

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

JUSTICE CENTER
COLLEGE OF HEALTH, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Approved on December 6, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Introduction | 2 |
| B. Purpose | 3 |
| 1. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities | 3 |
| 2. Scholarship: The Core Responsibility of the Faculty Role | 3 |
| C. Academic Rank, Appointment, and Tenure | 5 |
| 1. Appointment to Assistant Professor | 5 |
| 2. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor | 5 |
| 3. Appointment or Promotion to Professor | 5 |
| 4. Appointment to Professor Emeritus | 6 |
| 5. Appointment to Distinguished Professor | 6 |
| 6. Tenure | 6 |
| D. Evaluation of Justice Center Faculty for Progression Towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review | 8 |
| 1. Types of Evaluations | 8 |
| 2. Levels of Review | 9 |
| 3. Criteria for Assessing the Quality and Significance of Scholarship | 10 |
| 4. Evaluation Review File Types | 10 |
| 5. Preparation of File | 11 |
| 6. Scholarly Agenda (Optional) | 12 |
| 7. Teaching | 13 |
| 8. Research | 16 |
| 9. Service | 19 |
| E. Reviewer Training | 24 |

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

A. INTRODUCTION

The mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage is to discover and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, engagement, and creative expression. The mission of the College of Health is to advance the health and well-being of people and communities. The mission of the Justice Center is to provide undergraduate, graduate, and professional education; to conduct academic research in the areas of crime, law, and justice; and to provide service to government units, justice agencies, and community organizations throughout urban and rural Alaska to promote a safe, healthy, and just society.

In pursuit of these objectives, Justice Center faculty members are committed to producing high-quality scholarly work and to creating a center of distinction recognized for excellence in teaching, academic research, and service. The following core values serve as our guideposts to achieving these aims.

Excellence:

We strive to do work of the highest quality.

Integrity:

Our work is guided by our unwavering allegiance to honesty and the highest standards of professional conduct.

Dedication:

We are tenacious and conscientious in our work.

Inspiration:

We lead by example, and endeavor to ignite a passion for lifelong learning.

Respect:

We recognize the dignity of each individual and value differing perspectives inherent in our multicultural society.

Collegiality:

We understand our shared responsibility and the importance of civility in furthering our collective efforts.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

B. PURPOSE

This document defines the policies and procedures for evaluation of all tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Justice Center and assessment of individual faculty members' contributions to the mission, vision, and values of the Justice Center, as well as those of the College of Health and the University of Alaska Anchorage.

This document is to be used in conjunction with the collective bargaining agreements between the University of Alaska and United Academics – AAUP/AFT (UNAC) and between the University of Alaska and the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT), and with the policies and procedures of the University of Alaska Board of Regents, the University of Alaska Anchorage, and the College of Health. In the event of a conflict, Justice Center policies and procedures shall be subordinate.

It is highly recommended that faculty review these additional policies.

1. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculty members in the Justice Center have two or three components to their workload. Workload agreements are made annually based upon the faculty member's appointment at hire and subsequent modifications negotiated between the faculty member and the Justice Center Director.

Bipartite faculty workloads typically comprise teaching and service responsibilities. Tripartite faculty workloads comprise teaching, academic research, and service responsibilities. The faculty evaluation process will involve a review of scholarly accomplishment within each workload component. Faculty members are encouraged to integrate the components of their workloads where doing so enhances their contribution to scholarship.

Justice Center faculty members have a responsibility to their students, their discipline, the University, and communities to strive for exemplary ethical conduct and scholarly achievement. Such achievements are the defining qualifications for appointment, tenure, and promotion in the academic ranks. All Justice Center faculty members are obligated to engage in scholarly work in teaching, academic research, and service activities according to their respective appointments, positions, and workload agreements.

2. SCHOLARSHIP: THE CORE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FACULTY ROLE

Within the Justice Center, the faculty role is grounded in the University of Alaska Anchorage's comprehensive definition of scholarship:

Scholarship, or scholarly work, is characterized by creative intellectual work reflective of a high level of professional expertise, is communicated so others may

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

benefit from it, is subjected to reflective critique and evaluation by others, and supports the fulfillment of the mission of the University.

Scholarly work may be derived from or demonstrated through one's teaching, academic research, and service, and can take any of five forms: discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation.

Justice Center faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly work in all aspects of their assigned workload. While all forms of scholarship are valued, the Justice Center places special emphasis on scholarly activity with community partners, as this form of scholarly work is fundamental to the achievement of the Justice Center's mission to lead Alaska toward a safer, healthier, and more just society. Community-engaged scholarship by Justice Center faculty members aligns with the University's strategic emphasis on community engagement and its Carnegie classification as a "Community Engaged University in Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships."

