COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

FOR PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

Approved:

8.05.14

John R.D. Stalvey, Dean — Date

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Approved:

_____ _____

Elisha R. Baker, IV — Date
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

For Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

Contents

		Page
1.0	Faculty Appointment	1
	1.1 Hiring	1
	1.2 Discipline-Specific Criteria	1
2.0	Faculty Review Process	1
	2.1 Review Procedures	1
	2.2 Ongoing Refinement of the Review Process	2
3.0	Peer Review Committees	2
	3.1 Disciplinary Clusters for Peer Review	3
	3.2 Procedures of Peer Review Committees	4
4.0	Types of Review	4
	4.1 Progression towards Tenure	4
	4.2 Tenure	4
	4.3 Promotion	5
	4.4 Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty	5
	4.5 Emeritus/Emerita Status	6
	4.6 Distinguished Professor	6
5.0	Documentation of Performance	6
	5.1 Review Files	6
	5.1.1 Abbreviated Files	6

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

5.1.2 Full Files 7
5.2 Periods of Review 7
5.3 External Reviewers 8
6.0 Criteria for Promotion 8
6.1 Board of Regents and University Criteria 8
6.2 College of Arts and Sciences Criteria 8
6.3 Discipline-specific Criteria 8
7.0 Evaluation of Teaching, Service, and Research or Creative Activity 9
7.1 Review of Teaching Activity 9
7.1.1 Optional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness 9
7.1.2 High-Impact Teaching Practices 9
7.2 Review of Service Activities 9
7.3 Review of Research or Creative Activities 10
7.3.1 Products and Artifacts of Research Activity 10
7.3.2 Products and Artifacts of Creative Activity 11
7.3.3 Efforts to Obtain External Funding 11

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendices

Discipline-Specific Guidelines for Faculty Review

Appendix A:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Anthropology	13
Appendix B:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Art	21
Appendix C:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Biological Sciences	30
Appendix D:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Chemistry	39
Appendix E:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of English	51
Appendix F:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies	60
Appendix G:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Geological Sciences	68
Appendix H:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of History	77
Appendix I:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Journalism and Communication	84
Appendix J:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Languages	93
Appendix K:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics	99
Appendix L:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Music	107
Appendix M:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Philosophy	115
Appendix N:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Physics and Astronomy	124
Appendix O:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Political Science	130
Appendix P:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Psychology	137
Appendix Q:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Sociology	154
Appendix R:	Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Theatre and Dance	162

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

For Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

---

This document provides evaluation guidelines adopted by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for major personnel decisions. The guidelines are applicable to faculty holding academic rank whose workloads require that at least half of their university efforts be directed toward teaching, service, and/or research or creative activity. This document is to be used in conjunction with the union Collective Bargaining Agreements, the University of Alaska Board of Regents Policies and University of Alaska Anchorage Policies. If there is a conflict between those policies and this document, the Collective Bargaining Agreements, Board of Regents policies, and UAA policies prevail. Unless guidelines specific to the College or one of its constituent units are detailed in this document (including appendices), the College of Arts and Sciences adopts University guidelines without elaboration.

1.0 FACULTY APPOINTMENT

1.1 Hiring

Tenure-track appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences are made at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor level. Tenure-track and tenured faculty must hold a terminal degree in an appropriate discipline. The appropriate terminal degree and appropriate professional credentials vary according to the discipline and the areas of responsibility specified in the position description.

1.2 Discipline-Specific Guidelines

Departments within the College are expected to develop discipline-specific guidelines to ensure that faculty appointments and faculty evaluation reflect disciplinary, craft, or professional criteria.

2.0 FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS

Prior to the initiation of faculty reviews, an orientation meeting for department chairs (when reviewing UAFT files) and members of College peer review committees will be scheduled by the Dean. The purpose of the orientation is to address procedures and consider issues relevant to the consistency, efficiency, and fairness of the process.

2.1 Review Procedures

Process and procedures for each type of review (progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or periodic post-tenure review) are established by the University's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Depending upon the type of review and the

applicable CBA, the review process may involve evaluation of a faculty member by the director of a community campus, the chair of the appropriate academic department (as allowed by the relevant CBA), a disciplinary peer review committee, the Dean of the college, the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

All reviewers must complete a training session coordinated by the office of Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate prior to the first time they serve as reviewers or when four years have passed since they last attended training. Reviewers must fulfill the ethical standards for reviewers addressed in the University's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Reviewers must maintain the confidentiality of the candidate's file and the committee's deliberations. Only the candidate and reviewers may access information contained in the file.

Faculty under review submit a file appropriate to the type of review. The contents of files and the deadlines for submission are established by the University and/or the applicable CBA.

At each stage of review, a Findings and Recommendations document, in the format specified by the Office of Academic Affairs, will be composed and added to the file. The written review should address the faculty member's performance in each category of his or her workload and should support the conclusions reached in the evaluation. The reviewer's comments should indicate how the faculty member's performance, as documented in the file, does or does not fulfill the relevant criteria. Whenever possible, formative feedback should be provided to assist the faculty member in his or her future professional development.

Candidates may make a written response to the Findings and Recommendations at each level of review. Responses are always directed to the next higher level of review.

Candidates may add material to their files only if documentation related to scholarly accomplishments was anticipated but was not available at the time of file submission. The candidate should have a placeholder in the file for any anticipated material not available at the time of file submission.

Reviewers may elect to state their concurrence with the written evaluation of a preceding review stage, in which case no further narrative need be presented on the Findings and Recommendations form.

2.2 Ongoing Refinement of the Review Process

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

If a recommendation for changing the process is approved by a majority of CAS peer review committees, it will be placed before the College as a proposed amendment to this document and forwarded for appropriate University level and administrative review. Amendments to the College's review process require the support of two-thirds of College faculty who respond to a written ballot.

3.0 PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

In consultation with the Dean, a department selects one of the following options for constituting a peer

review committee: 1) a qualified department may elect to form its own review committee; 2) if a department is not qualified or does not elect to form its own review committee, then it will participate in a divisional peer review committee.

A department is qualified to form its own review committee if it has faculty sufficient to constitute a committee of at least five tenured faculty, with at least three at the rank of Professor. In case of temporary contingencies that reduce the number of eligible faculty, a departmental peer review committee may include a qualified faculty member from outside the department. A divisional peer review committee is comprised of faculty drawn from several departments within the division. The Dean appoints members of review committees in consultation with department chairs.

3.1 Disciplinary Clusters for Peer Review

Faculty members in departments that are not qualified or do not elect to form a departmental peer review committee are reviewed by a divisional committee. The cluster of disciplines to be reviewed by a particular divisional committee will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the departments. Each divisional cluster must have a total of at least five tenured faculty, with at least three at the rank of Professor. When possible, peer review committees should include eligible faculty from departments whose members are being reviewed, as well as representation of community campus faculty. When possible, faculty diversity should be considered in the formation of peer review committees.

Divisions within the College of Arts and Sciences include the departments listed below. In the event of additions or changes to the divisional structure of the College, the Dean, in consultation with departments, will determine appropriate disciplinary clusters for purposes of peer review.

Fine and Performing Arts
- Art
- Creative Writing and Literary Arts
- Music
- Theatre and Dance

Humanities
- English
- History
- Journalism and Communication
- Languages
- Philosophy

Natural Sciences and Mathematics
- Biological Sciences
- Chemistry
- Geology
- Mathematics and Statistics
- Physics and Astronomy

Social Sciences
- Anthropology
- Geography and Environmental Studies
- Political Science

Psychology
Sociology

If there are too few eligible faculty available to fully staff a divisional committee, the Dean may appoint faculty members from other disciplinary clusters.

3.2 Procedures of Peer Review Committees

The chair of each peer review committee is elected by the committee members. The committee chair signs all reviews on behalf of the committee. The evaluation of the committee should be stated as a recommendation to the Dean.

Only members of the peer review committee at the rank of Professor may evaluate candidates for promotion to Professor.

Faculty may be ineligible to serve on peer review committees for a variety of reasons. Faculty are ineligible if they are on any type of leave during the semester in which the review is conducted, if they are standing for promotion, or if they are members of either the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee or the University Appeals Board. Department chairs reviewing the files of UAFT faculty may not review faculty both as chair and as a member of a peer review committee. Faculty may not participate in peer committees that review a member of the faculty member's immediate family. Reviewers must disclose to the committee and the Dean any potential for conflict of interest in a particular case.

Committee meetings must be conducted according to University policy and provisions in the applicable CBA with respect to open or closed meetings.

4.0 TYPES OF REVIEW

Faculty appointed to tenure-track positions are reviewed for progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review. Retiring tenured Professors may be nominated and reviewed for emeritus or emerita status.

4.1 Progression towards Tenure

Faculty who are tenure-track but untenured, and who are not scheduled for comprehensive fourth-year review or for tenure and promotion review, are reviewed annually for progression towards tenure. The annual review evaluates the faculty member's performance and provides formative feedback on his or her professional progress. The objective of the review is to determine whether the faculty member has shown evidence of achievement or definite promise of achievement as prescribed in University, College, and departmental guidelines. Faculty should document evidence of continuous professional growth and promise for continuing scholarly achievement.

