

**CRITERIA FOR
RE-APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE**

Approvals:

**John A. Olofsson, Chair
School of Engineering
Peer Review Committee**

**Robert J. Lang, Dean
School of Engineering**

**James P. Chapman, Provost
University of Alaska Anchorage**

All signatures on file 10/9/03

CRITERIA FOR RE-APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

The criteria listed below are intended to be applied specifically to tenure track faculty members of the School of Engineering. References to engineering activities, products and accomplishments are intended to include all disciplines of Engineering and Geomatics. If negotiated bargaining unit agreements or university policies are in conflict with these guidelines, the agreements and policies shall take precedence.

TERMINAL DEGREE

The terminal degree for all disciplines within the School of Engineering is the doctorate. In most instances it is expected that the doctorate will be a Ph.D. However, when appropriately approved upon initial appointment, other equivalent doctorate degrees may be acceptable as terminal degrees.

FACULTY WORKLOADS

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

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As part of the workload noted above, it is expected that each faculty member shall engage in professional development activities on a continuing, long term basis. Professional development of the faculty is considered important in order to stay current in the technical disciplines. As part of their professional development, faculty are expected to meet, in a timely manner, any special conditions of employment included in their initial appointment letter.

I. REVIEW PROCESS

Review of all faculty in the School of Engineering is performed at two levels: by a Peer Review Committee, and by the Dean. The Peer review Committee shall consist of five tenured members of the School of Engineering faculty who hold rank of Associate Professor or Professor and who are elected by the School of Engineering faculty. At least one member of the Peer Review Committee must hold a bipartite workload assignment and at least one must hold a tripartite workload assignment. The candidate's Department Chair may participate as a member of the

peer review committee. All faculty are required to submit an Annual Activity report apart from that which is required for the Review Process described herein.

A) REVIEW PROCESS FOR NON-TENURED FACULTY

The annual review process for non-tenured faculty is designed to nurture and guide junior faculty, to assist them in attaining their highest professional capabilities, and to help them direct their efforts in ways that bring maximum benefit to themselves, the School of Engineering, the University of Alaska, and the people served by the university. The following two levels of review are available to non-tenured faculty in the School of Engineering:

Administrative Review: All non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually by the Dean of the School of Engineering.

Peer Review: When required by contract, or when requested by the faculty member, a peer review will be conducted. Peer review provides faculty colleagues the opportunity to evaluate and comment on a faculty member's progress and suggest activities in all areas of evaluation. When not mandated by contract, but requested by the faculty member, the findings of the peer review committee will be submitted directly to the faculty member, who may then include those findings in his or her personal file of activity and accomplishment. Peer review is always an option that may be requested by the faculty member in years when it is not mandated by contractual agreement. Faculty are encouraged to participate in peer reviews so that they may benefit from the advice and guidance of their colleagues.

For all review, at the beginning of each academic year the Dean will notify each faculty member who is to be reviewed. The notification will be in writing and will specify the type of review that is required, the materials that must be submitted by the faculty member, and will include an invitation to participate in a peer review.

At the end of each academic year, each non-tenured faculty member will complete an Annual Activity Report form for the current year and a Workload Agreement for the next year. These forms are the minimum documentation to be submitted to the Dean for annual review by the Dean alone.

When peer review is required or requested by a faculty member the Annual Workload Agreements and Activity Reports will be included in the faculty member's file of activities and accomplishments, along with the faculty member's initial appointment letter, and other information outlined in the UAA Faculty handbook, Chapter III. The complete file will be submitted to the Administrative Assistant for the School of Engineering. This activity file will serve as the basis for the annual review of the faculty member by the Committee and the Dean. The activity file provides an opportunity for faculty members to summarize their progress in completing any special conditions of initial appointment, their activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity and service, their efforts in professional development, to note any honors received, and to include any other noteworthy items deemed important in their review. Each level of review will then evaluate the effort and accomplishment of the faculty members under review and provide guidance to assist them in their professional activities.

B) THE PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Each candidate for promotion or tenure shall submit a file documenting her or his activities and accomplishments that are to be considered in reaching a tenure or promotion decision. These files must, as a minimum, contain all of the information required in UA and UAA policies, and the faculty member's initial appointment letter, including any special conditions.

The Peer Review Committee members shall review the files of each candidate. Each member of the Peer Review Committee shall read each candidate's file in depth. When each member of the committee has read the file, the committee shall meet as a body to discuss the contents of the file and to reach any conclusions concerning recommendations for promotion/tenure. This meeting is open to the candidate and the candidate is encouraged to attend. A typed report of the committee's finding on each recommendation of promotion or tenure shall be prepared and signed by the Chair of the committee.