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

C. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT, AND TENURE

1. APPOINTMENT TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold a Ph.D., J.D., or an equivalent post-graduate degree in law. They must also show evidence of achievement, or definite promise, in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high-quality and significance to their professional or academic field and the University.

2. APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must hold a Ph.D., J.D., or an equivalent post-graduate degree in law. They must also show clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage. Candidates should demonstrate an emerging level of recognition within their professional or academic field by professional peers, or community members external to the institution.

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 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. A candidate's area of marked strength is one that draws on his or her unique talents to significantly advance the missions or reputation of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor shall not be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.

3. APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Appointment to the rank of Professor is the highest award that the University can confer upon a faculty member. The award of this rank will be recommended by the Justice Center only in those cases in which the faculty member's record, when taken as a whole, demonstrates a record of extensive accomplishment.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

Candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor must hold a Ph.D., J.D., or an equivalent post-graduate degree in law. They must also 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 Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage. Candidates must have gained recognition in their professional 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 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 unique talents to significantly advance the missions or reputation of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Candidates for promotion to Professor must have been previously awarded tenure, or must simultaneously stand for tenure.

4. APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR EMERITUS

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

5. APPOINTMENT TO 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

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

department. Following the consideration of the recommendation by the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.

6. TENURE

For Justice Center faculty members, tenure is the acceptance of an on-going obligation to continued scholarly performance and achievement at a high level of professional competency. Importantly, tenure is not automatic and is not based on years of service. Rigorous evaluation and review of a faculty member's performance distinguishes between the routine conduct and completion of their work assignments and responsibilities, and their scholarly accomplishments and outcomes which are the results of high-quality and substantive scholarly work.

The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member is among the most important that will occur within the Justice Center because it determines, in large measure, the long-term teaching, academic research, and service trajectories of the unit. The excellence of the Justice Center derives from the quality of its faculty and their scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research, and service activities.

Consistent with the Justice Center's mission and long-term aspirations, tenure shall only be granted to faculty members who demonstrate a consistent pattern of high-quality and significant scholarly achievement across all workload components, who demonstrate their ability to sustain this level of scholarly productivity over the long-term, and whose expertise and achievement contribute to the Justice Center's goals and the overarching mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage.

It is each faculty member's responsibility to establish a case supporting the awarding of tenure. Therefore, it is incumbent on each candidate to provide evidence demonstrating that they have met or exceeded Justice Center and University criteria for the appointed rank; that this record of scholarly achievement has contributed to the Justice Center, College, and University missions; and that such scholarly accomplishments are likely to continue into the future.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

D. EVALUATION OF JUSTICE CENTER FACULTY FOR PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. TYPES OF EVALUATIONS

Annual Progression towards Tenure Review

A non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member who is not scheduled for a comprehensive fourth year, tenure, or promotion review shall receive a progression towards tenure review. The annual review should evaluate and provide feedback on the faculty member's performance with respect to his or her progress in scholarly accomplishments toward promotion and/or tenure expectations.

Comprehensive Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of a tenure-track appointment, a faculty member shall receive a comprehensive fourth year review. The purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion, and to notify him or her of any gaps or areas that need to be strengthened, as well as areas of strength to be sustained and enhanced.

Tenure Review

Tenure-track faculty members being considered for tenure shall receive a tenure review. This review is conducted to determine whether a tenure-track faculty member's work has demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research, and service, as appropriate to his or her appointment, faculty rank, and position. The deciding factor in tenure decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have contributed in sufficiently significant ways to the missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage, so as to merit the right to continuous employment at the institution.

Promotion Review

Tenure-track and tenured faculty members being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research, and service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's last tenure or promotion decision. The deciding factor in promotion decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have met the established criteria from the Justice Center, College of Health, and University of Alaska Anchorage guidelines for promotion, so as to merit appointment at a higher academic rank.

Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member who is not scheduled for a comprehensive sixth year post-tenure review shall receive a post-tenure review every three years (UAFT faculty only). In addition, the Dean of the College of Health may initiate a post-tenure review process at any time prior to a scheduled evaluation of a tenured faculty member. A tenured faculty member may also request a post-tenure

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

review prior to a scheduled evaluation. The post-tenure review should evaluate and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, and provide formative feedback to faculty to assist their continued development, and production of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements.

Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

Every sixth year, tenured faculty members will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review. The comprehensive post-tenure review should evaluate the faculty member's scholarly achievements over the preceding six years in all areas of their assigned workload, in accordance with the unit and University expectations for his or her rank in place at the time of the last promotion decision. The committee shall comment on specific strengths and/or weaknesses in performance.

