UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

_Approved_____   Date:_August 2014
T. Bart Quimby, Interim Dean
College of Engineering

approved by Provost to use criteria for reviews   Date: August 25, 2014
Dr. Elisha Baker, Provost
University of Alaska Anchorage

2013

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

These criteria are intended to be used for the periodic evaluation of tenure track and tenured faculty of the College of Engineering. They are also intended to be applied to the evaluation of faculty for promotion and the award of tenure. The guidelines should also provide a solid ground for making decisions for initial appointment. The criteria are intended to generally apply to all departments and disciplines within the College of Engineering, subject to amendment by departments to accommodate circumstances which are unique to specific departments. As such, these criteria are intended to serve as a general standard which individual departments may adjust to their unique needs subject to normal review, approval and incorporation. This document contains the definitions for faculty evaluation criteria and corresponding procedures. This document also describes the procedure for selection of the Peer Review Committee unless otherwise superseded by the COENG Bylaws.

In June 2012, UAA adopted a set of guidelines for the evaluation of faculty (Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, FEG). The UAA FEG document comprehensively reviews virtually all aspects of the faculty evaluation process, and is herewith adopted by the College of Engineering and incorporated in its entirety by reference here as part and parcel of College of Engineering faculty evaluation policy. Questions that may arise regarding procedure, philosophy of review process and mentoring, application of standards, etc., are addressed in the FEG and are not restated explicitly here. The faculty are relied upon to inform themselves of the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and its provisions. All faculty are therefore encouraged to develop a detailed working knowledge of the FEG as well as of other guidance documents such as the UAA Faculty Handbook, Regent's Policy and the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

References to professional activities, work products, accomplishments and other evaluative elements are inclusive of all College of Engineering departments. While the policy stated here provides a College of Engineering–wide structure for the review of faculty, individual academic departments, in addressing circumstances unique to a discipline, may require discipline-specific amendments to these criteria. Any such amendment shall be subject to the normal review and approval processes and approval cycles. Departments are encouraged to periodically review these criteria so as to improve the overall objective of effective faculty mentoring, review and professional growth. If negotiated bargaining unit agreements or University policies are in conflict with these guidelines, the agreements and University policies shall take precedence.

Philosophy of Peer Review

The College of Engineering fosters collegiality and cooperation in support of all faculty. To this end, these criteria are intended to provide a clear pathway for long-term success through clearly established criteria for periodic evaluation. Faculty are objectively evaluated using these criteria for professional advancement leading to the fulfillment of long-term and mutually beneficial relationships. To this end, it shall be the policy of the College to encourage mentoring of all faculty, whether they be untenured, tenured, adjunct or term faculty, in the achievement of excellence in all that they do.

Terminal Degrees/Professional Qualifications

The customary terminal degree for most disciplines within the College of Engineering is the doctorate, which in many instances will be a Ph.D. When appropriately referenced in letters of hire provided upon initial appointment and subject to negotiation at that time, a degree other than the doctorate will be acceptable as a terminal degree. This is intended to provide a degree of flexibility to accommodate emerging disciplines within the College of Engineering for which the terminal degree may not commonly be the doctorate. It is anticipated nonetheless that over time the doctorate will become more common for those disciplines for which it is not now common.

Faculty Workloads

Tenure track faculty members of the College of Engineering are expected to function under a tripartite or bipartite workload agreement. The tripartite workload typically involves 60% teaching, 20% research/creative activity and 20% service. The bipartite workload typically involves 80% teaching, and 20% service. Variations in this distribution of teaching, service and research activities may occur annually as faculty undertake externally funded research, accept assigned administrative duties, and/or undertake other special project assignments.

REVIEW PROCESS

Overview and Approach

Over the course of a career, a candidate will pass through various reviews, some of them associated with promotion to a given rank. For those reviews which involve promotion in rank, the contents of the review files will be evaluated according to the criteria for the rank that the candidate is applying for. The university-wide faculty evaluation guidelines establish the terminology and overall standards for promotion in rank. The ranks are listed below with brief summaries of the relevant terminology and standards. This is followed by a discussion of the application of standards in the College of Engineering for the various types of reviews.

- Emeritus Professor. The attainment of this rank requires a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishments as well as meeting certain specific requirements for years of service at UAA.
- Distinguished Professor. The attainment of this rank represents a special achievement, and it involves action by the Board of Regents as well as the review process.
- Professor. The attainment of this rank reflects sustained, extensive, high-quality, and significant scholarly accomplishments with professional recognition.