4.2 Tenure

Faculty standing for tenure are evaluated according to the following criteria: 1) sustained high-quality and significant scholarly performance of teaching, service, and/or academic research or creative activity as assigned in their academic workloads, and 2) promise of long-range contributions to the educational mission, reputation, and quality of the university.

Tenure is not automatic and is not based upon years of service. Faculty must meet criteria at each level of review; approval at one level of review does not guarantee approval by subsequent levels of review. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that he or she has met University, College, and disciplinary expectations at the appropriate rank; that this record of scholarly achievement has contributed to the College and University missions; and that appropriate scholarly accomplishments are likely to continue into the future.

4.3 Promotion

Candidates who apply for promotion must meet discipline-specific criteria appropriate to the rank to which they aspire. The minimum rank for tenure-track faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences is Assistant Professor. Untenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor must also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor may not occur without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.

At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in their discipline or field and demonstrate the following:

- A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, if teaching is part of the assigned workload. Effectiveness in teaching means establishment of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program and formal evaluation of student achievement.
- High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft, or academic field, with emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution.
- High-quality contributions to the institution through university and professional service.
- A strong record of professional growth with promise for continuing achievement.
- A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field and demonstrate the following:

- A sustained record of excellence in teaching, if teaching is part of the assigned workload. Excellence in teaching means maintenance of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, formal evaluation of student achievement, and active involvement in ongoing assessment and modification of instructional design.
- High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft, or academic field, which have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution.
- A demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities.
- A record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement.
- A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution

4.4 Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

The post-tenure review should provide formative feedback to faculty to assist their continuing professional development and continuing achievement of high-quality and significant scholarly work. For faculty at the rank of Associate Professor, post-tenure reviews should also document and provide feedback on progression towards promotion.

4.5 Emeritus/Emerita Status

As established in University's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, a retiring faculty member may be nominated by peers or unit administrators for appointment to the rank of Emeritus or Emerita Professor. Faculty who have held the rank of Professor for at least ten years prior to retirement are eligible to be considered for this honor. Emeritus or emerita status is based upon the quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarly achievements across the course of his or her career. The faculty member is expected to have a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishment that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

4.6 Distinguished Professor

According to the University's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, the title of Distinguished Professor or University Professor may be awarded by the Board of Regents on recommendation of unit members and concurrence of the Chancellor and the President. A tenured faculty member may be nominated for the status of Distinguished Professor or University Professor on the basis of rare and special achievement. Such a nomination is considered through the faculty review process including peer review at the College and University levels and review by the Dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor. Recommendation to the Board of Regents and the President is made by the Chancellor.

5.0 DOCUMENTATION OF PERFORMANCE

Faculty are responsible for submission of a review file appropriate to the purpose of the review, and when references external to the University are required, for submission of names and contact information of external reviewers.

5.1 Review Files

The faculty member's file is the focus of the review process and its careful preparation is critical to a successful review outcome. The purpose of the file is to present the faculty member's case for the decision under consideration: progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. As detailed in the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and the applicable CBA, it is the responsibility of the candidate to submit a file appropriate to the purpose of the review.

A review for emeritus or emerita status is based upon a dossier submitted by the nominating body (peers or unit administrators). The contents of the dossier are not prescribed and are left to the discretion of the nominators. Consideration of a faculty member for appointments of distinction such as Distinguished Professor or University Professor is based upon nomination and supporting letters, which will vary depending upon the nature of the special and rare achievement to be honored.

5.1.1 Abbreviated Files

For some types of review, an abbreviated file may be appropriate. For example, depending upon the

applicable CBA, an abbreviated file may be appropriate for an annual review of progression towards tenure or a periodic non-comprehensive post-tenure review. An abbreviated file must include the following:

- Curriculum vitae,
- Depending upon the applicable CBA, a cumulative Activity Report or Annual Activity Report(s) for the period under review,
- Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Report(s) for the period under review (when applicable),
- A self-evaluation.

Additional documentation may be included at the discretion of the faculty member.

5.1.2 Full Files

For comprehensive reviews, a full file may be required, as described in the applicable CBA. For example, faculty scheduled for comprehensive fourth-year review, faculty under review for tenure and/or promotion, and tenured faculty undergoing comprehensive review will submit a full file. A full file includes the following:

1. Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documents

2. Section I: Documents from the Academic Record
   - Initial letter of appointment, if necessary for documenting prior years of service;
   - Curriculum vitae (CV);
   - Verification of certificates, licenses, and degrees;
   - Annual workload agreements for the period under review, signed by the candidate and appropriate administrators;
   - Depending upon the applicable CBA, a cumulative Activity Report or annual Activity Report(s) for the period under review, signed by the candidate and appropriate administrators;
   - Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review; and
   - Copies of Findings and Recommendations from the most recent progression toward tenure, comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is applicable.

3. Section II: Self-Evaluation

4. Section III: File sections that describe and document high quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility: teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service.

Although additional evidence of quality teaching may be included at the faculty member's discretion, candidates whose workloads include teaching assignments are required by UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines to include the following items:

- Official student evaluations for the period under review;
- A selected example of a syllabus for each of the different courses taught. In the case of community campus faculty or others who have taught more than eight different courses during the review period, selected sample syllabi should reflect the scope

of content and/or disciplinary areas.

Documentation of scholarly achievements should be limited to the period under review.

5.2 Periods of Review

The periods covered in different types of reviews are the following:

- Annual reviews of untenured faculty – preceding year.
- Comprehensive fourth-year review and tenure review – period since hire in a tenure-track position at UAA. If applicable, years prior to the candidate's tenure-track hire at UAA that were credited at the time of hire are also part of the period under review.
- Promotion – full period since the candidate's last promotion, or the full period since hire, whichever is applicable.
- Post-tenure review – three years (UAFT faculty only) or six years, depending upon the type of review and the applicable CBA. UAFT tenured faculty are reviewed every three years. At least every sixth year, both UAFT and UNAC tenured faculty undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review covering the six years since the tenure review or the last comprehensive post-tenure review.

If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, and those years are included within the period under review, documentation of teaching, research or creative productivity, and service at the prior institution during the credited years should be included in the file.

5.3. External Reviewers

Reviews for tenure or promotion require evaluation of the candidate's record by professional references external to the University, according to procedures described in the appropriate CBA. In recommending external reviewers to the Dean, faculty should understand that both the stature of the reviewer within the discipline and the objectivity of the reviewer may affect the weight accorded to the external review. External reviews may carry less weight if the reviewer is not an academic or professional with stature in the discipline, or if the reviewer's own professional success may be enhanced by supporting the candidate. The latter might be the case if (a) the reviewer previously had a professional or personal relationship with the candidate, such as a former mentor or collaborator, or (b) the reviewer is currently engaged in funded research with the candidate. External reviews that are likely to have greater impact are evaluations by referees who have national or international reputations in the discipline and those who hold the rank of Professor at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

6.0 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Faculty must meet criteria for promotion at each level of review.

6.1 Board of Regents and University Criteria

Faculty standing for promotion must meet Board of Regents criteria (BOR Policy 04.04) and UAA criteria for the appropriate rank.

6.2 College of Arts and Sciences Criteria

Although the College places primary emphasis on discipline-specific criteria articulated by the

appropriate department, the Dean may also consider activities of particular value to the mission of the College. Examples of faculty activities of particular value to the College of Arts and Sciences include high-impact teaching practices, assessment of student learning outcomes, promotion of a diverse and inclusive academic environment, efforts to obtain external funding, and contributions to University Advancement and Development at the College or program levels.

6.3 Discipline-Specific Criteria

Each academic department within the College has the responsibility to establish evaluation guidelines that (a) conform to the University and College guidelines, and (b) establish objective criteria for each rank that are appropriate to the discipline. Disciplines or disciplinary clusters should articulate standards of achievement for faculty members at different ranks and faculty members with different workload assignments, as well as standards for judging quality.

7.0 EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SERVICE, AND RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Evaluation of each component of a faculty member's workload should be guided by the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, College guidelines, and discipline-specific guidelines adopted by the relevant department.

7.1 Review of Teaching Activities

The faculty member's self-evaluation should address teaching effectiveness at a level appropriate for the relevant review. For comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive post-tenure reviews, the full file must include student evaluations for the period under review and selected examples of syllabi for the different courses taught. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program. As faculty advance in rank, they should demonstrate increasing contributions to curriculum development, assessment, mentoring, and/or innovation.

7.1.1 Optional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

In addition to student evaluations and representative syllabi, the file may contain other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Some examples are the following:

- Description of an innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
- Evaluation of teaching by colleagues;
- Curriculum development and program planning activities;
- Description of new preparations;
- Description of major course revisions;
- Achievements of students, such as awards, publications, or other academic or professional recognition;
- Evidence demonstrating the creation of student interest and involvement;
- Tailored course evaluation procedures carried out by the faculty member.