2. LEVELS OF REVIEW

Reviews of UAFT faculty may be conducted by the Director of the Justice Center, the College of Health Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College of Health (or designee), the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

Reviews of UNAC faculty may be conducted by the College of Health Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College of Health (or designee), the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

Annual Progression towards Tenure Reviews

Annual progression towards tenure reviews are conducted by the Dean of the College of Health (or designee). In addition, the Dean or designee may request a review by the Director of the Justice Center (if applicable).

Comprehensive Fourth Year Reviews

Comprehensive fourth year reviews are conducted by the Director of the Justice Center (if applicable), the College of Health Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College of Health (or designee), the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Provost. The faculty member may also request that the review proceed to the Chancellor. Once the faculty member begins the comprehensive review process, he or she may not request that it be converted to a tenure or promotion review.

Promotion Reviews / Tenure Reviews

Promotion reviews and tenure reviews are conducted by the Director of the Justice Center (if applicable), the College of Health Peer Review Committee, the Dean of the College of Health (or designee), the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

Post-Tenure Reviews

Post-tenure reviews are conducted by the Dean of the College of Health (or designee). In addition, the Dean or designee may request a review by the Director of the Justice Center (if applicable).

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

Comprehensive Post-Tenure Reviews

Comprehensive post-tenure reviews are conducted by the College of Health Peer Review Committee and the Dean of the College of Health (or designee). If the overall evaluation of a comprehensive post-tenure review by the unit peer review committee and administrator(s) is satisfactory, the review proceeds no further and is complete. An unsatisfactory review by the peer review committee or the administrator(s) will proceed to the university-wide evaluation committee and the Provost. The review may proceed to the Chancellor only at the written request of the faculty member. In addition, the Dean or designee may request a review by the Director of the Justice Center (if applicable).

For all reviews, candidates have the opportunity to submit a written response to the findings and recommendations at each review level for consideration at the next level of review. When responding to a review, faculty members may submit additional documentation that was not available at the time the file was submitted if it is related to the scholarship that was previously included and documented in the file_[MKB1].

3. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE QUALITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SCHOLARSHIP

When evaluating a Justice Center faculty member's scholarly work, a consistent pattern of high-quality scholarship across all dimensions of faculty work is more important than the quantity of work done.

The criteria for evaluating quality and significance include the extent to which a faculty member's scholarship:

- Reflects a high level of discipline-related expertise;
- Establishes clear and relevant goals;
- Uses appropriate methods and resources;
- Is effectively documented and communicated;
- Results in positive impact or outcomes; and,
- Upholds professional ethical standards.

4. EVALUATION REVIEW FILE TYPES

Abbreviated Files

Faculty members shall submit an abbreviated file for annual progression towards tenure reviews, post-tenure reviews, and comprehensive sixth year post-tenure reviews.

Abbreviated files must include:

- (1) A curriculum vitae;
- (2) A self-evaluation;
- (3) All annual activity reports for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrator;

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

- (4) Feedback from appropriate designated administrators in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review when applicable; and
- (5) Optional selected documentation to support the self-evaluation.

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

The self-evaluation must provide a clear summary of the faculty member's contributions to scholarship. In addition, it may provide a summary of the faculty member's scholarly agenda. The faculty member may, at his or her discretion, opt to include selected evidence to support the self-evaluation. Selected documentation should be kept to a minimum, and focus on providing supporting evidence only in those cases where the curriculum vitae and/or the annual activity reports cannot fully reflect the quality or significance of the scholarship.

If the University has provided an appropriate system for consistently creating and managing electronic files, it is strongly encouraged that files be submitted in digital or electronic format.

Full Files

Faculty members shall submit a full file for comprehensive fourth year reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews.

Full files must include the following four sections:

- (1) A table of contents;
- (2) Introductory materials, including:
 - a. The initial letter of appointment (if necessary for documenting prior years of service);
 - b. A curriculum vitae;
 - c. Verification of certificates, licenses, and degrees;
 - d. All annual workload agreements for the period under review;
 - e. All annual activity reports for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrator;
 - f. Feedback in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review, and
 - g. All previous evaluations for the period under review;
- (3) A self-evaluation;
- (4) Documentation of scholarship in teaching, academic research (if applicable), and service; and,
- (5) Letters of recommendation from both internal (UAA) and external peers when seeking tenure or promotion.

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

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

The self-evaluation must provide a clear summary of the faculty member's contributions to scholarship. In addition, it may provide a summary of the faculty member's scholarly agenda. Documentation of scholarship should be limited to the period under review (including prior years of service, if applicable).