- Associate Professor. The attainment of this rank reflects sustained, effective, high quality and significant scholarly accomplishments with promise of continued achievement and strength in at least one area of responsibility, with emerging professional recognition.
- Assistant Professor. The attainment of this rank reflects achievement or definite promise of continuing professional growth and high-quality and significant scholarly contributions.
- Instructor. The attainment of this rank reflects promise for sustained professional growth and development of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments.

It is apparent, but worth reiterating, that the standards for the ranks reflect an expectation of increasing accomplishment and success. As such, the context for the evaluation of any candidate's file at any stage does not depend on a static enumeration of specific achievements. The review includes the concept of progression through the career. Each candidate will have a different number of activities and achievements, of varying levels of quality, in each area of the candidate's workload. For the sake of clarity, assume that the typical candidate, beginning at whatever rank they are initially appointed to, performs at the level expected at that rank, and not above. Then the critical question in review is not a comparison of accomplishments in rank with some list of desiderata. The question is whether or not the candidate has made sufficient progress over the time in rank to meet the standards for promotion. Summarizing the standards for the ranks in very brief form, one might say:

- Instructor to Assistant: Having met the formal requirements for terminal degree, has the candidate gone from development of scholarship to continuing scholarship; and has the candidate gone from promise to definite promise or the start of actual attainment of these goals?
- Assistant to Associate: Has the candidate gone from promise or attainment of scholarship to sustained and effective scholarship; and has the candidate developed at least one area of strength; does the candidate exhibit emerging recognition?
- Associate to Professor: Are the candidate's scholarly accomplishments significant, sustained, and extensive; and has the candidate attained professional recognition?

Every candidate's accomplishments will differ. No single set of quantitative or qualitative measures alone can be applied by the peer review committee to establish whether a candidate is progressing successfully and merits promotion to a particular rank. However, the determination of success is not subjective. It is the candidate's responsibility to create a file which conforms to the guidelines given below. Careful, complete, credible documentation of the candidate's activities, accomplishments, work products, and other evidence of performance provide the factual basis needed by the committee for making its determination. Over the course of a successful career, the candidate's files, in succession, should be a comprehensive record of accomplishment, reflecting this progression: starting with scholarly promise, moving to sustained and effective scholarly accomplishment with one area of strength and emergent recognition, subsequently moving to sustained and extensive scholarly accomplishment with professional recognition.

Time in Rank

Consistent with University policy, a faculty member may submit a file and request a review for tenure in any year of service. However, he or she must be reviewed no later than the mandatory year of review, as specified in the hire letter. A faculty member evaluated for tenure prior to the mandatory year for review shall be evaluated on the basis of performance expectations that would exist at the time of mandatory tenure review. At the time of hire, a faculty member may negotiate up to three years of service from a prior institution to be counted toward their faculty service at the university. New faculty should be notified of this possibility by their hiring unit administrator. Any prior years of service which are subsequently granted should be documented in the faculty member's initial letter of appointment. The faculty member should present evidence of the credit for prior service and evidence of accomplishments during those years in the Full File for tenure and/or promotion.

Levels of Review

Files submitted by COENG faculty are reviewed at the following levels:

1. Tenured Department Director/Chair (as appropriate, UAFT faculty only)
2. COENG Peer Review Committee
3. Dean
4. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
5. Provost
6. Chancellor

Types of Review

- Annual Progression towards Tenure Review involves review levels 1 and 3.
  - Non-tenured, tenure track faculty members shall submit an Abbreviated File.
- Comprehensive 4th Year Review involves review levels 1 through 5.
  - Non-tenured, tenure track faculty members shall submit a Full File.
  - To be eligible, the faculty member shall meet the criteria for initial appointment to his or her current rank.
  - Review level 6 may be requested by the faculty member
- Tenure Review involves review levels 1 through 6.
  - Non-tenured, tenure track faculty members shall submit a Full File.
  - To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must present evidence of successful scholarship as specified in the applicant's workload agreements.
- Promotion Review involves review levels 1 through 6.
  - Non-tenured and tenured faculty members shall submit a Full File.

- To be eligible, the faculty member shall meet the criteria of initial appointment to the rank that she or he is seeking promotion to.
- Post-tenure Review (non-comprehensive) involves review levels 1 through 3 (UAFT faculty only).
  - Tenured faculty members shall submit an Abbreviated File.
- Comprehensive 6th Year Post-tenure Review involves review levels 1 through 3, unless review at any level is negative in which case review continue through level 5.
  - Tenured faculty members shall submit an Abbreviated File covering the preceding six years.
  - To meet the standard, the faculty member shall meet the criteria for initial appointment to his or her current rank.
  - Review level 6 may be requested by the faculty member
- Professor Emeritus Review involves review levels 1 through 6.
  - Follow the procedure outlined in the University-wide faculty evaluation guidelines.
- Distinguished Professor Review involves review levels 1 through 6 plus University of Alaska President and Board of Regents' approval.
  - Follow the procedure outlined in the University-wide faculty evaluation guidelines.

