Ability to test the boundaries of language, form or style in the unique circumstances of production.
7. Ability to coach actors with various levels of expertise and to prepare them for effective performance experiences.
8. Understanding of the related production areas—choreography, stage voice and dialects, stage movement and combat, costume design, lighting design, sound design, stage rigging and pyrotechnics.
9. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association (AEA), the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), and the Society of American Fight Directors (SAFD).

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual

and structural analysis of scripts.

2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting and directing techniques, visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, and costume.
3. Knowledge of the history of art (artists, historic styles, and genres), architecture, and decor.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history.
5. Knowledge of current performance trends including performance studies and theories of acting and directing.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills to secure sensitive translation of directorial concepts into effective productions.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings
3. Knowledge and application of fiscal management skills.
4. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
5. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
6. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

PLAYWRIGHT

The playwright is the artist who writes the play, which serves as the foundation for the exploration and performance by the creative ensemble. Playwrights may also collaborate with the stage director, dramaturge, designers and actors in developing the playscript. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiencies typically required of a playwright includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Advanced technical skills in dramatic construction.
2. A deep understanding and demonstrated ability to use theories and methods of script analysis, criticism, and dramaturgy in the development of theatrical and dramatic works.
3. Possessing careful and insightful observation of human behavior and interaction.
4. Skills in researching and expertise in storytelling.
5. Ability to write illuminating dialogue and effective action.
6. Ability to develop engaging characters and complex character interactions.
7. In developing a script in collaboration with the creative ensemble, flexibility and ability to effectively handle feedback to make positive change in the developing the playscript.
8. Ability to connect with an audience through the embodied script.
9. The ability to develop a work from concept to finished product.

B. Literature and History

1. A working knowledge of theatre history and theory and various ways each may influence the creative process
2. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
3. Excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.

FIGHT CHOREOGRAPHER/ FIGHT DIRECTOR

The fight director (or fight choreographer) is a movement specialist who has particular expertise in stage combat and who is responsible for teaching and coaching those special skills and collaborating on performances for scenes involving combat or stage violence. Teaching activities may involve (but are not limited to) (1) fundamentals and practice of stage movement (anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation and alignment, breath, balance, strength); (2) a wide variety of movement techniques; (3) textual analysis and interpretation; (4) development of stage presence; (5) group ensemble techniques; (6) stage combat skills; (7) creating character or style through gesture and physicalization; and (8) physical stamina and safety. Coaching activities may involve, but are not limited to: (1) working with director and production staff to design staging and physical elements of a production; (2) coaching performers (individuals or groups) to fulfill the physical demands of the production; (3) coaching performers in textual analysis and application to the performance; (4) coaching movement demands of the production; (5) coaching performers in effective technique which maintains or develops the strength and stamina of the body and ensures the safety of the actor in meeting those demands, (6) providing a resource for period styles of movement and dance; (7) professional consultations with individuals and professional organizations seeking training in specific movement techniques.

Though accomplished fight directors and choreographers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the movement specialist/fight director includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Fundamental knowledge of anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation techniques, and body alignment.
2. Fundamental knowledge of movement systems as demonstrated through study with various recognized stage movement/stage combat practitioners and institutions devoted to

the study of stage movement.

3. Knowledge of other approaches to performance (including stage acting, dance, and vocal performance), physical approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation, stage movement design and its application to theatrical or musical production.
4. Knowledge of training methods in stage combat including unarmed combat and various weapons.
5. Knowledge of recorded materials from film, television and electronic media.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for designing stage movement or combat and/or coaching of productions.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and physical theatre techniques.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

MUSICAL THEATRE SPECIALISTS

The area of musical theatre is a prime example of an area where “blended” specialties predominate, requiring a unique combination of expertise. Job descriptions for musical theatre faculty may fall into several categories. The most common ones are: musical theatre director/actor, choreographer/dance, or voice coach/conductor or music director. Faculty teaching musical theatre will necessarily understand all three areas of music, voice and dance and there will often be some crossover in proficiency. It is the rare individual who will have equal expertise in all three areas. Furthermore, a faculty member who specializes in musical theatre needs to have a solid background in musical theatre performance and be skilled at curricular organization, assessment (academic and creative) and constructive mentorship of students.