For teaching, documentation must include all student evaluations for the period under review. In addition, documentation must include a selected example of syllabi from each course the faculty member has taught. In the case of faculty members who have taught more than eight (8) different and separate courses during the review period, selected representational examples should be included to reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas.

For academic research and service, documentation should only include a selective sample of the faculty's scholarship, with narrative sections that provide context and continuity for the selected materials.

If the University has provided an appropriate system for consistently creating and managing electronic files, it is strongly encouraged that files be submitted in digital or electronic format^[MKB2].

5. PREPARATION OF FILE

It is the responsibility of each individual Justice Center faculty member to submit a complete and well-organized file for review. The purpose of the file is to provide evidence that the faculty member's scholarly productivity is consistent with the expectations of their workload type (bipartite/tripartite), workload unit allocation (e.g., 3:1:1, 2:2:1, 4:1), and current or desired rank.

Put simply, the preparation of the file is time-consuming. Consequently, faculty members submitting a file for review should initiate assembly of their file well in advance of its submission date.

Reviewers are dependent upon materials submitted by each candidate for reaching conclusions about tenure, promotion, or periodic review. Reviewers do not solicit additional information and should not draw on their independent knowledge of a candidate's work. Additional materials may not be added to the file once submitted unless it was not available at the time of submission and there is a placeholder for it in the file. Faculty members should keep this in mind when making decisions about the materials to include in their file.

In general, candidates should select examples of their most accomplished scholarly work. Evidence of professional development over time should also be documented. Therefore, items that the candidate does not think demonstrate their most accomplished scholarly work, but which help to demonstrate change or responsiveness to feedback may also be included. Although specific elements are required for all review files, faculty members are urged to include additional items to support their claims of achievement and contribution. Submission of only the required elements

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

may not be persuasive at all levels of review. Additional items are most likely to be helpful in the full files submitted for promotion and/or tenure.

The self-evaluation is a crucial component of the file. A candidate's self-evaluation provides each faculty member with the opportunity to express how their work fits into their scholarly agenda and explain how their scholarly achievements contribute to, and align with, the mission of the Justice Center, as well as the missions of the College of Health and the University more generally.

6. SCHOLARLY AGENDA (OPTIONAL)

A scholarly agenda is a faculty member's proposed program of scholarly work, outlining his or her professional and discipline-based foci, goals, and proposed contributions to scholarship over a three- to five-year period. Establishing a scholarly agenda provides a faculty member the opportunity to identify and define his or her professional goals and focus of scholarly efforts within the framework of unit, College, and University goals and mission. The scholarly agenda, therefore, should include specific aspirations, goals, priorities, and scholarly activities, rather than a list of tasks or expected outcomes. It is not designed to limit or inhibit a faculty member's academic freedom nor constrain his or her scholarship. It allows the faculty member to articulate how to direct and develop his or her unique array of talents and expertise.

Primarily, the scholarly agenda is developmental, not evaluative. In the faculty evaluation and review process, an individual's contributions to scholarship should be evaluated in the context of the quality and significance of the work presented for evaluation. If the scholarly agenda is included in the evaluation review file, it is included to provide insight into and context for the individual member's goals, intellectual interests, and connections to unit, College, and University missions and needs.

Faculty members may find a scholarly agenda to be a useful tool for planning and explaining their work as a complement to their workload, activity report, and self-evaluation. The scholarly agenda differs from the self-evaluation in that the self-evaluation is specific to the review period, whereas the scholarly agenda addresses the broader vision of the work, and provides a context for activities during the review period with a particular eye toward the future. While the use of a scholarly agenda is not required, faculty members who find it useful are encouraged to include it in their review file.

If a faculty member decides to include a scholarly agenda in their file, it shall not be considered, nor be construed, as establishing an evidentiary base for evaluation purposes.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

7. TEACHING

The work of teaching is a challenging and dynamic enterprise that includes curriculum writing, developing course materials, developing community engaged learning opportunities for students, including service learning as part of classes, developing community internships for students, mentoring, planning and conducting workshops for colleagues, and other activities. Justice Center faculty members are expected to be reflective educational practitioners who continuously examine their effectiveness.

Teaching effectiveness is an essential criterion for the evaluation and review of Justice Center faculty. Faculty members must demonstrate their effectiveness in teaching by a command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and attainment of the University's Institutional Learning Outcomes. Evaluations of a candidate's teaching activities may take into account the level of contribution to the Justice Center's instructional mission as indicated by such factors as the number of preparations, differing class characteristics, and advising large numbers of students.

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

Justice Center faculty members should also reflect on their professional development and growth over time in their teaching practice generally, and when appropriate, in specific courses. All Justice Center faculty members are encouraged to revise current curriculum and prepare new, innovative courses that fill gaps in the curriculum. The self-evaluation should assess teaching quality, demonstrate professional growth and development, and show how faculty member efforts in the classroom contribute to student learning.

Teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated through some combination of the candidate's teaching activities and may include the following:

- Instruction and learning experiences;
- Building and developing curriculum and learning resources;
- Mentoring students;
- Advancing teaching excellence; and,
- Advancing student excellence.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

The teaching activities and accomplishments listed below fall into three tiers. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive. If candidates think other activities demonstrate accomplishment in this workload area, they are encouraged to identify them. However, it is their responsibility to explain what tier the activity belongs to. Similarly, if candidates think some of their teaching activities demonstrate accomplishment in a higher tier, it is their responsibility to explain why those items belong in a higher tier. These guidelines should not be construed as rigid requirements; the candidate has the responsibility and opportunity to demonstrate how a particular constellation of activities evinces teaching effectiveness commensurate with rank and the distribution of workload components.

Tier 1: Examples of Extensive Teaching Activities and Accomplishments

- Pedagogical innovation in course structure/content/delivery
- Development and delivery of new or revised program options (e.g., substantial restructuring of degree requirements or development of new degree or certificate)
- Development and delivery of community-engaged teaching activities/projects (e.g., service learning)
- Management and coordination of undergraduate/graduate program accreditation
- Designing, managing, and reporting program assessment and progress toward program outcomes
- Development and delivery of interdisciplinary courses that include collaboration between two or more academic units and/or disciplines
- Providing a comprehensive written peer review of course structure, content, and delivery to other faculty, including evaluation of congruity between course structure and content and the student learning outcomes

Tier 2: Examples of Significant Teaching Activities and Accomplishments

- Coordination of undergraduate/graduate course scheduling and program offerings
- Significant contribution to development and delivery of new or revised program offerings
- Significant contribution to undergraduate/graduate program accreditation or assessment
- Coordination/supervision of student internships or independent study opportunities
- Mentoring student research, projects, or activities outside the scope of routine instructional duties
- Serving on undergraduate and/or graduate thesis committees
- Consistent practice of engaging in university-sponsored or externally-offered programs of professional development and self-assessment related to teaching
- Adapting teaching strategies or course content delivery in response to formal peer-review of classroom practice and course content
- Engagement in assessment of student learning outside the scope of routine assignment of grades
- Development of course packets, manuals, or other instructional materials beyond ordinary course handouts and assignments

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

- Creating a course new to the curriculum and managing the curriculum approval and cataloging process
- Mentoring new faculty
- Conducting classroom observation as part of a peer teaching evaluation process that involves a written report documenting the process and peer evaluator's recommendations for enhancing the faculty member's teaching effectiveness

Tier 3: Examples of Standard Teaching Activities and Accomplishments

- Preparation of courses new to the faculty member
- Revision/updating of existing courses
- Contribution to program development, accreditation, and/or assessment activities
- Providing academic advising

Although there is no precise formula for teaching activities and outcomes required for specific ranks, there is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. For positive faculty evaluations of all types, faculty must demonstrate the minimal activities and accomplishments of Tier 3. There is no expectation that any faculty member's teaching will fall uniformly into Tier 1, as that would not allow for experimentation and growth. As a general guideline, candidates for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor shall provide evidence of significant accomplishment in teaching at the university level. Their files should demonstrate a level of contribution commensurate with the types of activities identified in Tier 2. Candidates for promotion to Professor shall provide evidence of extensive accomplishment in teaching at the university level. Their files should fall solidly into Tier 2, with some aspects of their teaching qualifying as Tier 1.

The faculty member should provide an orienting statement to complement the self-evaluation and guide reviewers as they interpret the evidence items. The message that different evidence items are intended to convey may not be readily apparent to reviewers, particularly reviewers outside the Justice Center. Therefore, the candidate must clearly explain to reviewers how to prioritize items and read the evidence. For example, the same syllabus may provide evidence of keeping current with the literature, adding new educational technologies, and clear expectations for students. A note from a colleague who observed a candidate's class may demonstrate efforts to solicit feedback and a peer's positive evaluation of content delivery and expertise. A certificate from CAFE may demonstrate efforts to learn a new teaching strategy. Results from student evaluations, especially over time, may demonstrate improvement with the same class.