Review Timeframe and Schedule

For all mandatory reviews, at the beginning of each academic year the Dean will notify each faculty member who is to be reviewed. The notification will be in writing and will specify the type of review that is required.

The review steps, sequence, and schedule are defined by the UAA timeframe for each academic year.

Files for Review

In keeping with the university-wide faculty evaluation guidelines, the College of Engineering defines contents of "full" and "abbreviated" files consistent with the specifications given in the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Furthermore, it requires that candidates for promotion, tenure, and other reviews, prepare files with binder tabs that clearly identify and separate the different items listed.

Full File

A full file should contain the following tabs:
- Findings and Recommendations

- Table of Contents
- **Section I**
  - Initial Letter of Appointment (if necessary)
  - Curriculum Vitae
  - Verification of Degree
  - Workload Agreements
  - Activity Reports
- **Section II**
  - Self-Evaluation
- **Section III**
  - Teaching
    - Student Evaluations
    - Syllabi
    - Examples of Teaching Materials
    - Examples of Student Work
    - Other (as appropriate)
  - Research and Creative Activity
    - Examples of Products
    - Documentation of Activity
    - Other (as appropriate)
  - Service
    - Examples of Service Products
    - Letters of Appointment or Thanks
    - Other (as appropriate)
- **Section IV**
  - External Reviews (as appropriate)
  - Internal Reviews (as appropriate)
  - Letters of Reference

In addition to this list, please note required items as per the relevant collective bargaining agreement and the UAA FEG.

The list of tabs given above includes items such as student evaluations—which are standard and uniform across the university and do not require further definition. The list also includes items which require further elaboration. These items are repeated below with additional description.

Contents of the File

Contents of the file should be limited to the period under review and be of a reasonable size.

However the CV should reflect the candidate's entire career.

Teaching

Examples of Teaching Materials
Typical examples of teaching materials would include: tests; homework problems/questions and solutions/answers; project specifications and grading guidelines; lecture materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentations); lab manuals; and documentation of examples, models, templates or other discipline-specific artifacts created for teaching purposes. Because the university-wide guidelines now encourage digital files, it would be possible to include video of presentations, animations, simulations, or any other documentation which can be digitized, not excluding customary, static, textual documentation. This list is intended to be illustrative, not all-inclusive. Any work done by the candidate as part of the candidate's teaching responsibilities, which the candidate deems significant and relevant to a clear presentation of the candidate's review, is eligible for inclusion.

Examples of Student Work
Typical examples of student work would include: test papers; research papers; presentations (e.g., PowerPoint presentations); program code; design documentation (e.g., blueprints, diagrams, flowcharts, or any other discipline-specific means); technical reports; and photographs or other non-textual documentation of physical artifacts. Because the university-wide guidelines now encourage digital files, it would be possible to include video of presentations, animations, simulations, or any other documentation which can be digitized, not excluding customary, static, textual documentation. This list is intended to be illustrative, not all-inclusive. Any student work done as part of the candidate's teaching responsibilities, which the candidate deems significant and relevant to a clear presentation of the candidate's review, is eligible for inclusion.

Other (as appropriate)
Because the contents of the items given above are not comprehensive, the candidate always has the option of including other tabs for other significant, teaching related documentation. For example, perhaps the candidate has been involved in curriculum revision or development at the departmental or institutional level, or perhaps the candidate has participated in workshops, seminars, symposia, conferences, etc., the purpose of which and the effect of which was to change the candidate's teaching philosophy, methods, course content, etc. As above, this is intended not as an exhaustive list, but as an example. Anything which the candidate believes is significant and relevant to teaching, beyond teaching materials and student work, can be included in this section.

Research and Creative Activity

Examples of Products
Typical products of research and creative activity would include: books; journal papers; conference papers; technical reports; invited presentations; posters; and non-confidential intellectual property disclosures and patents. In cases where publication success was not or has

not yet been achieved, evidence of activity would include: documentation of submissions; and white papers—namely research products which remain internal to the institution. As with teaching materials, a digital file would support the inclusion of non-traditional products of research and creative activity. This might include video materials; Web publication, whether textual or one or more other media; mobile device apps. As above, this is intended not as an exhaustive list, but as an example. Anything which the candidate believes is a significant product of research and creative activity may be included. It is the candidate's responsibility to select and present documentation in such a way to best support the candidate's review.