7.1.2 High-Impact Teaching Practices

The College encourages faculty engagement in high-impact teaching practices that advance the university's instructional mission. In particular, CAS places special emphasis on the following:

- Undergraduate student research,

- Service learning,
- Instruction focusing on international or intercultural perspectives,
- Writing intensive courses (courses in which each student produces at least 25 pages of finished writing that is evaluated as part of the course grade).

7.2 Review of Service Activities

All faculty are expected to engage in public, professional, disciplinary, and university service activities, with increasing involvement at higher ranks, as appropriate to the discipline, craft, or professional field and the missions of the department and the College. The UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines provide examples of different types of public service, professional service, and university service, calling particular attention to the value of community engagement.

Service that is particularly valued in the College includes but is not limited to the following:
- Participation in faculty governance;
- Participation in assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting at the departmental, college, or university levels;
- Participation on faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
- Mentorship of other faculty;
- Participation in accreditation activities;
- Participation in advancement and resource development activities;
- Professional or public service that is recognized as a significant contribution to the profession or community;
- Professional or public service that brings prestige to UAA.

7.3 Review of Academic Research or Creative Activity

Faculty members whose workloads include research or creative activity are expected to document the outcomes of that activity as evidenced by products, artifacts, creative works, or performances. The UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines provide different examples of finished and disseminated products of research or creative activity. Discipline-specific criteria should guide the evaluation of research or creative activity in each discipline.

7.3.1 Products and Artifacts of Academic Research Activity

Evaluation of academic research is based upon completed and disseminated artifacts or products of research. Research products should be documented in the candidate's file. A continuum of research products exists in most disciplines ranging from papers presented at local meetings to the publication of a major book. While all types of research productivity may be considered, some receive greater recognition than others. The college particularly values a publishing record of both quality and quantity in refereed venues. The College encourages the candidate to provide evidence that he or she has become an independent scholar who is recognized as contributing to the discipline at the national or international level by the time promotion and tenure are sought.

Listed below are examples of research products. The order in which they are listed is a general reflection of how they might be weighed in relevant disciplines, assuming that the various examples are of appropriate quality. Products of research may vary greatly in the weight they receive depending on their scope and their impact within the discipline. In reviews of faculty research productivity, the quality of research products is given careful consideration and may result in a particular research product receiving

more or less recognition in that discipline than indicated by the following list. Reviewers should avoid a mechanical application of the list below as a necessary or inflexible hierarchy of value:

- Book (authored or edited)
- Refereed monographs
- Funded research proposals
- Refereed journal articles
- Articles in edited books
- Refereed proceedings
- Laboratory Manuals and instructional materials for use beyond UAA
- Non-refereed monographs
- Non-refereed journal articles
- Reviews of publications or presentations that contribute to disciplinary debate and discussion
- Reviews of electronic media
- Non-refereed proceedings
- Cases published
- Research reports
- Paper presented at a professional meeting
- Annotated bibliography
- Translations, collections, bulletins, synopses
- Abstracts, books of readings, manuals
- Journal comments and notes
- Newspaper editorials or articles on professional topics.

7.3.2. Products and Artifacts of Creative Activity

The outcome of creative activity is a completed and disseminated product, artifact, or performance. The products of creative activity or performance should be documented in the candidate's file. Creative activity may lead to interpretive performances or presentations of artistic works or the creation and exhibition of new works of art in such disciplines as Art, Dance, Theatre, Music, or Creative Writing. There is an extremely diverse range of creative products in the arts. Below are examples of artifacts and products of creative activity. The quality of creative products is given careful consideration and may result in a particular creative activity receiving more or less recognition than other works in that discipline. The most appropriate guidelines for evaluating products of creative activity are discipline-specific criteria that reflect the values and practices of the faculty member's discipline, craft, or professional field.

Products of creative activity may include, but are not limited to, the following examples of performance or presentation:

- Production of a play
- A concert
- Creative work presented through slides or photographs
- Directorial concepts
- Lighting, set, costume design
- Technical plots
- Prompt scripts
- Production photographs
- Costume renderings with swatches
- Scenographic models or ground plans/elevations

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

- Plots, working drawing, revisions
- Actor's journal
- Recordings.

The following are examples of creative activity involving the creation of new works:
- Choreography
- A sculpture, painting, print, photograph
- A musical composition
- An original play, film, screenplay, or adaptation
- Poetry, short stories, novels, creative nonfiction, or other literary texts.

7.3.3 Efforts to Obtain Extramural Funding

All faculty in the College are encouraged to obtain extramural funding to support all areas of their work. While potential sources of extramural funding vary across disciplines, faculty efforts to bring additional resources to the University are valued by the College. Faculty should present evidence of their endeavors to obtain extramural support, such as proposals submitted for extramural funding, funded extramural grants and contracts, documented interactions with philanthropic organizations, or memoranda of agreement with philanthropic organizations, as appropriate to the discipline. The College recognizes the increasing importance of interdisciplinary approaches in order to successfully obtain extramural funding and encourages such approaches.

Examples of efforts to secure extramural funding include:
- Proposals submitted to federal agencies to fund research, creative activity, or pedagogical innovations
- Proposals submitted to state agencies to fund research, creative activity, or pedagogical innovations
- Proposals submitted to local or community agencies to support service projects

Appendix A:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Anthropology

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Anthropology
October 2013

The Department of Anthropology within the Division of Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty. Information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression towards tenure/tenure/promotion/post-tenure review and by those responsible for assessing review files. Evaluation shall be based on qualitative and quantitative assessments of the faculty member's fulfillment of responsibilities in teaching, academic research, and service to the Department of Anthropology, CAS, and the University during the appropriate evaluation period.

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

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

1.0 DEFINITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS

1.1 Workloads:

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

1.2 Department Chair

It is university policy that a department chair must be a *tenured faculty member* to provide formal written reviews of faculty. As specified in the applicable CBA, only UAFT faculty are reviewed by the department chair.

1.3 Faculty Files

Faculty files submitted in the Department of Anthropology will be comprised of, but not limited to, workload agreements, a cumulative Activity Report or annual activity reports as indicated in the applicable CBA, *curricula vitae*, external reviews (where appropriate), and faculty self-evaluation. The latter must address the guidelines for evaluation of teaching, academic research, and service outlined below. Faculty files are reviewed for all three of these workload components.

1.4 "Marked Strength"

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

The UAA guidelines approved in 2012 and the CAS guidelines approved in 2013 call for indications of a "marked strength" in teaching, academic research, or service. The Department of Anthropology interprets "marked strength" to mean productivity in teaching or academic research exceeding that required for rank. Marked strength in *teaching* means the use of "high impact teaching methods" as determined by CAS. Marked strength in academic *research* involves exceeding minimal standards in production of publications or grants, or recognition of research or publication (see under "Associate Professor of Anthropology").

1.5 Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be evaluated for tenure by the beginning the seventh year of service at UAA (the *mandatory year* to apply for tenure and promotion). If the faculty member applies for tenure and promotion *before* the mandatory year, he/she shall be evaluated on the basis of performance expectations that would exist at the time of the mandatory tenure review. External reviews should be sought at this stage.

1.6 Refereed Publications:

Before publication, refereed manuscripts undergo a process of detailed anonymous review by experts in the field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes; a recommendation for immediate publication; or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book to which the manuscripts were submitted. Online publications count equally with print publications if they appear in recognized and professionally refereed online locations. Research products may include reports developed in formal association with government agencies, non-government organizations (NGOs), or private corporations.

1.7 Non-refereed Publications:

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

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

2.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Evaluation of faculty files should follow accepted practice as defined by existing guidelines from UA Regents, within appropriate CBAs, UAA, and CAS for faculty review within CAS. This assessment will note any changes or improvements required for tenure, promotion, and continued professional growth. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist. The evaluation should conclude with a recommendation for or against progression towards tenure/tenure/promotion.

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

2.1 General Guidelines – Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. Faculty will be evaluated on effectiveness in the practice of teaching. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will include the faculty member's own self-assessment based upon teaching goals, methods, strategies, assumptions, and philosophy; summary of teaching responsibilities, course levels, and enrollment; course content, as reflected by syllabi, sample coursework, class handouts, materials placed on Blackboard or webpages; formal course assessment, based on quizzes, exams, lab practicals, graded papers, class projects, and other assignments; and other relevant material as a basis for evaluating the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the course(s).

Areas of teaching effectiveness during the review period may also include:

- Ongoing practice in the classroom,
- Innovative teaching techniques, methods, and deliveries,
- Teaching honors and awards,
- Advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students,
- Developing and implementing departmental (and, where relevant, interdepartmental) curricula,
- Disseminating teaching techniques and innovations (e.g., through publications and presentations to conferences and colloquia),
- Professional development such as attending conferences, participating in field projects, or undertaking archival studies that enhance course content, including sabbatical activities,
- Notable student successes such as awards, publications, or public presentations by mentored students,
- Currency of curriculum, course content, and teaching techniques,
- Teaching independent study or supervised research courses,
- Scores on teaching evaluations, and
- Evaluation of teaching by a peer faculty member(s).

Areas specifically related to graduate teaching effectiveness during the review period may also include:

- Serving on graduate student committee(s),
- Chairing graduate student committee(s),
- Graduate student(s) receiving degree,
- Graduate student publications and public presentations,
- Graduate student employment, and
- Graduate student external funding.