The University requires that quantitative student evaluation results (at this writing, the IDEA course evaluation) and course syllabi be included in full files as evidence of teaching. Faculty members are urged to select other items that will provide additional evidence in support of their claim of accomplishment. Such items could include:

- Teaching awards earned by the faculty member during the review period;
- Results from other systematic attempts to solicit student feedback, such as Justice Center student evaluations, Qualtrix, or anonymous handwritten surveys;

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

- Letters, emails, and other forms of student testimonials pertaining to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness;
- Written summaries/evaluations derived from Justice Center faculty peer observations;
- Certificates or content summaries from CAFE, CCEL, FTC, or professional conference sessions related to new curricular content or teaching strategies;
- CCGs for new or updated courses; and,
- A summary chart showing trends in student evaluation scores over time.

8. RESEARCH

Academic research¹ is vital to the mission of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage. High-quality academic research is a fundamental component of advancing knowledge, and it plays a critical role in support of teaching and learning, as well as promoting the application of knowledge in ways that benefit our students, our communities, and broader society. Justice Center faculty members with a research component in their assigned workload are expected to engage in academic research that supports the research objectives of the Justice Center and that aligns with the University's goal of becoming a leader in research and research-centered undergraduate and graduate education.

In the Justice Center, high quality academic research directly contributes to our understanding of the causes and correlates of crime/delinquency and criminal victimization, the nature and dynamics of the legal/institutional responses to these phenomena, and jurisprudence and the development of law, as well as the development of public policy and professional practice within the field. Academic research within the field of Justice, in other words, spans both basic and applied research domains.

Justice Center faculty members with designated workload effort in this component of faculty work during the period of review are expected to engage in high-quality academic research as appropriate to their discipline (e.g., criminology, criminal justice, sociology, law), their continuing professional growth, and the respective missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University. Faculty members will be evaluated based on the outcomes of their academic research as evidenced by products appropriate to her or his discipline. Academic research outcomes include: publications, presentations, and academic research grant awards.

Interdisciplinary, collaborative, and community-engaged research by Justice Center faculty members is highly valued, especially as it has an impact on the development of justice policy and practice in Alaska and the Circumpolar North. Large, externally-funded projects are also highly valued, but so, too, are community-based projects that are smaller in scope or complexity. Regardless of its funding source, scope, or complexity, high-quality academic research requires Justice Center faculty to invest significant time and effort to cultivate relationships, develop research proposals, and design and execute research studies.

Justice Center faculty members with a research component in their assigned workload must establish a clear and consistent pattern of scholarly research production in one or more areas of expertise that is proportional to the research allocation of the workload. Justice Center faculty members with a higher proportion of research in their workload are expected to engage in more academic research than faculty members with a lesser proportion of their workload dedicated to academic research.

¹ UAA guidelines state, "Academic research... may be generated through all forms of scholarship--discovery, integration, transformation/interpretation, engagement, and application--and contributes to the generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline... as defined by the respective scholarly community" (p. 14).

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

Effectiveness in academic research may be demonstrated² through some combination of (1) *conducting and disseminating academic research*³, and (2) *leading and managing funded research projects or contracts*³. The significance of a faculty member's academic research accomplishments will be assessed according to the quality of the product, the degree of independent research effort, and their contributions to the missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage. The significance of funded research accomplishments will be determined according to the locus of funding (internal or external), whether or not the research proposal was submitted in response to a competitive solicitation, the funding source, the scope and complexity of the proposed project, and the amount of research funding awarded.

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

The key distinction between Tier 1 and Tier 2 is the strictness and stringency of review (e.g., blind review by multiple persons, application of scientific or other disciplinary standards), the significance and originality of the faculty member's contribution to the scholarly knowledge base, and the impact potential of a faculty member's research on policy and/or practice. Tier 1 products have been judged by professional/disciplinary peers to be of the highest quality.

Tier 2 academic research products, on the other hand, make substantial contributions to the advancement of knowledge, as well as justice policy and/or practice; however, they are not subject to the same level of scrutiny or critique as research products in Tier 1. Tier 2 research products are also more limited in scope, complexity, and subsequent impact on the field. Importantly, however, research products in Tier 2 serve as important stepping stones for Tier 1 accomplishments by a faculty member in the future, and as such are valued more highly than the research accomplishments in Tier 3.

Tier 3 research products represent the artifacts of routine academic research activities that are the responsibility of all tripartite Justice Center faculty members and are the result of standard academic research practice.

Tier 1: Examples of Extensive Research Activities and Accomplishments

² According to UAA guidelines units may include their own examples of academic research work within a specific academic research category or place different emphasis and value on certain academic research categories to reflect the particular needs and concerns of their respective discipline(s) or professional field(s) (p.15).

³ Specific examples of expected academic research products within this category are provided on page 15 of the UAA guidelines.