MUSICAL THEATRE DIRECTOR/ACTOR

The musical theatre stage director is an artist who is responsible for preparing a musical theatre production for public performance by researching, casting, rehearsing, staging, collaborating with designers and the production team, and managing the time and budget. The musical theatre director develops the stylistic interpretation of the performance unique to the production in collaboration with the acting and production ensemble. The production should illuminate the work of the playwright/librettist and composer and be accessible to the audience. The musical theatre actor is an actor with specialized training and expertise for performance in the musical theatre genre. The specialist pages for Actor and Director outline the fundamental production expertise, knowledge base and administrative skills expected of the musical theatre actor and director. For faculty who are specialists in musical theatre, the range of proficiency typically required includes additional proficiencies such as:

A. Production Expertise

1. The ability to perform and/or direct and teach the acting style found in traditional musical theatre as well as the evolving performance styles of the contemporary musical theatre.
2. The ability to connect scenes of spoken word, music expression and dance/movement illustration into an integrated coherent storytelling performance.

B. Literature and History

1. The unique history and development of the musical theatre genre including the contributions of opera, operetta, ballad opera, vaudeville etc.
2. An understanding of music theory, song structure, story through song, vocal capabilities, instrumentation, and music genres.
3. Knowledge of historical and stylistic dance genres.
4. Knowledge of vocal repertoire for all ranges of singers.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Understand the professional musical theatre market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
2. Overall excellence from the musical stage director and actor requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above (along with the knowledge outlined in the director and actor specialist pages). Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the musical theatre actor/director may be available through the ATHE focus groups in Acting, Directing, and Musical Theatre/Dance.

CHOREOGRAPHER

A choreographer is an artist who is responsible for creating original works of choreography sometimes in collaboration with additional artistic collaborators for public performance.

A. Production Expertise

1. Significant competency in performing in multiple forms of dance, including but not limited to: ballet, tap, jazz, modern, folk and contemporary forms.
2. The ability to choreograph for, teach, train and adapt to performers at various levels of expertise, including those with little or no dance training and of all ages.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of the history and development of dance as a performance genre.
2. The history of multiple forms of dance utilized in traditional and contemporary styles.
3. Knowledge of major choreographers and their unique styles and contributions.

C. Administration

1. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with designers and performers in a variety of professional and academic settings.
2. Understand the professional dance market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

PERFORMER - DANCE

A dance performance artist is an artist who investigates movement phrases set by a choreographer and then interprets those phrases in public performance. The dance performance artist may also be a creative participant in the developmental process in devised work where the choreography is created in collaboration or with other arts-based collaborators. The responsibilities of the dance performance artist include rehearsing the choreography with the choreographer and/or other collaborators and performing the role in a public performance. Dance performance artists often also perform in media such as television and film.

Although accomplished dance artists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the dancer includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. The ability to explore, comprehend, and embody a variety of choreographic styles.
2. Skilled in using the imagination in interpreting diverse choreographic styles.
3. Presence in live performance.
4. Excellent movement range, fluidity and control; knowledge of anatomy and physiology and principles of sound technique quality.

5. Ability to effectively interpret the choreography through physical gesture, dance and movement with skills such as strength, flexibility, coordination and stamina.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of the history of various dance styles and choreographic genres.
2. Knowledgeable about dance training methods across a range of techniques such as ballet, modern the various jazz genres, tap and world culture dance.
3. Knowledge of current performance trends including theories of movement and performance style.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Understand the professional dance market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
2. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with performance.

MOVEMENT SPECIALIST

The movement specialist is an artist who is responsible for training and coaching students and/or professional performers in the use of the physical body for theatre performance. The movement specialist's job is to foster artistic growth, personal freedom, and safe and respectful exploration of the physical components of communication, and effective, efficient motion. Within his or her own unique expertise, specialists practice creativity and freedom of expression; empower students/clients, themselves and the organization; promote research into related fields. To achieve these objectives movement specialists will employ reasonable and accepted practices such as: visual demonstration and modeling, physical contact, written text, observation, and discussions that foster understanding.