Data such as the required IDEA student evaluations in the form of the course quantification of student responses should be included but utilized with caution. If summary student evaluations are used, reviewers should compare faculty teaching the same courses or level of courses in the same department and with previous sections of the same course taught by the faculty member.

2.2 General Guidelines -- Evaluation of Academic Research and Creative Activities

In assessing academic research/creative effectiveness the quality, quantity, and scholarly significance of

the products should be the primary concern. **It is the responsibility of the faculty member to articulate academic research goals, methods, and results in relation to the field of anthropology in the context of the self-evaluation.**

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

Tier 1

- Books, either sole or co-authored,
- Edited books,
- Refereed articles as first author,
- Book chapters,
- Externally funded academic research greater than $25,000,
- Editing a scholarly journal, and
- Refereed reports.

Tier 2

- Refereed articles as other than first author,
- Non-refereed articles,
- Externally funded academic research less than $25,000,
- Internally funded academic research,
- Submitted external grant proposals irrespective of funding success,
- Submitted internal grant proposals irrespective of funding success,
- Non-refereed reports,
- Videos or other electronic media,
- Museum displays,
- Book, monograph, or article reviews,
- Reviews of grant proposals and participation on scholarly review panels,
- Conference papers or posters,
- Published abstracts, and
- Participation in workshops and other professional panels.

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

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

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

All items produced under the categories listed under Tier 1 or Tier 2 above are considered "scholarly units." For example, each book or article produced is a distinct scholarly unit. In terms of academic research/creative activity, "marked strength" is considered to be reflected by the significant production of these scholarly units above the baseline level of productivity. Ideally, academic research or creative activities should include some combination of both Tier 1 and Tier 2 scholarly products. Collaborative

work, which is central to anthropological inquiry, is encouraged.

2.3 General Guidelines -- Evaluation of Service

Service includes a combination of departmental, college, university, and professional activities. All faculty members are expected to contribute service at levels appropriate to rank. Junior faculty are *not* encouraged to devote substantial time and energy to service activities, but they are expected to provide limited service on departmental, college, or university committees or governing bodies.

Activities that directly contribute to the ongoing functions or development of departmental, college, and university organization and/or administration are part of service. These activities will be evaluated as appropriate in the context of departmental, college, and university committee assignments and other responsibilities. They include a willingness to work effectively to improve the programs, conditions, and activities supporting the mission of the Anthropology Department, the college, and the university. They include professional development activities designed to contribute to teaching and academic research, including attendance at conferences, workshops, and training sessions.

Beyond the university, *professional* service includes being an officer, board member, or committee member of a professional organization; being a conference organizer; chairing or participating on a professional panel; serving as an editor or assistant editor of a professional journal; or other service to professional organizations.

Community service includes providing leadership, actively participating or consulting with organizations, or undertaking activities that are related to disciplinary expertise. Outreach and engagement activities must draw upon the academic and professional expertise of the faculty member while contributing to the public good, or addressing or responding to real-world problems.

Service also includes all honors and awards recognizing professional status or activities, including election as Fellow of organizations or election to honorary societies.

2.4 General Guidelines for Review of Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion

The following are guidelines for reviews of progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion, tenure, within the Department of Anthropology. Specific guidelines are cited for each of the three main ranks for tenure-track faculty (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor). Guidelines under each category refer to criteria established in the General Guidelines above.

2.4.1 Assistant Professor of Anthropology

2.4.1.1 Review of Progression towards Tenure:

All untenured tenure-track faculty are reviewed for progression towards tenure annually before achieving tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. These reviews of progression towards tenure will be carried out by the Department Chair (for UAFT faculty only), and by the CAS Dean or designee. These reviews should reference and utilize the standards for effective performance described below for teaching, academic research/creative activity, and service to assess the faculty member's performance toward meeting those standards. Reviewers should clearly note any potential problem(s) with the file and should suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before the next scheduled review.

2.4.1.2 Fourth Year Comprehensive Review of Progression towards Tenure:

After completing three years of academic employment faculty submit near the beginning of their fourth year a comprehensive file for diagnostic review by the:

1. Department Chair (for UAFT faculty only)
2. CAS Divisional Peer Review Committee
3. CAS Dean or designee
4. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
5. Provost
6. Chancellor, at the request of the faculty member

2.4.1.3 Criteria for review of progression towards tenure:

Teaching: For the rank of Assistant Professor of Anthropology, faculty should demonstrate teaching effectiveness and document it by providing evidence of:

- Promoting the Department of Anthropology's Student Learning Outcomes, and
- Command of course subject matter.

Academic research/creative activity: For the rank of Assistant Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document academic research/creative activity effectiveness by providing evidence of scholarly effectiveness in the production of scholarly units within the categories listed above. Progress in the accomplishment of these scholarly activities should be assessed by the Dean, who should provide guidance as necessary.

Service: For the rank of Assistant Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document developing service activity effectiveness by providing evidence of a record of departmental, college, university, professional, and public service. Attention should be paid to departmental and college service during this phase of the faculty career.

2.4.2 Associate Professor of Anthropology

All candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology must document that they hold a terminal degree in Anthropology or a closely related field and will be expected to demonstrate that, since the commencement of the tenure-track appointment:

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

Candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate and document marked strength in teaching or academic research/creative activity as defined above.

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

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

Marked strength in teaching involves the use of "high impact teaching methods," and potentially includes such items as the development of online courses or the receipt of teaching awards.

Note: Products to be examined for teaching evaluations are listed under section 2.1 above.

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

- Scholarly effectiveness demonstrated in part by production of at least five scholarly units under the categories listed above, of which at least three must come from Tier 1 (section 2.2 above),
- A strong record of professional growth demonstrated by evidence of participation in training, workshops, and other forms of skill development, and
- An emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the university.

Marked strength in academic research includes such items as the production of publications exceeding minimal standards of scholarly units by 50%, the production of a book, the receipt of multiple grants, or significant recognition of academic research or publication.

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

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

2.4.3 Professor of Anthropology

To achieve and maintain (at periodic review) the rank of Professor of Anthropology, faculty should demonstrate evidence of sustained professional growth. They should also continue to demonstrate marked strength in teaching or academic research/creative activity as defined above.

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

- Promoting the Department of Anthropology's Student Learning Outcomes,
- Maintaining an instructional environment leading to effective teaching,
- Continuing command of course subject matter,
- Continuous growth in imparting disciplinary knowledge to students,
- Leadership in new course development and contributions to improving the curriculum,
- Peer evaluations as described above,

- Student accomplishments in academic research or creative activity,
- Letters of recommendation from other faculty or students, and
- Leadership in review and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

Note: Products to be examined for teaching evaluations are listed under section 2.1 above.

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

- Scholarly effectiveness demonstrated during one's career by production of at least twelve scholarly units under the categories listed above, at least seven of which have been achieved following tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and at least four of which must come from Tier 1 (section 2.2 above),
- A significant level of recognition by professional peers on a national and international level, and
- Sustained and extensive generation and dissemination of significant and high-quality disciplinary knowledge.

Service: For the rank of Professor of Anthropology, faculty should document service activity effectiveness by providing evidence of:

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

Appendix B:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Art

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Art
October 2013

The goals of the Department of Art's Promotion, Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, and Post-tenure Guidelines are the following:

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

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

1.0 TYPES OF REVIEWS AND FILES

The faculty member's file is the focus of the review process. There are three components of faculty responsibilities: teaching, academic research and/or creative activity, and service, appropriate to their position and appointment. Candidates need to provide accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of achievements for review at the departmental, college and university levels. Faculty members who are candidates for comprehensive fourth year, tenure and promotion review, or comprehensive post-tenure view shall prepare a complete file that describes and documents their scholarly and creative achievements.

As specified in the applicable CBA, full Files should contain the following:

1. Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documentation in each section;
2. Section I: Introductory Materials, including;
    a. Initial Letter of Appointment, if necessary for documenting prior years of service;
    b. Curriculum Vitae;
    c. Verification of certificates, licenses and degrees;
    d. Annual Workload Agreements for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
    e. A cumulative Activity Report or annual Activity Reports (as applicable under the appropriate CBA) for the period under review;
    f. Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review (when applicable); and

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

g. Copies of Findings and Recommendations from the most recent annual progression towards tenure, comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review(s), whichever is applicable.

3. Section II: Self-evaluation of Teaching, Academic Research/Creative Activity and Service;
4. Section III: File sections that describe and document high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activity and service.
5. Within the teaching section of the file, candidates are required to include:
    a. All student evaluations from the period under review. For all reviews subsequent to tenure, a candidate should include student evaluations only since the previous comprehensive review;
    b. Representative syllabi from courses taught. Selected syllabi should reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas;
    c. Documentation of scholarly achievements and creative activity, limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track position at UAA, or since the most recent tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review;
    d. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, documentation should be included from those years as well.

Faculty should refer to the applicable CBA, the UAA FEGs, and the CAS Guidelines for descriptions of full file elements.