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

- Original work published as a book manuscript by a scholarly press
- Original work published as a manuscript in a refereed journal that has high quality or extensive impact
- Award⁴ and successful execution of a competitive externally-funded research proposal, regardless of award amount, complexity, or scope

Tier 2: Examples of Significant Research Activities and Accomplishments

- Original work published as a manuscript in a refereed journal
- Publishing an academic textbook (author)
- Serving as Editor of book/volume published by a scholarly press
- Award and successful execution of a non-competitive externally-funded research proposal, regardless of award amount, complexity, or scope
- Refereed presentation at a professional conference or meeting

Tier 3: Examples of Standard Research Activities and Accomplishments

- Original work published as an article/chapter in an edited scholarly book/volume (author)
- Non-refereed research articles, research briefs, and reports
- Award and successful execution of an internally-funded research proposal
- Publication of products such as white papers, monographs, and practitioner guides related to the development and dissemination of innovations in justice policy and/or practice
- Publication of summaries/syntheses of extant academic research such as encyclopedia entries, resource guides, bibliographies, and book reviews
- Non-refereed presentation at a professional conference or meeting
- Unfunded research proposals submitted for external funding
- Evidence of significant academic research currently in development or in progress such as research proposals or manuscripts under review or revision

As with teaching, there is no precise formula for academic research activities and outcomes required for specific ranks, but there is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. For positive faculty evaluations of all types, faculty members must demonstrate the minimal activities and accomplishments of Tier 3. There is no expectation that any faculty member's academic research will fall uniformly into Tier 1. As a general guideline, candidates for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor shall provide evidence of significant accomplishment in academic research. Their files should demonstrate a level of contribution commensurate with the types of activities identified in Tier 2. Candidates for promotion to Professor shall provide evidence of extensive accomplishment in academic research. Their files should fall solidly into Tier 2, with some aspects of their academic research qualifying as Tier 1.

⁴ Faculty member must serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI).

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

The faculty member should provide an orienting statement about her/his research agenda, area(s) of expertise, and reflect on the activities and products engaged in during the review period. This statement should complement the scholarly agenda and overall self-evaluation, guiding reviewers as they interpret the evidence items. The statement should address, for example: how academic research activities during the review period contributed to the candidate's scholarly agenda, as well as the strategic priorities of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University. Interdisciplinary and collaborative work should be highlighted, as should work that has had an impact on justice policy and/or practice development on the local, state, or national levels. When the faculty member is engaged in academic research with one or more collaborators, the faculty member's specific contribution should be delineated.

Academic research products that have been disseminated or are currently under review for publication should be included.

9. SERVICE

All Justice Center faculty members are expected to engage in University, professional, and public service activities, with increasing involvement at higher ranks, as appropriate to their discipline, and the missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, and the University of Alaska Anchorage. Service can be performed within the Justice Center, the College of Health, the University, the profession, and the community.

Justice Center faculty members should strive to provide a balance of service in all three areas – University, professional, and public service.

University, professional, and public service can generally be demonstrated through the following broad categories:

- University Service: Service to the University, to the College of Health, and/or to the Justice Center through (1) *governance* – participation on Justice Center, College of Health, and University-wide committees and sub-committees or in an administrative capacity, including as an academic program coordinator or center director; (2) *academic and faculty development* – organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development or academic development activities; participating in academic program development, approval, or accreditation activities; and participation on faculty, administrator, or staff search committees; and/or (3) *student success support* – sponsoring or advising student organizations and developing or participating in outreach activities to present, past, or future students.
- Professional Service: Service to the profession in such forms as writing peer reviews for discipline, craft, or professional publications and funding organizations; performing editorial assignments for discipline, craft, or professional publications; participation in academic, craft, or professional conferences as panel organizer and/or discussant;

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

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. For Justice Center faculty members with bipartite teaching and service workloads, academic publications will qualify as professional service.

- **Public Service:** Service to society such as writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to specialized audiences; 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 through collaborative, jointly-developed projects designed to address issues of community concern; and general community service that advances the missions of the Justice Center, the College of Health, or the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Active service, considering both the nature and quantity of services rendered, is considered more important than mere membership in disciplinary/professional societies, or membership on committees or boards. Service activities must advance the mission of the Justice Center, College of Health, or the University; it is the responsibility of the faculty member to explain the contribution in their self-evaluation.