The movement specialist's work with students/performers in production includes, but is not limited to: (1) Collaborating with the director and production staff to design a unique physical life for a production and a work process for the movement coach and or choreographer; (2) Creating a process for the performing artist in which they create, enter and inhabit the internal and external elements of a performance space; (3) Assisting in the ability of a physical instrument to maintain freedom from tension, vivid expression, a released and aligned vertical silhouette, and remain responsive to the world of the script while demonstrating specific physical character dynamics implementing the imagination; (4) Coaching the physical and experiential crafting of a specific character life involving physical, vocal, and experiential choices that are related to the character, not the performer, including: rhythm, tempo, styles, strength and articulate character definition, and choreography; and (5) Developing a warm up process specifically designed to address the demands of the rehearsal period and the production.

The movement specialist may also be engaged in: (1) Consultations with professional artists, teachers, and other professionals from all walks of life in the public sector; (2) Direction and/or

creation of dramatic works, performance pieces of original work; (3) Teaching of other approaches to performance including: acting, musical theatre, singing or performing in film, television or broadcast media, vocal approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation; and (4) Research and scholarship including, but not limited to, historical investigations, pedagogical advances, and performance reviews. Though accomplished movement specialists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the movement specialist includes:

Production Expertise

1. Fundamental knowledge of physical training pedagogies as demonstrated through study with various recognized physical training practitioners and institutions devoted to the study of physical pedagogies. Movement specialists will often have received training in multiple approaches to the discipline. A few examples of these training methods are: dance, tai chi, yoga, period styles, combat, physical comedy, acrobatics, mime, mask, clown, or any one of many body use or movement techniques or approaches: Lecoq, Decroux, Bartenieff, Laban, Michael Chekhov, Alexander, Feldenkrais, Meyerhold, Suzuki, Pilates, Williamson, Bioenergetics, *Commedia dell'Arte*, Improvisation, Martial Arts, Viewpoints, and RasaBoxes.

2. The movement specialist employs practices that assist with appropriate self-use and mechanical issues concerning the body (the instrument). These issues range from general care to corrective work. The movement specialist/teacher works with the development of the intuitive and kinesthetic understanding of the performer. A movement specialist will devise a process for creating an articulate body that demonstrates technical proficiency, full physical commitment and ease along with the integration of physical skills. This may include but is not limited to:

- A) Examination of the muscles and the skeletal aspects of the body to foster optimum alignment, which is the ability to maintain a vertical silhouette within the body that demonstrates ease and radiates an engagement with the self and with the environment.
- B) Tension release to facilitate ease of motion and the technical proficiency of the body.
- C) Understanding of the process of respiration that supports all physical processes.
- D) Teaching of movement skills and/or dance pedagogy to increase strength, flexibility, control, articulate self-use, and as elements of improvisation.
- E) Addressing physical mannerisms as they affect the student/client.
- F) Clarity and specificity in the physical shaping of movement dynamics.
- G) Physical definition of character – training the body to be emotionally and physically connected to the specifics of the text.
- H) Styles training – the ability to inhabit a physical and experiential reality other than one's own, including styles that may range from *Commedia dell'Arte* and Restoration manners to twenty first century dance.

3. A movement specialist will assist the student/performer in the exploration of the body as an expressive tool of the creative imagination. This may include but is not limited to:

- A) Teaching physical articulation and the use of the body as an instrument of perception and expression facilitating the transformation of the body.
- B) Developing the ability to externalize and communicate the character's goals/objectives and inner state through movement, with or without text.
- C) Increasing the powers of concentration, observation, and sensitivity to others; and applying these skills to working collaboratively in groups.
- D) Assisting in the achievement of attaining the skill, confidence and freedom of expression required to play diverse characters and to convincingly convey differences of age, physical condition, class position, historical period, and emotional attitude.

B. Literature and History

- 1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
- 2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for designing stage movement and/or coaching of productions.
- 3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and physical theatre techniques.
- 4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.