Documentation of Activity
Typical activities which may be documented include: grant or contract proposals prepared and submitted, and in the case of successful proposals, projects managed and responsibilities involved; book prospectuses prepared and submitted, and in the case of successful prospectuses, documentation of progress on the manuscript, and progress on the publisher's schedule; papers written and submitted to journals, conferences, or other publication venues (in the case of successful submissions, the end result would be documented above under "Examples of Products"); and Intellectual property disclosures – when these lead to provisional or full patent applications, progress on the patent application process. As above, this is intended not as an exhaustive list, but as an example.

Other (as appropriate)
With the proliferation of digital forums and electronic media, many modern scholarly activities may not fall exactly within the categories listed above. Anything which the candidate believes is a significant research and creative activity may be included. It is the candidate's responsibility to select and present activities and documentation in such a way to best support the candidate's review.

Service

Examples can include: Public Service; Professional Service; Service to the Discipline; Craft, or Professional Field; and Service to the University.

Examples of Service Products
Typical products of service would include: committee reports; reviews of manuscripts; and reviews of applications. Any attempt to be exhaustive would necessarily fail because the range of possible service activities is so broad. If any kind of service results in a work product that can be textually or digitally documented, it may be included here.

Letters of Appointment or Thanks
Some forms of service may result in no concrete work product. In such cases, the best documentation may be letters of appointment or appreciation—items which confirm that service occurred and that peers or leaders judge the contribution to be significant.

Other (as appropriate)

The additional possibilities for documenting service are vast. The following example would not fall into the categories above. A candidate may mentor a student group in the development of a project, participation in a competition, etc. Not only is the mentoring a form of service in and of itself, the student group may achieve some notable success. Documentation of this derivative success would be a natural addition to the service component of a candidate's file. As with all of the categories already listed, anything which the candidate believes is a significant service accomplishment may be included. It is the candidate's responsibility to select and present activities and documentation in such a way to best support the candidate's review.

Abbreviated File

An abbreviated file should contain the following tabs:
- Curriculum Vitae
- Self-Evaluation
- Activity Reports
  Other (as appropriate)

In addition to this list, please note required items as per the relevant collective bargaining agreement and the UAA FEG.

Committee Work

The decision of the COENG Peer Review Committee to recommend or not recommend promotion, tenure, or progression towards tenure must be based on the Committee's review of the evidence presented in the candidate's file.

For UNAC-represented faculty, the COENG Peer Review Committee shall determine whether discussions will be open or closed to the public and/or the candidate. Votes to recommend or not recommend promotion, tenure, or progression towards tenure will be conducted in a closed session. These conditions are stipulated in Article 9.2.6.d of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UNAC and the University of Alaska.

The COENG Peer Review Committee will submit its completed review to the Dean of the College. The Dean will complete her or his review of the candidate's file, thus completing the College level review process. If the overall evaluation of a comprehensive post tenure review is satisfactory, the review proceeds no further and is complete. The files for comprehensive fourth-year, tenure and promotion will then be forwarded to the next level for review.

ASSESSING SCHOLARSHIP

The COENG faculty evaluation guidelines are in consonance with UAA's consideration of scholarship as a central pillar that supports the fulfillment of the mission of the University through creative intellectual work and high level of professional expertise. Scholarship is manifested in teaching, research and creative activity, professional practice, and service by taking

a number of forms that include discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation.

Scholarship in Teaching and Scholarship in Learning

It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following aspects in accordance with the workload agreement.

Instruction and Learning Experiences
- Teaching students in undergraduate/graduate courses, capstone courses, laboratories, projects, field experiences, or distance/web-based environments;
- Teaching participants in professional development courses, workshops, or seminars;
- Applying adequate management techniques to course, laboratory, or project teaching and learning (assignment, assessment, records, learning experiences);
- Using effective teaching and learning strategies;
- Providing community engaged learning opportunities; and/or
- Incorporating active learning and/or research experiences in the curriculum.

Librarianship
- Analyzing and selecting topical textbooks to be used in course teaching;
- Selecting and acquiring bibliographic or software resources to support curriculum;
- Cataloging and classifying teaching-related materials;
- Working with the Engineering Liaison Librarian to create and maintain bibliographic support systems;
- Designing bibliographies, web sites, and other research tools for teaching-related resources; and/or
- Developing and using specialized information systems.

Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources
- Authoring/creating new teaching material such as textbooks, laboratory manuals, projects, or software;
- Designing and implementing the material for new course, laboratory, or project curricula;
- Developing outcome-based curricula and assessment for new courses, laboratories, or projects;
- Designing new and varied delivery modes, including web-based and new media technologies; and/or
- Revising existing course, laboratory, or project curricula in terms of content and outcome-based design/delivery;

- Facilitating support of distributed education and independent learning; and/or
- Providing access to additional information resources in support of learning goals.

Mentoring Students
- Guiding and advising undergraduate and graduate students to achieve their academic goals and in career planning;
- Supporting and providing opportunities to students in their research and scholarship endeavors;
- Providing personalized, one-on-one instruction or tutoring;
- Designing, supporting, and guiding independent study opportunities; and/or
- Supervising research assistants and teaching assistants.

Advancing Teaching Excellence
- Mentoring colleagues in terms of their teaching pedagogy and methods;
- Consulting with colleagues on the selection and use of instructional tools, resources, and materials;
- Reviewing current literature and national standards in subject areas;
- Planning and contributing to professional development activities related to teaching;
- Designing and improving assessment methods;
- Conducting instructional and classroom inquiry;
- Implementing research ideas into teaching;
- Implementing ideas from professional development activities; and/or
- Using student feedback and self-reflection to enhance or change instructional practices.

Advancing Student Excellence
- Nominating students for scholarships and awards;
- Writing letters of recommendation for students wishing to expand their professional formation;
- Encouraging and facilitating participation of students in professional workshops, conferences, or symposia;
- Supporting students' professional accomplishments and corresponding dissemination of results, such as through Student Showcase, Undergraduate Research Grants, or presentations at professional conferences;
- Supporting and guiding student extracurricular professional work, such as student club activities; and/or
- Serving as member/chair of undergraduate or graduate theses, and honors, or capstone project committees.

Evaluation of Teaching Activities

The following information is intended as a general guide for candidates presenting their teaching activities and for the reviewers evaluating those activities. The quality and quantity of accomplishments are expected to increase with time in rank. The burden of evidence for demonstrating success before tenure or promotion to a higher rank rests with the candidate to present in the file. This list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted.

Instructor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of teaching, an instructor demonstrates capable teaching and **meets contractual obligations** by:
- Engaging
- Participating
- Performing
- Executing

Assistant Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of teaching, an assistant professor **responds and contributes** to identified educational needs primarily at the local level and takes action to improve his or her teaching effectiveness by:
- Conducting and facilitating
- Contributing to development
- Refining
- Improving
- Participating in professional development
- Sustained effectiveness in teaching

Associate Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of teaching, an associate professor **organizes, manages, and plays a key role** in accomplishing tasks to meet educational needs beyond local levels and implements effective teaching strategies by:
- Demonstrating, accomplishing
- Facilitating, revising, reviewing
- Organizing
- Delivering
- Mentoring other faculty
- Collaborating
- Sustained effectiveness in the scholarship of teaching

Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of teaching, a professor **identifies, initiates, and plays a leadership role** in developing solutions to meet educational needs at the highest levels and designs effective teaching strategies by:
- Initiating, leading
- Developing, innovating, identifying

- Effectively mentoring faculty
- Planning, organizing
- Establishing frameworks
- Collaborating
- Sustained record of excellence in teaching

Scholarship in Academic Research and Creative Activity

It is expected that academic research and creative activity will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following categories.

Conducting and Disseminating Academic Research:
- Conducting basic/fundamental and applied research and inquiry;
- Conducting community engaged or participatory action research;
- Conducting research for and writing specialty books, monographs, and textbooks (possibly incorporating research aspects);
- Writing book chapters;
- Editing books;
- Writing papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings;
- Presenting papers at professional meetings;
- Writing and disseminating white papers;
- Writing translations, abstracts, and reviews;
- Designing and writing computer software;
- Research activities not presently reflected in publications, presentations, or papers;
- Developing cases studies;
- Writing research reports
- Publishing in non-refereed journals;
- Developing, producing, and disseminating tools, technologies, or methods that enhance engineering practice;
- Participation in activities to develop research competencies;
- Involving undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research; and/or
- Conducting research that leads to the development of intellectual property and potential commercialization.

Producing and Performing Creative Works:
- Producing radio and television productions, films, and videos on engineering topics;
- Engaging in engineering competitions, commissions, and exhibitions;
- Creating and preparing software and electronically published documents;
- Developing electronic and print information resources that support the curriculum.