Candidates for promotion/tenure shall be informed when the report of the committee is complete. Candidates shall then have an opportunity to read the report of the peer review committee and to respond in writing to the findings of the committee.

After the candidate has reviewed and has had the opportunity to respond to the findings of the Peer Review Committee, the candidate's file will be reviewed by the Dean of the School of Engineering. The findings of the Dean shall be recorded and included in the candidate's file.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be informed when the report of the Dean is complete. Candidates shall then have five days to read the report of the Dean and to respond to the next level in writing to the findings of the Dean.

After the candidate has reviewed the report, and has had the opportunity to respond to the findings of the Dean, the candidate's file will be transferred to the Office of Academic Affairs for review by the University Wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and for subsequent review by the Provost and by the Chancellor.

C) POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

After the award of tenure, faculty are reviewed in accordance with the policies and collective bargaining agreements. Faculty to be reviewed are given notice by the administration of upcoming reviews before the final day of their contract in the academic year prior to the review. The candidates must submit a file documenting their activities and accomplishments for only that time since their most recent review.

II. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY

A) ANNUAL REVIEW (RETENTION) OF NON-TENURED FACULTY

The criteria used for evaluation of each faculty member's annual performance shall be consistent with the criteria used for consideration of promotion and tenure. To conduct the annual

evaluation and arrive at recommendations concerning retention of faculty, the Dean of the School of Engineering and, when appropriate, the Peer Review Committee will review each faculty member's file of activity and accomplishment, keeping in mind:

- 1) The specific workload agreement of the faculty member and activities and accomplishments under that workload.
- 2) The current rank of the faculty member;
- 3) The progress of the faculty member toward professional development, and satisfaction of criteria for promotion/tenure.
- 4) The progress of the faculty member toward completion of any special conditions of initial appointment.
- 5) Professional contributions of the faculty member which result in recognition and/or advancement of the University of Alaska Anchorage.

B) PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

TIME IN RANK

Bipartite faculty candidates must have at least two years of successful experience in the rank of Instructor to be eligible for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. There is no time in rank requirement for tripartite faculty promotion to Assistant Professor.

TEACHING, SERVICE AND RESEARCH

Candidates who were initially appointed to the rank of Instructor and who are applying for promotion to Assistant Professor must provide clear evidence of a potential for successful teaching, service and research as specified in the candidate's workload. Such evidence may be provided through a wide variety of documents including but not limited to the Annual Activity Reports, a curriculum vita, student evaluations of teaching, letters of reference, etc.

1) TEACHING

Candidates must provide evidence of their potential for success in teaching at the college/university level. Determination of potential is based on evaluation of evidence which may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Teaching undergraduate or graduate courses
- b) Teaching professional development courses
- c) Development of new and/or special courses or curriculum materials
- d) Development of laboratory activities or additional lab/research capabilities
- e) Development of specialized teaching aids, lab manuals, etc.
- f) Advising students
- g) Directing graduate student thesis or project research

NOTE: The activities listed above are not shown in order of importance.

In evaluation of the above evidence, the reviewers may consider the number of students taught, the complexity of the material, the sophistication and effectiveness of the teaching methods employed, the learning outcomes accomplished by the students, and other similar objective and subjective criteria, as assessed by the students, other faculty, and/or practitioners in the subjects covered.

2) SERVICE

Candidates must provide evidence of the potential to perform service, both to the university community and outside of the university. Services provided outside of the university community must be related to the candidate's professional discipline. Service activities may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Membership on boards, commissions, committees, etc.**
- b) Holding office (i.e., President, Chair, Director, V.P., etc.) in professional organizations, on boards, commissions, committee, etc.**
- c) Service in capacity of editor or reviewer of professional publications, research proposals, etc.**
- d) Non-remunerated professional services rendered.**
- e) Spoken or written communication in a public forum in support of the engineering profession, the School of Engineering or the university.**
- f) Service on graduate committees.**

3) RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Candidates with a research workload component must provide evidence of the potential to perform research within their discipline. This evidence may be in the form of detailed plans to undertake research or creative activities that will result in outcomes such as those listed below, or others that are determined to be valuable by the Dean and the candidate.

- a) Publications in refereed professional journals**
- b) Receipt of funds from competitive sources, both inside and outside of the university, with which to conduct research, training or other creative activities**
- c) Books published by publishing houses**
- d) Refereed monographs published by publishing houses**
- e) Papers appearing in refereed, published proceedings from national/international conferences**
- f) Reviewed technical reports written in fulfillment of the provisions of research related grants and contracts.**
- g) Preparation and submission of research proposals to funding organizations**
- h) Technical papers presented at national conferences.**
- i) Documentation of the application of engineering resulting in a contribution to a worthwhile effort within the profession, the community or the state.**

- j) Successful contribution to research/creative activity assignments within the School of Engineering or the university
- k) Develop or conduct specific training programs to meet public or industry needs.
- l) Develop innovative engineering educational materials to be used locally or offered through distance delivery.

C) PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

TIME IN RANK

Candidates must have at least 5 years at the rank of Assistant Professor. At least 3 of the 5 years in rank must have been at the University of Alaska Anchorage.

TEACHING

Candidates must provide evidence of successful teaching at the college/university level. Determination of success is based on evaluation of evidence which may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Teaching undergraduate or graduate courses
- b) Teaching professional development courses
- c) Development of new and/or special courses or curriculum materials
- d) Development of laboratory activities or additional lab/research capabilities
- e) Development of specialized teaching aids, lab manuals, etc.
- f) Advising students
- g) Directing graduate students' thesis or project research

Note: The activities listed above are not presented in order of importance.

In evaluation of the above evidence, the reviewers may consider the number of Students taught, the complexity of the material, the sophistication and effectiveness of the teaching methods employed, the learning outcomes accomplished by the students, and other objective and subjective criteria, as assessed by the students, other faculty and/or practitioners in the subjects covered.

SERVICE

Candidates must provide evidence of service both within and outside the university. Services provided outside of the university community must be related to the candidate's professional discipline. Service activities may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Membership on boards, commissions, committees, etc.
- b) Holding office (i.e., President, Chair, Director, V.P., etc.) in professional organizations, on boards, commissions, committees, etc.
- c) Service in capacity of editor or reviewer of professional publications,

- research proposals, etc.
- d) Non-Remunerated professional services rendered
- e) Spoken or written communication in a public forum in support of the engineering profession, the School of Engineering or the university.
- e) Service on graduate committees.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Candidates with a research workload component must provide evidence of research activities reviewed and accepted by peers in the discipline of the candidate. Research activities may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Publications in refereed professional journals
- b) Books published by publishing houses
- c) Refereed monographs published by publishing houses
- d) Papers appearing in refereed, published proceedings from national/international conferences.
- e) Receipt of funds from competitive sources, both inside and outside of the university, with which to conduct research, training or other creative activities.
- f) Reviewed technical reports written in fulfillment of the provisions of research related grants and contracts.
- g) Preparation and submission of research proposals to funding organizations
- h) Technical papers presented at national conferences.
- i) Documentation of the application of engineering resulting in a contribution to a worthwhile effort within the profession, the community or the state.
- j) Successful contribution to research/creative activity assignments within the School of Engineering or the university
- k) Develop or conduct specific training programs to meet public or industry needs
- l) Develop innovative engineering educational materials to be used locally or offered through distance delivery.

NOTE: Articles, books, monographs, and/or papers which have been accepted for publication but which are not yet published may be used as evidence of research activities subject to careful review and evaluation by the peer review committee.

The School of Engineering has not established a specific quantitative level of research output expected for candidates for promotion to Associate Professor. However, as a general guideline, candidates should be able to document a minimum of 3 items of research output, including at least one from each of a and b above. It is expected that such research output will have occurred during the period of review for promotion.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Candidates for promotion shall provide evidence of continued professional development in their discipline. Activities related to professional development may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) University courses attended
- b) Timely completion of special conditions of initial appointment
- c) Refresher courses, short courses, technical workshops and other similar courses attended
- d) Attendance at professional meetings, conventions, specialty technical conferences, etc.
- e) Individual self study activities to keep abreast of technical developments (i.e., in computer hardware and/or software)
- f) Professional consulting activities
- g) State of Alaska registration as a Professional Engineer or Professional Land Surveyor
- h) Professional certification in some area of the engineering field such as Project Management professional or Network Engineer, etc.

C. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

TIME IN RANK

Candidates must have at least 5 years at the rank of Associate Professor. At least 3 of the 5 years in rank must have been at the University of Alaska Anchorage.

TEACHING

Candidates must provide evidence of exemplary teaching at the college/university level. Determination of exemplary teaching is based on evaluation of evidence which may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Teaching undergraduate or graduate courses
- b) Teaching professional development courses
- c) Development of new and/or special courses or curriculum materials
- d) Development of laboratory activities or additional lab/research capabilities
- e) Development of specialized teaching aids, lab manuals, etc.
- f) Advising students
- g) Directing graduate students' thesis or project research

Note: The activities listed above are not in order of importance.