C. Administration

- 1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
- 2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
- 3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
- 4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

VOICE SPECIALIST

1 These guidelines incorporate definitions and standards established by VASTA (Voice and Speech Trainers Association) in its document "Promotion, Tenure, and Hiring Resources," 2002. www.vasta.org/publications/promotion_tenure_hiring/PTH_Resources.pdf

The voice specialist is an artist who is responsible for training and coaching students and/or professional performers in the use of the voice and dialects for theatre performance. The voice and speech trainer's job involves (but is not limited to) teaching student and/or professional performers, coaching students and/or professional actors for performance, consultations with professional voice users in the public sectors. Teaching activities may involve (but are not limited to) (1) fundamentals and practice of voice production (vocal anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation and alignment, breath, pitch and resonance, tone and speech, dynamic

control); (2) singing technique; (3) textual analysis and interpretation; (4) public speaking and presentation skills; (5) group speaking techniques; (6) vocal extremes; (7) accent modification; (8) dialect acquisition, (9) voice and speech for stage, film or broadcast media, (10) creating character or style through voice and speech; and (11) vocal health.

Coaching activities may involve, but are not limited to: (1) working with director and production staff to design vocal elements of a production; (2) coaching performers (individuals or groups) to fulfill the vocal demands of the production - audibility and intelligibility as well as vocal dynamics, group speaking or other special demands of the production; (3) coaching performers in textual analysis and application to the performance; (4) providing dialect resources and coaching performers to speak with accents appropriate to the demands of the play; (5) coaching performers in effective technique which maintains or screaming and shouting; (6) providing a resource for pronunciation of unusual terms and names as well as textual and language analysis and research; (7) professional consultations with individual professional voice users seeking voice, speech or communication training for their employees, or professional organizations seeking training in specific voice or speech techniques. Though accomplished voice specialists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the voice director/coach includes:

Production Expertise

1 For more detailed information, please refer to VASTA's document, *Guidelines for the Preparation of Voice and Speech Teachers*, adopted and amended the summer of 1995

1. Fundamental knowledge of vocal anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation techniques, principles of sound production (such as dynamics and tonal quality), vocal health, acoustic and perceptual training. 2. Fundamental knowledge of voice and speech systems as demonstrated through study with various recognized voice and speech practitioners and institutions devoted to the study of voice and speech.

3. Knowledge of other approaches to performance (including stage acting, singing or performing in film, television or broadcast media), vocal approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation, public address and interview skills, vocal design and its application to theatrical or musical production.

4. Specialized skills may include phonetics systems and the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), dialect acquisition, accent modification, vocology, singing, verse drama, narration, voiceover and broadcast media, vocal extremes such as shouting and screaming, vocal direction for theatre, nonwestern vocal traditions such as keening, chanting, overtone singing.

5. Knowledge of recorded materials (such as samples of dialects, character voices, vocal styles) from film, television and electronic media.

Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.

2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for vocal design and/or coaching of production.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and stage voice techniques.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

DESIGNERS

1 These descriptions are modeled on “USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines,” 2000, pages 1215 properties, puppets, projections, etc.

Theatre productions require a team of designers who work with the director to create the aural and visual world of the play. Listed below are the primary categories of designers but productions may also utilize special designers to create such elements as stage properties, puppets, projections, etc.

COSTUME DESIGNER

The costume designer is an artist who designs the costumes that enhance a given production in general and characterization in particular. The designs should also enhance or harmonize with the other visual elements such as scenery and lighting. The range of proficiency typically required of a costume designer includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in creating sketches, renderings and drawings in various media.
2. Knowledge and ability to manipulate the elements of design.
3. Knowledge of the materials and methods of costume construction, including fabrics, pattern development, fitting, tailoring, etc.
4. Knowledge of movement for acting, dance, and stage combat and the related requirements of costumes.
5. Knowledge of fabric modification, including dyeing, painting, lamination, and distressing.
6. Knowledge of techniques in makeup, hair, wigs, and masks.