Developing and Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations:

- Developing and disseminating creative 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;
- Implementing pilot projects or advanced studies independently or in collaboration with colleagues;
- Participating in the supervision of student research or independent study, capstone projects;
- Mentoring of students that leads to the presentation of academic research and other creative works; and/or
- Developing non-traditional teaching activity, such as computer-based or computer-aided instruction.

Editing and Managing Creative Works:

- Fulfilling major editorial assignments with academic, disciplinary, and professional publications, including academic/specialty books, journals, newsletters, or electronic media; and/or
- Initiating or organizing scholarly conferences symposia, and other similar activities.

Leading and Managing Funded Research Programs, Contracts, and Creative Projects:

- Leading research projects or contracts, including multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative project task forces;
- Writing proposals to funding agencies (private, public, and internal);
- Preparing new or follow-on research proposals;
- Managing budgets of grants and contracts;
- Selecting and supervising staff;
- Preparing required reports; and/or
- Writing and managing the process of intellectual property disclosures.

Evaluation of Academic Research and Creativity Activities

Unless explicit statements governing the nature of academic research and creative activities have been adopted and approved, the following criteria are intended as a general guide for candidates presenting their research and creative activities and for the reviewers evaluating those activities. The quality and quantity of accomplishments are expected to increase with time in rank. The burden of evidence for demonstrating success before tenure or promotion to a higher rank rests with the candidate to present in the file. This list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted.

Assistant Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of research and creative activity, an assistant professor **responds and contributes** to identified research or creative activities by:
- Conducting, facilitating, and disseminating
- Making and disseminating quality and significant contributions
- Refining, improving
- Participating
- Growing professionally

Associate Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of academic research and creative activity, an associate professor **organizes, manages, and plays a key role** in accomplishing academic research by:
- Developing, proposing
- Making and disseminating high quality and highly significant contributions
- Organizing
- Mentoring
- Leading as principal investigator

Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of academic research and creative activity, a professor **identifies, initiates, and plays a leadership role within his or her field** in developing and/or influencing academic research or creative activities at the highest levels by:
- Leading, managing
- Initiating, developing, innovating, creating, disseminating
- Making and disseminating high quality and highly significant contributions
- Multi-disciplinary collaboration
- Establishing frameworks
- Leading among peers in the field of study

Scholarship in Service – Public, Professional, and University

Scholarship in public, professional, and University service can generally be demonstrated through the broad categories listed below. However, service activities within these categories can take a number of forms beyond those listed.

Public Service

Service to Society

Includes contributions to the community made by a faculty member utilizing their competence and skill in their profession, such as:

- Providing technical assistance, evaluation, consulting, professional advice, and support to the public;
- Collaborating or partnering with public institutions;
- Serving on public boards, task forces, or committees; and/or
- Developing and offering training or professional development workshops and other demonstrations or dissemination of professional methods or techniques.

Community Engaged Service

Includes activities that are distinguished by their focus on collaborative, jointly developed projects and that are designed to apply concepts, processes, or techniques to community identified issues, concerns, or problems, which result in community change and development. 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, this service activity may combine or alternatively be represented as an aspect of teaching, or within research and creative activity.

Professional Service

Professional service includes contributions by the faculty member engaged in professional service through use of their academic training, professional expertise, and experience to serve the discipline or society, while contributing to the institutional mission. The following are examples of professional service:
- Reviewing articles for publication or conference proceedings in the discipline;
- Reviewing proposals for funding from organizations, other universities or institutions;
- Performing editorial assignments for the discipline or professional publications;
- Participation and leadership in conferences, societies and associations related to the discipline, craft, or profession.
- Reviewing computer software or hardware; and/or
- Reviewing technical reports written in fulfillment of the provisions of research-related grants and contracts;

University Service

University service includes service to the department, college, campus, or university with faculty contributions to the shared governance system and institutional development, faculty development, and student success support. University service may include but is not limited to the activities listed below.

Governance
Involves fulfilling administrative or other directed responsibilities at many different levels that may include:

- Department level service such as: major curriculum development and revision, program support, program development, providing training or instruction that is not part of the assigned teaching component, coordinating program advisory committees, maintaining and repairing laboratory equipment, supervising and furnishing support of laboratories, program assessment, and/or supervising adjunct faculty or student aides.
- College level service such as: service on a college committee, leadership on a college committee, providing training or instruction that is not part of the assigned teaching component, serving on a Dean's council, providing technical assistance to other college departments, and/or acting as a liaison to the community or industry.
- Campus level service such as: service on a campus-wide committee, providing leadership on a campus-wide committee, providing training or instruction that is not part of the assigned teaching component, providing technical assistance to other schools or colleges, and/or service to the faculty unions (University of Alaska Federation of Teachers, United Academics).
- University - wide level of service such as: service on a statewide committee or task force, leadership on a statewide committee or task force, providing training or instruction that is not part of the assigned teaching component, providing technical assistance to schools, colleges and campuses, and/or service to the faculty unions (University of Alaska Federation of Teachers, United Academics).