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

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

Tier 1: Examples of Extensive Service Activities and Accomplishments

University:

- Elected or appointed positions to University-wide committees, such as: UAA Institutional

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

Review Board, UAA Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, UAA Graduate or Undergraduate Academic Boards, and the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee or other committees requiring similar commitments of time or expertise

- Service as a graduate or undergraduate Program Coordinator within the Justice Center
- Providing leadership (e.g. serving as chair, coordinator, or facilitator) to Tier 1 or Tier 2 bodies

Professional:

- Elected or appointed positions to: the leadership of national or international disciplinary/professional bodies, or a program chair for national or international conferences
- Service as an editor of a disciplinary/professional journal
- Extensive work on behalf of professional organizations that requires a substantial contribution of time and professional expertise and results in a substantial impact that advances the mission of the Justice Center, College or University

Public:

- Elected or appointed positions on state, national, or international boards, commissions, or committees where professional expertise is used to advance the mission of the Justice Center, College or University
- Pro bono service as a legal counsel in a case in federal or state court of legal significance at trial or on appeal requiring substantial time commitment
- Extensive work on behalf of non-profit organizations that requires a substantial contribution of time and professional expertise and results in a substantial impact that advances the mission of the Justice Center, College or University

Tier 2: Examples of Significant Service Activities and Accomplishments

University:

- Elected or appointed positions to: COH Peer-Review Committee, COH Curriculum Committee, COH Interdisciplinary Research or Interdisciplinary Curriculum Committees, UAA Undergraduate Research Committee, or other committees requiring similar commitments of time or expertise
- Leading UAA faculty development efforts such as CAFE, FTC, Making Learning Visible, Books of the Year
- Coordination of public outreach events and activities (e.g., Campus Kickoff, National Criminal Justice Month, Color of Justice)
- Service as a Faculty Advisor to one or more Justice Center student clubs
- Chair of graduate and undergraduate thesis committees
- Primary organizer of conference at UAA involving speakers from outside the University
- Chairing faculty, director, or dean search committee

Professional:

- Elected or appointed positions to the leadership of local (e.g. community, municipal, borough), state, or regional disciplinary/professional bodies, or a program chair for local, state, or regional professional conferences

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions
May 2014 – comments per OAA
July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs
August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

- Proposal reviewer for local, state, national, or international research organizations/agencies (e.g., National Institute of Justice)
- Service on an ethics or disciplinary adjudication panel of a professional organization
- For bipartite faculty without a research component to their workload, publishing an article in a professional journal or law review

Public:

- Elected or appointed positions on local (e.g. community, municipal, borough) boards, commissions, or committees where professional expertise is used to advance the mission of the Justice Center, College or University
- Pro bono service as legal counsel in a case(s) requiring substantial time commitment but of ordinary legal significance
- Substantial written work or presentations directed toward broad public education on issues of importance to the mission of the Justice Center, College or University

Tier 3: Examples of Standard Service Activities and Accomplishments

University:

- Service on short-term, ad-hoc committees for the College of Health or the University
- Routine faculty governance activities within the Justice Center
- Service on ad-hoc Justice Center committees (e.g., faculty/staff searches)
- Service on graduate and undergraduate thesis committees
- Participation in public outreach events and activities (e.g., Campus Kickoff, National Criminal Justice Month, Color of Justice)
- Chairing staff search committee

Professional:

- Service as a panel or roundtable chair at a disciplinary/professional conference
- Reviewer for refereed publications
- Service on committees of state or regional disciplinary/professional bodies
- For bipartite faculty without a research component to their workload, publishing non-refereed research articles, research briefs, and reports
- Presentation at professional education event on an area of expertise

Public:

- Uncompensated professional consultation, assessment, and evaluation services provided to community groups/organizations
- Short term or limited pro bono services as legal counsel
- Primary organizer of public talk at UAA involving speakers from outside the University
- Uncompensated speaking engagements and written work on an area of expertise
- Uncompensated consultation with local, state, or national organizations in an area of expertise

As with teaching and research, there is no precise formula for the service activities and outcomes required for specific ranks, but there is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater presence in Tiers 1 and 2. For positive faculty

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

evaluations of all types, faculty members must demonstrate the minimal activities and accomplishments of Tier 3. There is no expectation that any faculty member's service will fall uniformly into Tier 1. As a general guideline, candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall provide evidence of significant accomplishment in at least two of the service categories and standard accomplishment in the third. Their files should demonstrate a level of contribution commensurate with the types of activities identified in Tier 2. Candidates for promotion to Professor shall provide evidence of significant accomplishment in two of the three service categories, and extensive accomplishment in the third. Their files should fall solidly into Tier 2, with some aspects of their service qualifying as Tier 1.

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

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

February 2014 – Not yet approved by Provost and Unions

May 2014 – comments per OAA

July 2014 – Revisions by Justice Center to comply with UNAC/UAFT CBAs

August 2014 – Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria for reviews

E. REVIEWER TRAINING

The Director of the Justice Center and faculty serving on peer review committees shall attend a training session prior to the first time they review faculty files, or if four years or more have passed since the last time they attended training. They must also attend a training session if there have been substantive changes in policy since their last training.