In evaluation of the above evidence, the reviewers may consider the number of students taught, the complexity of the material, the sophistication and effectiveness of the teaching methods employed, the learning outcomes accomplished by the students, and other objective and subjective criteria, as assessed by the students, other faculty, and/or practitioners in the subjects covered.

SERVICE

Candidates must provide evidence of exemplary service both within and outside the university. Services provided outside of the university community must be related to the candidate's professional discipline. Service activities may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Membership on boards, commissions, committees, etc.
- b) Holding office (i.e., President, Chair, Director, V.P., etc.) in professional organizations, on boards, commissions, committees, etc.
- c) Service in capacity of editor or reviewer of professional publications, research proposals, etc.
- d) Spoken or written communication in a public forum in support of the engineering profession, the School of Engineering or the university.
- e) Non-remunerated professional services rendered.
- f) Service on graduate committees.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Candidates with a research workload component must provide evidence of exemplary research activities reviewed and accepted by peers in the discipline of the candidate. Research activities may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) Publications in refereed professional journals
- b) Receipt of funds from competitive sources, both inside and outside of the university, with which to conduct research, training or other creative activities
- c) Refereed monographs published by publishing houses
- d) Papers appearing in refereed, published proceedings from national/international conferences.
- e) Books published by publishing houses
- f) Reviewed technical reports written in fulfillment of the provisions of research related grants and contracts.
- g) Preparation and submission of research proposals to funding organizations
- h) Technical papers presented at national conferences.
- i) Documentation of the application of engineering resulting in a contribution to a worthwhile effort within the profession, the community or the state.
- j) Successful contribution to research/creative activity assignments within the School of Engineering or the university.
- k) Develop or conduct specific training programs to meet public or industry needs
- l) Develop innovative engineering educational materials to be used locally or offered through distance delivery.

NOTE: Articles, books, monographs, and/or papers which have been accepted for publication but which are not yet published may be used as evidence of research activities subject to careful review and evaluation by the peer review committee.

The School of Engineering has not established a specific quantitative level of research output expected for candidates for promotion to Full Professor. However, as a general guideline, candidates should be able to document a minimum of 3 items of research output, including at least one from each of a and b above. It is expected that such research output will have occurred during the period of review for promotion.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Candidates for promotion shall provide evidence of continued professional development in their discipline. Activities related to professional development may include but shall not be limited to the following:

- a) University courses attended
- b) Refresher courses, short courses, technical workshops and other similar courses attended
- c) Attendance at professional meetings, conventions, specialty technical conferences, etc.
- d) Individual self study activities to keep abreast of technical developments (i.e., in computer hardware and/or software)
- e) Professional consulting activities
- f) Timely completion of special conditions of initial appointment
- g) State of Alaska registration as a Professional Engineer or Professional Land Surveyor.
- h) Professional certification in some area of the engineering field such as Project Management Professional or Network Engineer, etc.

3. CRITERIA FOR AWARD OF TENURE TO FACULTY

A) AWARD OF TENURE AT THE RANK OF INSTRUCTOR

In the case of candidates for tenure who are at the level of Instructor, each candidate's file will be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee and by the Dean of the School of Engineering for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, in service, in research and in continued professional growth and professional achievement as indicators of the candidate's predicted future performance. Decisions involving award of tenure emphasize the prospects for the faculty member's continued performance must show success in the current rank and potential for sustained effort at the next rank.

B) AWARD OF TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

In the case of candidates for tenure who are at the level of Assistant Professor, each candidate's file will be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee and by the Dean of the School of Engineering for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, in service, in research and in continued professional growth and professional achievement as indicators of the candidate's predicted future performance. Decisions involving award of tenure emphasize the prospects for the faculty member's continued performance must show success in the current rank and potential for sustained effort at the next rank.

C) AWARD OF TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In the case of candidates for tenure who are at the level of Associate Professor, each candidate's file will be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee and by the Dean of the School of Engineering for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, in service, in research and in continued professional growth and professional achievement as indicators of the candidate's predicted future performance. Decisions involving award of tenure emphasize the prospects for the faculty member's continued performance must show success in the current rank and potential for sustained effort at the next rank.

D) AWARD OF TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

In the case of candidates who were initially appointed to the rank of Professor without tenure and who are applying for tenure, it is expected that each candidate will have continued to meet the criteria of exemplary teaching, service and research activities since initial appointment to that rank. In reviewing each candidate's file for tenure, emphasis is to be placed, by the Peer Review Committee and by the Dean of the School of Engineering, upon the prospects of the faculty member's continued performance at this level. The candidate's file will be reviewed for evidence of sustained, long-term exemplary teaching, service, research and continued professional growth and professional achievement as indicators of the candidate's predicted future performance.