

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

JUSTICE CENTER
COLLEGE OF HEALTH, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Approved by Justice Center Faculty: March 2, 2018
Approved by the COH Associate Dean Andre Rosay: March 24, 2018
Approved by the UAA Interim Provost John Stalvey: July 31, 2018

A. INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Justice Center is to provide undergraduate 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 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.

B. PURPOSE

This document defines the standards of 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 agreement between the University of Alaska and United Academics – AAUP/AFT (UNAC), 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 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."

C. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT, AND TENURE

1. APPOINTMENT TO FACULTY RANKS

In the Justice Center, initial appointment and/or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor requires that candidates hold a Ph.D., J.D., or an equivalent post-graduate degree in law.

2. Tenure

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.

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

1. 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.

2. 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 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.

3. TEACHING

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
- 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.

Faculty members are urged to select additional evidence beyond the evidence required by the University 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, Qualtrics, or anonymous handwritten surveys;
- 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.

4. RESEARCH

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.

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.

Effectiveness in academic research may be demonstrated through some combination of (1) *conducting and disseminating academic research*, and (2) *leading and managing funded research projects or contracts*¹. 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

¹ Faculty member must serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI).

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

- 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
- Award² 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

² Faculty member must serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI).

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.

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.

5. SERVICE

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

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 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
- 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 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.