Some reviews, as specified in the applicable CBA and the UAA FEGs, require only an Abbreviated File. Abbreviated Files should contain the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae;
2. Self-evaluation;
3. A cumulative Activity Report or Annual Activity Report(s) for the period under review, whichever is applicable under the relevant CBA,
4. Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review; (when applicable), and
5. Optional selected documentation to support the self-evaluation.

1.1 Teaching

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

1. Instruction and Learning Experiences;
2. Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources;
3. Mentoring Students;
4. Advancing Teaching Excellence;
5. Advancing Student Excellence. (UAA FEG, IV, a, pp. 13–14)

The key idea is that this component of the file, and particularly the self-evaluation, should demonstrate how the faculty member creates a pedagogical environment where students can achieve the Student Learning Outcomes in all classes taught.

The faculty member's self-evaluation should address teaching effectiveness at a level appropriate for the relevant review. For comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion and comprehensive post-tenure reviews, the full file must include student evaluations for the period under review and selected examples of syllabi for the different courses taught. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program. As faculty advance in rank, they should demonstrate increasing contributions to curriculum development, assessment, mentoring and or innovation.

The Department of Art's disciplinary definition of teaching includes not only classroom activities but the range of activities that support the delivery of courses to students, as listed below. Currently, IDEA evaluations are used by the University for student feedback on classes. Faculty are encouraged to develop methods for eliciting better student response to increase the effectiveness of this evaluation system.

1.1.1 Teaching Examples

In addition to student evaluations and representative syllabi, the file should contain other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Some examples are:

- Description of an innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
- Peer evaluation of instruction;
- Development of methods for teaching students to become well-rounded artists;
- Evidence of effective teaching in helping students enhance and expand technical and aesthetic skills for their specific disciplines;
- Participation in or mentoring of student organizations to encourage and develop extra-curricular studio use;
- Description of curriculum development and program planning activities;
- Description of new course preparations or major course revisions;
- Evidence of teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student achievements, such as participation in exhibitions, presentations to professional organizations, or acquisition of grants/scholarships;
- Discussion of results received on student evaluations;
- Discussion of the selection of resources for a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- Discussion of grading in a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- Awards and recognition received by the faculty member for teaching excellence;
- Evidence of involvement in student career development (e.g., providing references or introductions);
- Incorporation of a high-impact teaching practice (undergraduate student research, writing intensive courses, service learning, and courses offering an international or intercultural perspective).

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

1.1.2 Teaching Criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching that may be demonstrated by evidence of: Command of subject matter; Continuous growth in subject field; Maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.	Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching that may be demonstrated by evidence of: Command of subject matter; Continuous growth in subject field; Involvement in instructional activities such as curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation or high-impact teaching practices.	Sustained record of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of: Command of subject matter; Continuous growth in subject field; Instructional environment that promotes student learning outcomes; Leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation or high-impact practices. Leadership in definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

In addition to the criteria cited above, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates may choose to demonstrate a marked strength in the teaching component in their workload. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program.

1.2 Service

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

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

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

1.2.1 Service Examples:

<u>Departmental Level</u>

- Serving on a hiring committee (both within the department or for another department);
- Serving as a member of a Department of Art committee;
- Serving on an ad hoc departmental committee;
- Chairing a faculty search committee;

College Level

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

University Level

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

Professional Level

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

Community Level

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

Service that is particularly valued in the College includes but is not limited to:

- Participating in faculty governance;
- Participating in assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting at the departmental, college or university levels;
- Participating on faculty, administrator or staff search committees;
- Mentoring other faculty;
- Participating in accreditation activities;
- Participating in advancement and resource development activities;
- Performing professional service that brings prestige to UAA;
- Performing public service that brings prestige to UAA.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

1.2.2 Service Criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in service that may be demonstrated by evidence of: Developing record of departmental, university, professional and public service; Evidence of beginning leadership-roles at the departmental level of service; Positive impact or outcome.	Sustained record of effectiveness in service that may be demonstrated by evidence of: Increasing involvement in selected areas of service; Evidence of leadership roles at the departmental level and beginning at the College/University levels; Positive impact or outcome.	Sustained record of excellence in service may be demonstrated by evidence of: Leadership in selected areas of service at the department, College and University levels; Positive impact or outcome.

In general, it is recommended that the faculty member's service component should be centered in the department for the first four years, gradually broadening into College and University service as the faculty member progresses in rank. In addition to the criteria cited below, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates may choose to demonstrate a marked strength in the service component of the workload.

1.3 Research and/or Creative Activity

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

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

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

Art faculty are primarily trained in the creation and exhibition of visual art, although some faculty may choose to focus on research with less emphasis on public exhibitions. The file should contain representative documentation of the faculty member's research and/or creative activity productivity. Because of the diversity inherent in the field of art, the possibility exists that a candidate's creative/research activities will not fall within the range of the suggested criteria. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify the unique circumstances of his or her research and the complexities of their particular creative inquiry when appropriate.

The following lists are examples of academic research and creative activity, but by no means represent all of the possibilities:

Publications (in order of importance)

- A scholarly book published by a recognized academic press;
- A textbook that contributes to Art pedagogy;
- An edited scholarly book;
- Editing of a peer-reviewed journal;
- Articles in a peer-reviewed academic journal;
- A chapter of an edited book;
- A book review;
- Articles in a non-peer-reviewed academic journal;
- Instructional presentation on world wide web;
- Review of work/career in recognized journal;
- Professional and/or public recognition for exhibitions.

Faculty members whose workloads include creative activity in the visual arts are expected to document the outcomes of that activity as evidenced by products, artifacts, creative works or performances. It is to be understood that faculty are not restricted to the activities outlined here, nor are they expected to show performance in each of the categories. Furthermore, since each discipline has distinct differences and emphasis, it will benefit each faculty to address these issues in their self-evaluation, for the benefit of colleagues reviewing the files who may need assistance in understanding the impact of these differences on the time and effort needed for production.

1.3.1 Creative/Research Examples:

- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with international or national visibility;
- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with regional visibility;
- Solo or Invitational Exhibition with local visibility;
- Group Exhibitions at any level;
- Works included in public art collections;
- Grants received;
- Consultantships (paid or unpaid);
- Public Art commissions;
- Professional free-lance work;
- Public performances;
- Participation in public panels;
- Website or other web activity.

1.3.2 Creative/Research Criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works and/or exhibitions appropriate to the discipline at the local, state and regional levels; Evidence of a scholarly research/creative activity agenda.	Sustained record of effectiveness in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works and/or exhibitions at the local, state, regional and national levels; Evidence of emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.	Sustained record of excellence in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works and/or exhibitions at the local, state, regional, national and international levels; Evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.

In addition to the criteria cited above, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels, candidates in Art may choose to demonstrate a marked strength in the research/creative activity component of the workload.

1.4 Summary

Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree in the discipline or field and show evidence of achievement, or definite promise (as evidenced by discipline-appropriate expectations as detailed in unit and department level guidelines), in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high-quality and significance[15] to the professional, craft, or academic field and the University.

Candidates at the Assistant Professor level who are progressing toward tenure must show clear and convincing evidence of continuous professional growth in producing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements within and among the components of faculty work for which they are responsible. This will include:

1. A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching;
2. Scholarly contributions of quality and significance to the unit and institution through university service and professional service;
3. Evidence of promise for the continued contribution of high-quality scholarly achievements in both these components in support the mission of the unit and University.

At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field, as verified by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) that they have a transcript on file. In addition, they must demonstrate the following:

1. A sustained record of effectiveness of teaching. Effectiveness in teaching means establishment of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning

Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, the cultivation of well-rounded artistry, and formal evaluation of student achievement;
2. High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft or academic field, with emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution;
3. High-quality contributions to the institution through university and professional service;
4. A strong record of professional growth with promise for continuing achievement;
5. A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field, either by official transcripts or verification from OAA that they have a transcript on file. In addition, they must demonstrate the following:

1. A sustained record of excellence in teaching. Excellence in teaching means maintenance of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, formal evaluation of student achievement and involvement in ongoing assessment and modification of instructional design;
2. High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft or academic field, with emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution;
3. Demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities;
4. Record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement;
5. A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

Appendix C:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Biological Sciences

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences
October 2013

The Department of Biological Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines for evaluating faculty. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Policies, and the United Academics (UNAC) and University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT) Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). If there is a conflict between the policies, CBAs, and the CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure Review, the policies and CBAs will prevail.

1.0. Description of Standards for Promotion:

The expected standard for each level of Tenure and Promotion for Biological Sciences as synthesized from the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs) is:

1.0.1. Promotion to Associate Professor:

Overall standard: Clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments, with a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment. Additionally, a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, listed below, must be demonstrated. Marked strength may also be shown through integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components.

- *Teaching*: Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching
- *Research*: An emerging level of recognition by professional peers or community members external to the institution through high-quality and significant research contributions
- *Service*: High-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service that support scholarly excellence

1.0.2. Promotion to Professor:

Overall standard: Clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments with a strong record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing scholarly achievement. Additionally, a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, listed below, must be demonstrated. Marked strength may also be shown through integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components.