7. Knowledge of safety procedures and regulations as they apply to costume construction.
8. Understanding of the related production design areas—scenic design, lighting design, makeup design.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in textual analysis of scripts.
3. Knowledge of historical dress, including ethnic dress and accessories, nonwestern and unique theatrical costume, Western theatrical costume, and differing national styles of historic dress.
4. Knowledge of historic textiles and decoration.
5. Knowledge of art history as it relates to dress.
6. Knowledge of social and popular history, including period manners and movement.
7. Knowledge of the history of makeup, hair, wigs and masks.
8. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication.
2. Ability to work and collaborate with various artists, technologists, and technicians, many of whom may be unskilled students with various levels of experience.
3. Excellence in fiscal management, including budget development and material acquisition.
4. Ability to oversee the technical execution of costumes.
5. Knowledge of studio and wardrobe personnel management and scheduling as needed in planning for productions.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

LIGHTING DESIGNER

The lighting designer is an artist who designs the theatrical lighting for productions. Theatrical lighting should express the lighting designer's visual interpretation of the production and support, reinforce and enhance the artistic statements of the other members of the production team. Lighting is a combination of artistic work and technical knowledge and ability. Traits exhibited by individuals usually include both of these areas, but in wide variance. Many excellent lighting designers know or attribute little importance to technical details leaving that work to electricians. Other lighting designers have a highly technical background and organize many or all of the technical details themselves, considering that to be an important part of the lighting design process. The range of proficiency typically required of the lighting designer includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Ability to communicate design intent verbally and to also use devices such as story boards, overlays to renderings, sketches, lighting lab demonstrations, etc.
2. Knowledge of the theories and behavior of light (e.g., optics, reflection, refraction, etc.)
3. Knowledge of color theory in both light and pigment.
4. Technical knowledge of current lighting equipment and the ability to apply this technology to a given production.
5. Knowledge of theories on the psychological perception of light.
6. Ability to interpret theatrical movement, speech, and song in terms of light.
7. Knowledge of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to lighting design.
8. Knowledge of safety codes and regulations affecting lighting.
9. Knowledge of energy conservation methods appropriate to lighting.
10. Basic knowledge of the use of light as a design element in other media, such as film, television, and architecture.
11. Abilities in hand and/or computerized drafting.
12. Understanding of the related production design areas—scenery, costume, makeup, and sound.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and the textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting and costumes.
3. Knowledge of art history (artists, historic styles, and genres), especially in the use of light.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication needed to describe the sensitive translation of the design ideas into a theatrical reality.
2. Ability to work and collaborate with various artists and technicians with various levels of experience.
3. Ability to oversee the technical execution and operation of lighting in production.
4. Excellence in the development and management of budgets for lighting equipment and personnel.
5. Knowledge of lighting personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher-level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

SCENIC DESIGNER

The scenic designer is an artist who designs scenery (and often properties) that enhance a given production. The scenery should visually express the stylistic interpretation of the drama unique to the production. It should meet the needs of the actors and the director (and sometimes dancers and choreographers) by allowing for appropriate staging and dance spaces, both within the scene and from scene to scene. Further, the setting should complement and integrate with the other visual elements of the production such as costumes and stage lighting. Though accomplished scenery designers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the scenic designer includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in recording and simulating the his/her intentions for the setting in sketches, story boards, renderings, or scale models; drafting of plans and sections; execution of painter's elevations; scheduling and listing equipment and material selection; and painting to reflect the collaborative choices made by the production team.
2. Knowledge about the impact of color, line, shape, texture, movement, and composition, and demonstrated excellence in manipulating these design elements.
3. Knowledge of the materials and methods of scenic construction, rigging and shifting, properties, and scenic painting.
4. Knowledge of movement for acting, dance, and stage combat, and the related spatial requirements.
5. Understanding of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to scenic design.
6. Understanding of the related production design areas—costume design, lighting design, and sound design.
7. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, and costume.
3. Knowledge of the history of art (artists, historic styles, and genres), architecture, and decor.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills to secure sensitive translation of designs into workable scenery.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings

3. Knowledge of fiscal management of scenic production, acquisitions, and maintenance.
4. Ability to assess the accurate technical execution and operation of the scenic elements of the production.
5. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