Academic and Faculty Development
Includes activities such as:
- Mentoring other faculty members;
- Participating in faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
- Organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development activities; and/or
- Participating in academic program development and accreditation activities.

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

Compensated Service

Compensated professional activity and consulting service are not considered to be teaching,

academic research or creative activity, or service for the purpose of faculty evaluation. In those disciplines where direct practical experience may constitute valuable professional development, faculty members may request consideration for its contribution to the development of the discipline, craft or professional knowledge. Compensated service should be listed separately from public and professional service.

Evaluation of Service Activities

The following information is intended as a general guide for candidates presenting their service activities and for the reviewers evaluating those activities. The quality and quantity of accomplishments are expected to increase with time in rank. The burden of evidence for demonstrating success before tenure or promotion to a higher rank rests with the candidate to present in the file. This list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted.

Instructor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of service, an instructor demonstrates service contributions and **meets contractual obligations** by:
- Engaging
- Participating
- Performing
- Executing

Assistant Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of service, an assistant professor **responds and contributes** to identified service needs primarily at the local level and takes action to improve his or her effectiveness by:
- Conducting and facilitating
- Contributing to development
- Refining
- Improving
- Participating in professional development
- Sustained effectiveness in service

Associate Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of service, an associate professor **organizes, manages, and plays a key role** in accomplishing tasks, planning, implementing effective strategies, programs, projects, or committee activities to meet service needs by:
- Demonstrating, accomplishing
- Facilitating, revising, reviewing
- Organizing
- Delivering
- Mentoring

- Collaborating
- Sustained effectiveness in service

Professor: With respect to the aforementioned aspects of service, a professor **identifies, initiates, and plays a leadership role** in developing and/or influencing solutions or policies to meet service needs at the highest levels. Provides leadership and/or designs effective strategies that are shared by:
- Initiating, leading
- Developing, innovating, identifying
- Effectively mentoring
- Planning, organizing
- Establishing frameworks
- Collaborating
- Sustained record of excellence in service

CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Initial Appointment

It is recognized that some COENG programs may require faculty whose education and/or experience may be different from the criteria stated below. Exceptions to the discipline's terminal degree or experience qualifications for rank must be fully justified. The exception should also be presented in the file during reviews for tenure and/or promotion. The basis for exception shall be outstanding academic performance and/or outstanding professional experience. The customary criteria for appointment at various ranks are listed below.

Assistant Professor
Achievement or definite promise of continuous professional growth and contributions of high-quality scholarship. Holds the Terminal Degree in the discipline or field and has two years of documented successful scholarship and/or documented professional experience beyond the apprentice level in an area directly related to the appointment.

Associate Professor
Significant accomplishments of high-quality scholarship and contributions to the profession, craft or academic field. Holds the Terminal Degree in the discipline or field and has five years of documented successful performance at the Assistant Professor level and/or documented significant scholarship at the Associate Professor level.

Professor
Initial appointment to the rank of Professor is an extraordinary event that requires documentation of extensive accomplishment and a sustained record of excellence in

scholarship. Must hold the Terminal Degree in the appropriate discipline or field and has six years of documented successful performance at the Associate Professor level and/or documented significant scholarship at the Professor level in the field. A national or international reputation for excellence within the discipline may be grounds for such an appointment.

Review for Progression, Promotion and Tenure

Assistant Professor
Faculty members initially appointed to a tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant Professor must be reviewed for tenure no later than the seventh consecutive year of service. Appointments to these ranks may continue beyond the eighth year of service only with tenure.

Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of continuous professional growth in producing high-quality and significant scholarship within and among the components of the faculty work they are responsible for.
This includes:
- A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching.
- Contributions of quality and significance to the unit, institution, and profession.
- Evidence of promise of continued contribution to these components in support of the mission of the unit, College, and University.

Associate Professor
Faculty members initially appointed to a tenure-track position at the rank of Associate Professor must be reviewed for tenure no later than the fourth consecutive year of service. Appointments to these ranks may continue beyond the fifth year of service only with tenure.

Non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor must also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor cannot be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must meet the criteria for initial appointment to Associate Professor. Candidates must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of professional effectiveness.
This includes:
- A sustained record of effectiveness in the scholarship of teaching.
- Significant accomplishments of high-quality scholarship and contributions to the profession, craft or academic field.
- High-quality contributions to the unit, college, university, and profession through service.
- A strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishments.
- Demonstration of marked strength in an area of responsibility that advances the mission or reputation of the unit, college, or university.