- *Teaching*: Sustained record of excellence in teaching
- *Research*: Documented recognition by professional peers or community members external to the institution through high-quality and significant research contributions

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

- *Service*: Demonstrated record of effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of professional service activities

1.1. Annual Review for Progression towards Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

All untenured faculty are reviewed annually for progression towards tenure and promotion. These annual reviews will be carried out by:

- Campus Director, for faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's community campuses
- CAS Dean or his/her designee (The Director of Biological Sciences serves as the Dean's designee for annual performance reviews.)

1.2. Comprehensive Fourth Year Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

If appropriate according to the applicable CBA, faculty completing three years of academic employment will undergo comprehensive 4th year review at the beginning of their fourth year. During the fourth year review the faculty member will be comprehensively and diagnostically reviewed by the following:

- Campus Director, for faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's extended sites
- Unit Peer Committee
- CAS Dean
- University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee (UFEC)
- Provost
- Chancellor, at the request of the faculty member

1.3. Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be evaluated for tenure by the beginning of the mandatory year at UAA. The current mandatory year for an Assistant Professor to be evaluated for tenure and promotion is the beginning of the seventh year of service at UAA (i.e., after completing 6 years of service in the department). If the faculty member applies for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory year, he/she shall be evaluated on the basis of the performance expectations that would exist at the time of the mandatory tenure review. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA.

1.4. Definitions

1.4.1. Refereed Publications:

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

1.4.2. Editor Reviewed Publications:

Editor reviewed manuscripts are reviewed by one or more editors. Examples may include (but are not

limited to) final reports, technical reports, and conference publications.

1.4.3. Non-Refereed Publications:

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

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

1.4.4. Department of Biological Sciences Individual Mentoring Committee:

New Assistant Professors in the Department of Biological Sciences are assigned a mentoring committee comprised of three tenured faculty members from within the Department. Duties of the mentoring committee are outlined in the Bylaws of the Department of Biological Sciences.

2.0. Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines in the Biological Sciences

As appropriate according to the applicable CBA, reviews for tenure and/or promotion include assessment by external reviewers. In addition to external reviewers selected by the faculty member, the Dean or the Dean's designee may select up to two additional external reviewers. The Director of the Department of Biological Sciences will exercise this option for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor. The faculty member and/or his or her Department of Biological Sciences Individual Mentoring Committee may provide a list of suggested external reviewers to the Director; however, the Director is not obligated to choose from this list.

External reviewers receive from the Dean's office a full curriculum vitae prepared by the faculty member and a formal request from the Dean for review of relevant areas of workload. University, college, and departmental guidelines applicable to tenure and promotion reviews are available on the Faculty Services web site. Faculty are encouraged to provide reviewers with relevant information about their workloads and their productivity.

2.1.2. Annual Progression towards Tenure Review

Evaluation of the teaching component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA and within CAS. Artifacts used for demonstrating effective teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate, graduate research, and postdoctoral research. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for **continuous professional growth toward the promise or achievement of sustained effectiveness** in teaching. This will help build the case for a recommendation for progression towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays promise or achievement of sustained teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

2.1.3. Comprehensive Fourth Year Review

As authorized by the applicable CBA, faculty members, regardless of the nature of their teaching

assignments, who undergo comprehensive fourth year review must meet CAS requisites for teaching as defined in the *CAS Faculty Evaluation Procedures for Progress toward Promotion, Promotion, Tenure and Periodic Review.* Faculty should **demonstrate achievement or promise of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching**. Artifacts for use in demonstrating effective teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

2.1.4. Review of Teaching for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be awarded tenure and be promoted to Associate Professor, faculty should provide clear and convincing evidence of a **sustained record of *effectiveness* in teaching** in one or more of the aspects of teaching, and a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon, that faculty examine their effectiveness and make changes as appropriate, and that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching, using data and artifacts available in the review file. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusion.

2.1.5. Review of Teaching for Promotion to Professor

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must provide clear and convincing evidence that demonstrates a **sustained record of *excellence* in teaching**. Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is the highest academic rank the University can bestow, so artifacts included in the review file should lend support to sustained excellence. Examples may include (but are not be limited to): teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty or students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring research of post-docs, graduate and undergraduate students, and/or other professional recognition of teaching. University guidelines note that at the rank of Professor, faculty should have a demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs. In addition, faculty at the rank of Professor must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibility (normally the one of primary responsibility), or through their integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components. Evidence which demonstrates leadership as it relates to teaching activities, and which may demonstrate a marked strength in teaching includes, but is not limited to, design of effective teaching strategies that are shared and discussed with other faculty, identifying and initiating development of solutions that meet teaching needs, chairing peer mentoring committees, participating in peer review of teaching, etc.

***IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports:** Caution should be exercised in using the IDEA student evaluations for a variety of reasons including the adequacy of: a) sample size; b) student response rates; and c) the IDEA course database. Reviewers should exercise care when interpreting numerical scores whenever IDEA results are considered unreliable or do not represent the class as a whole. However, the IDEA instrument can provide useful indicators of one's teaching when mean values fall outside or within this range. In such instances, the review process should focus on providing faculty constructive advice and recommendations.

Adequate sample size is another issue related to the use of student evaluations as teaching indices or metrics. Evaluations based on 5 or fewer students should be dismissed, particularly when beginning class sizes are less than 5 (*sensu* IDEA presentation, 4 Sept 2007). Access http://www.idea.ksu.edu/resources/index.html for additional information, or the IDEA Center for information on interpreting results: Overview of Student Ratings: Value & Limitations; Using IDEA Results for Administrative Decision-making.

** **Scholarly teaching**: As noted in the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

(footnote 11, page 12) "scholarly teaching" refers to "having a good understanding of the discipline and applying pedagogical techniques *of demonstrated effectiveness…"* (e.g., as published in the literature or based upon one's own scholarship of teaching and learning). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) refers to a research activity "that has impact beyond the faculty member's students, typically via dissemination of *reviewed* products or artifacts" (in the SoTL literature). The SoTL is a research activity, and evidence of it should be described in the research section of the review file.

2.2 Guidelines-Evaluation of Service

Evaluation of the service component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for faculty review, in the applicable CBA and within CAS. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for growth towards the promise, achievement, and sustained or demonstrated record of scholarly contributions and leadership in service to the department, university, professional organizations, and the public that support scholarly excellence. This will help build the case for an overall record of scholarly contributions and support a recommendation for progression towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays a sustained, high-quality or demonstrated record of service. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

Service includes a combination of scholarly activities at the department, university, professional and public levels that support scholarly excellence. All faculty members are expected to contribute to department, university, professional and public service. Moreover, it is anticipated that Biological Sciences faculty regularly attend and participate in department meetings and committees, and perform other duties consistent with the Bylaws, and as the Director requests. Contributions to both *professional and public service should be discipline-related*. Reviewers should be aware that faculty service as referees or as members of review committees for journals, books, grant proposals, research programs, national level centers, and/or experimental facility awards requires substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute for or replace departmental or University service.

2.2.1 Annual Progression towards Tenure Review

All faculty members undergoing annual review are expected to **demonstrate growth towards the promise or achievement of scholarly contributions** in service that support scholarly excellence. Metrics for potential success can include serving on department and university committees, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, and reviewing textbooks.

2.2.2 Comprehensive Fourth Year Review

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

professional development.

2.2.3 Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate both **high-quality and significant scholarly contributions** to the institution through university and professional service that supports scholarly excellence. The minimum level of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong, continuing and productive involvement in the Department of Biological Sciences' academic and professional development. Other metrics of high-quality and significant scholarly service can include contributions to the department, university and to the faculty member's profession. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments for funding agencies, chairing sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and disseminating scholarly information to the public.

2.2.4 Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate a **sustained record of effective leadership** in service in department and university affairs that supports scholarly excellence. The minimum level of demonstrated record of effective leadership in service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership record of significant service in the department's academic and professional development. Other metrics of effective leadership in service can include leadership contributions to the university and to the faculty member's profession. These include reviewing student presentations, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments and/or proposal review for significant funding agencies, chairing sessions at state, national, and international meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and/or holding office in one's professional societies.

2.3 Guidelines-Evaluation of Academic Research/Creative Activity

In assessing performance, primary emphasis will be placed on refereed manuscripts; editor reviewed and non-refereed research products are considered to be a secondary level of research productivity and will not be acceptable as sole criteria for assessing the faculty member's potential for success in the research component of the workload or to determine progress towards promotion and tenure.

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

Since research faculty are expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis, evidence of these submissions should be included in the review file. In reviewing funding activity, external competitive grant proposals that are funded will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, and awards of experimental time and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit but will not replace the expectation of external research funding.

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to **demonstrate progress in academic research/creative activity** through the documentation in their file. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate **high-quality and significant contributions in academic research/creative activity** in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In those cases where a faculty member changes workload categories (e.g., changes from **20% research workload** to **40% research workload)** research productivity should be judged on a *pro-rated* basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate an **extensive record of high-quality and significant accomplishments in academic research/creative activity** through productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. An extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program that includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national labs. Each discipline has established appropriate measures for meeting this high standard, keeping in mind that the rank of Professor is the highest rank the University can award to faculty.