SOUND DESIGNER

The sound designer is an artist whose primary responsibility is designing sound for the theatre to enhance a given production. The sound should aurally express the stylistic interpretation unique to the production. Though accomplished sound designers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the sound designer includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in the sharing of ideas and concepts in the artistic arena with other artistic staff (i.e., director, other designers, dramaturge, etc.).
2. Ability to collaborate with artistic staff and support the direction of the production within an aural environment. Ability to share sound design ideas with others through both verbal and aural means.
3. Knowledge and ability to manipulate current audio technology and systems, both reinforcement and recording/playback.
4. Knowledge of technology and system analysis and equipment assembly processes for both reinforcement and recording/playback.
5. Knowledge of acoustics and spatial effects on acoustics.
6. Knowledge of psycho-acoustics and the effects of sound in a human environment.
7. Knowledge of basic rigging, electrical, and electronic techniques/technologies as related to sound design.
8. Understanding of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to sound design.
9. Understanding of the related production design areas—costume design, lighting design, and scenery design.
10. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production.
3. Knowledge of music history and music genres.
4. Understanding of basic musical composition principles.
5. Knowledge of economic and social history.

6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral, written and aural communication skills needed to secure sensitive translation of designs into reality.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technologists in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Knowledge of fiscal management of audio production, acquisitions, and maintenance.
4. Ability to assess the accurate technical execution and operation of the aural elements of the production.
5. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.

STAGE MANAGER / PRODUCTION MANAGER

1 This description is modeled on the “USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines,” 2000, pg. 17. Those charged with evaluating the work of design and production professionals should expect to address appropriate issues including the following when assessing stage managers and production managers. Stage managers practice a discipline in which their creative achievement is devoted to enabling and implementing a theatrical work of art. Theatre is a collaborative art involving the contribution of writers, actors, directors, designers, technicians and an audience. Stage management is the component of this process responsible for the interaction of all these participants, both on the artistic and the human plane.

The process of planning, rehearsing and performing a theatrical work of art is a paradigm for group activity, the equivalent in the theatre field to traditional research. Successful work requires collaborative efforts from faculty and students. The disciplines of stage and production management are central to this process. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiencies typically required of a stage manager or production manager includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Understanding scenic, costume, lighting and sound design practices.
2. Ability to interpret designer’s renderings, models and/or sketches and to communicate effectively with all members of the design and production team regarding:
3. Resources of time and/or funds to accomplish project
4. Computer resources to support production process as appropriate (scheduling, spreadsheets, database, etc.)
5. Materials commonly used in scenic construction and their safe use.
6. Safe handling procedures for scenic equipment and materials used in scenic construction

7. Safe stage operations and stage maintenance, including stage rigging and machinery, stage lighting equipment, and stage audio equipment.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and demonstrated excellence in textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of theatrical production history, with emphasis on elements of scenery, properties, lighting, costumes and sound.
3. Knowledge of art history, especially architecture and decor, and understanding of how designers use such knowledge.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Responsible and adaptable communication with an ability to handle and coordinate diverse groups of artistic personalities with tactful discipline and a sense of humor.
2. Establishing a creative environment by combining the ability to anticipate, prioritize, and solve problems with calm sensitivity and grace under pressure.
3. Demonstrated success in collaborative accomplishment in important work with artists of the contemporary American theatre.
4. Competence in higher levels of planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.

TECHNICAL DIRECTOR

1 This description is modeled on the "USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines," 2000, pg. 16. The technical director is an artisan/scholar/teacher charged with directing the technical aspects of a theatre's production operation. The technical director typically oversees the work of staff, student, and volunteer technicians, and sometimes student designers. Thus, the technical director must be evaluated as both a practicing technician and an administrator. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth or knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the technical director includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Knowledge of theatrical, scenic, costume, lighting and sound design practices.
2. Ability to effectively translate the designer's renderings, models and/or sketches into practical stage settings, commonly requiring the following:
3. Skill in communicating technological solutions, including technical drafting, sketching, model building.
4. Knowledge of the materials commonly used in scenic construction, the strengths of these materials and their safe use.
5. Skill in the various methods of scenic construction, including plastics fabrication, metalworking, carpentry, and cabinetwork.
6. Knowledge of the safe handling procedures for scenic equipment, hand and power tools, and materials used in scenic construction.
7. Skill in using computer software to support the production process as appropriate

(spreadsheets, database, CAD, etc.).

8. Skill in stage operations and stage maintenance, including stage rigging and machinery, stage lighting equipment, and stage audio equipment.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in the textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, sound, and costumes.
3. Knowledge of the history of art, especially architecture and decor, and understanding of how designers use such knowledge.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).