Professor
Faculty members initially appointed to the rank of Professor without tenure shall be reviewed

for tenure no later than the second consecutive year of service. Appointment to Professor may continue beyond the third year only with tenure.

Candidates for promotion to Professor must meet the criteria for initial appointment to Professor and must have been previously awarded tenure, or must simultaneously stand for tenure. Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of professional excellence and marked strength in faculty responsibilities.
This includes:
- A sustained record of excellence in teaching.
- Extensive accomplishment and a sustained record of excellence in scholarship recognized by peers or constituencies outside the institution.
- Demonstrated record of effective leadership in unit, college, or university affairs and professional service activities.
- A record of sustained professional growth and promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarship.
- Demonstration of marked strength in one area of faculty responsibilities. The area of strength is one that draws on her or his unique talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit, college, and university.

Emeritus

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

Distinguished Professor

The tenured appointment of Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, or University Professor may be given by 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 the 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.

CoENG PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

Duties

- Review candidates' files and prepare letters of recommendation for the Dean.
- Propose improvements to CoENG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
- Other duties as defined by the CoENG Bylaws or as delegated by the Dean.

Composition and Selection

The College of Engineering Peer Review Committee members must have tenure and rank at or above the rank to which candidates seek promotion. Tenured associate professors may be elected if there are insufficient numbers of professors to staff the committee.

Those not eligible to serve include:
- A faculty member who is on an approved leave of absence or sabbatical.
- A faculty member who has been elected to serve, or is currently serving, on a peer review committee at a subsequent level of review.
- Tenured faculty who are under consideration for promotion. Committee members under review for post-tenure or comprehensive 6th year post tenure review may continue to serve.
- A faculty member who has an administrative workload of more than 50%.
- A faculty member who has not completed the required reviewer training.

It is the responsibility of the members of the peer review committee and administrators to adhere to the policies and guidelines for conducting the review. Committee members must carefully examine and evaluate the candidate's file using the appropriate criteria of quality and merit and make recommendations to the next level of review. In the event that a department chair serves as a Peer Review Committee member, they should recuse themselves from a candidate's College-level review if they participated in that candidate's department-level review.

The COENG Peer Review Committee shall consist of one eligible faculty member from each department plus one at-large faculty member from the College. Each May, prior to the end of each academic year, the Office of the Dean shall conduct an election by secret ballot among the voting faculty as defined by the COENG Bylaws to select Peer Review Committee members according to the procedure described below. The members' terms will be for two years. Individual member terms shall be staggered to maintain sufficient continuity and experience within the team.

No less than five weeks prior to the end of the academic year, the Dean's office will notify

faculty that the process to select Peer Review Committee members should be initiated. Within two weeks of that announcement, each department within the COENG will select a nominee for the Peer Review Committee from among their eligible faculty as well as identify interested candidates for a College-wide at-large member election. Upon endorsement of those selections by the dean a College-wide election for an at-large committee member will be held. No less than one week after the departmental nominations have been submitted for endorsement, the Office of the Dean will make a College-wide announcement and distribute a ballot to each voting faculty member for the College-wide at-large committee member election. Each voting faculty member of the College may cast one vote for the at-large ballot committee member. At the conclusion of the at-large election, and no later than one week prior to the end of the academic year, the Dean will announce the results of the selection process and formally constitute the Peer Review Committee for the subsequent academic year.

In the event that faculty from community campuses are undergoing the COENG peer review, community campus faculty will be included on the Peer Review Committee subject to the agreed peer review committee selection process established in this section.

Reviewer Training

Only COENG Peer Review Committee members, who have completed the required reviewer training within the last four years, or more recently if there has been a subsequent change in the policies and guidelines, are eligible to serve. Any faculty member elected or appointed to the Committee who has not completed the training must do so before commencing any committee activities. A mandatory training will be given in the Fall and coordinated by Academic Affairs.

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION/PROGRAM FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

A unit may develop department/division/program-specific faculty evaluation guidelines. These guidelines may include procedures for unit peer review if the unit has a sufficient number of faculty members to conduct such reviews in a fair, rigorous, and on-going manner. If a unit opts to establish unit review, the resulting faculty evaluation guidelines must be in accordance with and aligned to the COENG guidelines and University-wide guidelines.

All department/division/program-specific guidelines must be submitted through the appropriate unit and the authorizing Dean to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation committee and the Provost for review and approval as described in the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.