2.3.1 Evaluation Criteria for Research/Scholarly Activity

The Department of Biological Sciences has specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in research/scholarly activity. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent *minimum* standards for progression towards tenure, promotion, and tenure.

Research in the biological sciences is expected to yield the following products:

Refereed publications and, optionally, **non-refereed publications**.

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

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

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

2.3.2 Annual Progression Toward Tenure Review

All faculty members undergoing first and second year progression towards tenure reviews are expected to demonstrate **progress in scholarly accomplishments** in research. Metrics for potential success can include manuscripts published, proposals submitted or funded, students (graduate or undergraduate) and/or post-doctoral scientists recruited for research activities in the lab and/or field, students and advanced (graduated), and presentations at professional conferences.

2.3.3 Comprehensive Fourth Year Review

To demonstrate **progress in scholarly accomplishments** in Research/Scholarly Activity:

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

*For a 20% research workload this is one publication, for a 40% research workload this is two publications, and for 60% research workload this is three publications.

2.3.4 Review of Research/Scholarly Activity for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To demonstrate **high-quality and significant contributions** in Research/Scholarly Activity:

The minimum research productivity required for promotion to Associate Professor is at least 0.5 manuscripts per year accepted for publication in refereed journals or books during employment by UAA for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload; at least *one* manuscript is to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload[1]. It is acknowledged that not every publication is equal and the quality of publications shall also be considered – journal impact factor or number of times a publication has been cited will also be considered. The intent is for the faculty member to have established themselves independently as an effective and productive investigator. In addition, the faculty member should have competitive external funding at a level appropriate to the faculty member's workload and research field. Other metrics of success can include funded internal competitive awards and external research contracts.[2]

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

National Institutes of Health–Basic Research Grants (R01), Small Research Grants (R03), Academic Research Enhancement Awards (R15), Exploratory/Developmental Research Grants (R21/R33)

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association –Sea Grant National Grants, National Marine Mammal Laboratory etc.

National Science Foundation – Early Concept Grants for Exploratory Research (EAGER), Rapid Response Research Grants (RAPID), Small Grants for Exploratory Research (SGER), Faculty Early

Career Development Grants (CAREER), Large Research Grants for most solicitations, Exploratory Research Grants for many solicitations

United States Department of Agriculture – National Institute of Food and Agriculture formula grants (NIFA)

United States Department of Energy – Biological and Environmental Research (BER) Grants

United States Environmental Protection Agency – Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Grants

Department of Defense—Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and related.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Private foundations –American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Mellon Foundation, North Pacific Research Board, Rockefeller Foundation, etc.

2.3.5 Review of Research/Scholarly Activity for Promotion to Professor

Faculty must demonstrate an **extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments** in research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Biological Sciences. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only.

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

[1] For example, for a 20% research workload this is three publications, for a 40% research workload this is six publications, and for a 60% research workload this is nine publications, based on six years' service prior to tenure.

[2] As a general rule research contracts with federal or state agencies do not fulfill the definition of competitive external funding.

Appendix D:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Chemistry

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Chemistry
October 2013

The Department of Chemistry in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty. The information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression towards tenure/tenure/ promotion / post-tenure review and by those responsible for assessing review files. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' Policies, the UAA Policies (the "FEGs"), and the UNAC and UAFT Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). If there is a conflict between the policies, CBAs, and the CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, the BOR policies and CBAs will prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

The expected standards for each level of Tenure and Promotion for Chemistry as synthesized from the UAA University guidelines are the following:

1.2 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

Overall standard: Show clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments, with a strong record of professional growth, and with the promise for continuing accomplishments. Additionally, a marked strength in at least one or more of the components of faculty responsibilities listed below, must be demonstrated:

1. Teaching: Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching
2. Research: An emerging level of recognition by professional peers or community members external to the institution through high-quality and significant research contributions.
3. Service: High-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service that supports scholarly excellence.

1.3 PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR:

Overall standard: Show clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments, with a strong record of sustained professional growth, and with the promise for continuing scholarly achievement. Additionally, a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, listed below, must be demonstrated.

1. Teaching: Sustained record of excellence in teaching
2. Research: Recognition by professional peers or community members external to the institution through high-quality and significant research contributions.
3. Service: Demonstrated record of effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

professional service activities.

1.4 ANNUAL PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE REVIEW PRIOR TO TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

All untenured faculty are reviewed for progression towards tenure annually prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These annual progression towards tenure reviews will be carried out by:

1. Campus Director, for those faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's extended sites.
2. Department Chair, if applicable (UAFT faculty only).
3. CAS Dean or his/her designee.

1.5 COMPREHENSIVE FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW PRIOR TO TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

As indicated in the applicable CBA, faculty completing three years of academic employment may be required to undergo comprehensive progression towards tenure review at the beginning of their fourth year. During the fourth-year review the faculty member will be comprehensively and diagnostically reviewed by the following:

1. Campus Director, for those faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's extended sites.
2. Department Chair, if applicable (UAFT faculty only)
3. Unit Peer Committee
4. CAS Dean
5. University-Wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
6. Provost
7. Chancellor, at the request of the faculty member

1.6 MANDATORY YEAR TO APPLY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be evaluated for tenure by the beginning of the mandatory year at UAA. The current mandatory year for an Assistant Professor to be evaluated for tenure and promotion is the beginning of the seventh year of service at UAA (i.e., after completing 6 years of service in the department). If the faculty member applies for tenure and promotion prior to the mandatory year, he/she shall be evaluated on the basis of the performance expectations that would exist at the time of the mandatory tenure review. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA.

1.7 REFEREED PUBLICATIONS:

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

1.8 EDITOR REVIEWED:

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

1.9 NON-REFEREED PUBLICATIONS:

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

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

1.10 DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR OR CHAIR:

In accordance with provisions of the applicable CBA, the department chair may provide formal written reviews of faculty (UAFT faculty only).

1.11 TERMINAL DEGREE REQUIREMENTS:

It is expected that all faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher hold a Ph.D. or equivalent in Chemistry or appropriately associated field according to the faculty's specific appointment to the University.

1.12 OTHER RANKS:

Faculty appointed to instructor do not have tenure-track positions and therefore are not considered for tenure nor promotion and are not subject to this level of review. Faculty appointed as Emeritus will meet the requirements as outlined in the UAA Guidelines and the CAS Guidelines, Section 4.5 and honorably represent the Chemistry Department when utilizing that title. Faculty appointed to Distinguished Professor are expected to meet the same criteria as those appointed to the rank of Professor in addition to requirements set by CAS 4.6 in the CAS FEG.

2.0 GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATIONS

The Campus Director (when providing a review), the tenured Department Chair (as applicable under the appropriate CBA), and College Peer Committee will review in turn a faculty member's file and assess the faculty's performance in all relevant workload components for a bipartite and tripartite faculty. This appraisal will note any changes or improvements required for tenure, promotion, and continued professional growth. The appraisal should conclude with a recommendation for or against progression towards tenure, tenure/promotion and post-tenure review.

For an evaluation for promotion (either tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor), the faculty will identify two external reviewers and the Dean may request letters of assessment from up to two additional external experts/reviewers in the faculty member's sub-discipline or field. Both the faculty member and his/her mentoring committee, if that committee is constituted, may provide a list of suggested reviewers.

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

2.1 GUIDELINES-EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR ALL RANKS:

Overview: Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. According to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (section IV. a.), *"When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning…"* As well, *"Faculty members are expected to be reflective practitioners who continuously examine their effectiveness as educators."*

Teaching, according to University guidelines, consists of the following aspects, rearranged in order of importance for the Chemistry Department:

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

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

2.1.1 TEACHING SECTION OF THE REVIEW FILE:

The section of the review file dedicated to teaching must include the following (UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, section VI):

1. All student evaluations for the period under review (IDEA or other as adopted by the university),
2. Selected examples of syllabi from each course taught during the period under review,
3. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (see below).

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

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

2.1.2 OTHER EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Descriptions of the type of work that defines each of the six aspects of teaching can be found in the University guidelines. Some of these, along with examples of the documentation which can be used to demonstrate effectiveness in each of those areas, are provided here.

Please note that the following examples are not intended to be all inclusive, and other work and documentation not listed here may be appropriately included. In addition, it is frequently the case that activities (and their documentation) can be placed within more than one teaching aspect, and may also cross into other areas of the faculty workload including research and service.

Instruction and Learning Experiences. This includes classroom instruction in lectures and laboratories and seminars, as well as course management (coordination, assessment), offering service learning and community-engaged learning opportunities, independent studies, and research experiences in the classroom. Examples of artifacts to support effectiveness include such things as awards for excellence in teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, copies of teaching material (e.g., assignments, course plans, exams), description of pedagogy, student work (papers, projects, posters), formal assessments of student achievement, letters from students, documentation of self-evaluation of teaching and scholarly teaching.

Mentoring students. Mentoring students in research is defined as the teaching of research and is properly considered a teaching responsibility. Faculty in Chemistry should mentor and involve undergraduate and/or graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research. Faculty having research workloads should include any combination of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research program to produce refereed publications. Metrics of successful mentoring of research include awards for mentorship of research, copies of CHEM A498 undergraduate research forms which describe undergraduate research projects and expectations, and evidence of students garnering competitive scholarships, fellowships, and grants; completing Honors and graduate theses, publishing in peer-reviewed literature, delivering presentations at regional, national, and international conferences, going on to more professional training; and attaining employment within their field. Other types of student mentoring include academic and career advising, supervision of teaching assistants, etc. Documentation may include lists of advisees, student letters, or evidence of any of the above metrics.

Building and developing curriculum and learning resources. Activities which fall in this category of work include developing and revising outcomes-based curriculum, shaping teaching materials, manuals and software, designing or implementing new delivery modes or technologies and providing access to information resources. The types of documentation which would support these activities include copies of revised teaching materials such as new laboratory manuals or computer programs, copies of CARs and PARs, course program descriptions and development, copies of databases and websites, etc.

Advancing teaching excellence. Work which advances teaching excellence includes mentoring and peer review of colleagues, planning or contributing to professional development activities, participating in formative assessment activities and disseminating those results to colleagues, participating in selection of instructional tools and using student feedback, peer feedback, and professional development to enhance or change instruction. Examples of documentation to support these activities include dates and descriptions of peer evaluation activities, appointment letter(s) to peer mentoring committees, letters or certificates documenting participation in professional development activities, and descriptions of how

feedback was used to enhance or change instruction.

Advancing student excellence. Activities which constitute advancing student excellence include writing letters of recommendation and nominating students for awards, supporting student applications for grants, fellowships and scholarships, supporting their attendance at conferences, and serving as Chair or member of graduate or undergraduate theses committees. Evidence to document effectiveness in these activities includes descriptions of student success in garnering awards, scholarships, grants, fellowships, etc.

2.1.3 ANNUAL PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE REVIEW

Evaluation of the teaching component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA and within CAS. Artifacts for use in demonstrating effective teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for **continuous professional growth toward the promise or achievement of a sustained record of effectiveness** in teaching. This will help build the case of an overall sustained record of effectiveness and thus a recommendation for progress towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays promise or achievement of sustained teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

2.1.4 COMPREHENSIVE FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

Faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, who undergo comprehensive fourth-year review must meet CAS requirements for teaching as defined in the *CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*. Faculty should **demonstrate achievement or promise of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching**. Artifacts for use in demonstrating effective teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

2.1.5 REVIEW OF TEACHING FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In order to be awarded tenure and to be promoted to Associate Professor, faculty should provide clear and convincing evidence of a **sustained record of effectiveness in teaching.** Candidates will clearly demonstrate sustained effectiveness in instruction and learning experience and mentoring of students (research) as mandatory categories for consideration for promotion. Other aspects from the categories listed above should be considered in the file as supporting evidence of teaching effectiveness. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon, that faculty examine their effectiveness and make changes as appropriate, and that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching using data artifacts available in the review file. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusion.

2.1.6 REVIEW OF TEACHING FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must provide clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate a **sustained record of *excellence* in teaching**. Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is the highest academic rank the University can bestow, so artifacts included in the review file should lend support to sustained excellence. Examples may include (but

should not be limited to): teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty or students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring research by graduate and undergraduate students, and/or other professional recognition of teaching. University guidelines note that at the rank of Professor, faculty should have a demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs. 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. Evidence which demonstrates leadership as it relates to teaching activities, and which may demonstrate a marked strength in teaching includes, but is not limited, to design of effective teaching strategies that are shared and discussed with other faculty, identifying and initiating development of solutions that meet teaching needs, chairing peer mentoring committees, participating in peer review of teaching, etc.

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

Adequate sample size is another issue related to the use of student evaluations as teaching indices or metrics. Faculty may obtain documentation from the Office of Academic Affairs relating to the reliability of IDEA data. Evaluations based on 5 or fewer students should also be dismissed, particularly when beginning class sizes are less than 5 (*sensu* IDEA presentation, 4 Sept 2007). Access http://www.idea.ksu.edu/resources/index.html for additional information, or the IDEA Center for information on interpreting results: Overview of Student Ratings: Value & Limitations: Using IDEA Results for Administrative Decision-making. It is incumbent upon the faculty being reviewed to address the reliability of the evaluations being presented if such concerns exist.

**** Scholarly teaching**: As noted in University guidelines, "scholarly teaching" refers to "having a good understanding of the discipline and applying pedagogical techniques *of demonstrated effectiveness*…" (e.g., as published in the literature or based upon one's own scholarship of teaching and learning). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) refers to a research activity "that has impact beyond the faculty member's students, typically via dissemination of *reviewed* products or artifacts" (in the SoTL literature). The SoTL is a research activity, and evidence of it should be described in the research section of the review file.

2.2 GUIDELINES-EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Evaluation of the service component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA and within CAS. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for growth towards the promise, achievement, and sustained or demonstrated record of scholarly contributions and leadership in service to the department, university, professional organizations, and the public that support scholarly excellence. This will help build the case for an overall record of scholarly contributions and

support a recommendation for progress towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays a sustained, high-quality or demonstrated record of service. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

Service includes a combination of scholarly activities at the Department, University, Professional, and Public levels that support scholarly excellence. All faculty members are expected to contribute to Department, University, professional and public service. Moreover, it is anticipated that Chemistry faculty regularly attend and participate in department meetings and committees, performing these and other duties consistent with normal departmental operating procedures and those that the Chair periodically requests. Contributions to both *professional and public service should be discipline-related.* Reviewers should note professional service of faculty who serve as referees or as members of review committees for journals/books/grant proposals/research programs/national-level centers and/or experimental facility awards since such activities necessitate substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute nor replace department or University service.

2.2.1 ANNUAL PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE REVIEW

All faculty members undergoing annual review are expected to **demonstrate growth towards the promise or achievement of scholarly contributions** in service that support scholarly excellence. Metrics for potential success can include serving on department and university committees, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, and reviewing textbooks.

2.2.2 COMPREHENSIVE FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

All faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, undergoing comprehensive fourth- year review are expected to demonstrate **evidence of promise or achievement** of scholarly contributions in service that support scholarly excellence. Metrics for a sustained record of scholarly contributions should include a continuing record of service to the department's academic and professional development, and contribution to university service. Other metrics of service that support a sustained record of scholarly contributions can include contribution to national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and activities related to the faculty member's professional development.

2.2.3 REVIEW OF SERVICE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate both **high-quality and significant scholarly contributions** to the institution through university and professional service that supports scholarly excellence. The minimum level of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong and continuing commitment to departmental service as a consensus-builder and team-player in Chemistry's academic professional development. Other metrics of high-quality and significant scholarly service can include guiding contributions to the department, University, and to the faculty member's profession. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in

committee assignments for funding agencies, chairing sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and disseminating scholarly information to the public.

2.2.4 REVIEW OF SERVICE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate **a sustained record of effective** leadership in service in department and university affairs that supports scholarly excellence. The minimum level of demonstrated record of effective leadership in service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership record of significant service as a team-player in the department's academic and professional development. Other metrics of effective leadership in service can include leadership contributions to the university and to the faculty member's professional development. These include reviewing student presentations, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments and/or proposal review for significant funding agencies, chairing sessions at state, national and international meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and/or holding office in one's professional societies.

2.3 GUIDELINES-EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH

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

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

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

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to **demonstrate progress in academic research** through the documentation in their file. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate **high-quality and significant academic research** in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In those cases where a faculty member changes workload categories, (e.g., changes from **20% research workload** to **40% research workload**), research productivity should be judged on

a *pro-rated* basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate an **extensive record of high-quality and significant academic research** through research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. An extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program that includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national labs. Each discipline has established appropriate measures for meeting this high standard, keeping in mind that the rank of Professor is the highest rank the University can award to faculty. External reviews must be sought at this stage when required by the applicable CBA.

2.3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH

The Chemistry Department has crafted specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in academic research. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent *minimum* standards for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion.

2.3.2 RESEARCH IN CHEMISTRY IS EXPECTED TO YIELD THE FOLLOWING PRODUCTS:

Refereed publications.

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

Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the *authorship standards associated with their particular discipline (*e.g., principal vs. senior authorship; principal vs. co-principal investigator, etc.).

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

2.3.3 ANNUAL PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE REVIEW

All faculty members undergoing 1st and 2nd year progression towards tenure reviews are expected to demonstrate **progress in scholarly accomplishments** in research. Metrics for potential success can include manuscripts submitted or published, proposals submitted or funded, students (graduate or undergraduate) and/or post-doctoral scientists recruited for research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

2.3.4 COMPREHENSIVE FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

To demonstrate **progress in academic research**:

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

*For a 20% research workload this is one publication, for a 40% research workload this is two publications, and for 60% research workload this is three publications.

2.3.5 REVIEW OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To demonstrate **high-quality and significant contributions** in Academic Research:

The minimum research productivity required for promotion to Associate Professor is at least 0.5 manuscripts per year accepted for publication in refereed journals or books during employment by UAA for each 20% of the faculty member's workload;[1] at least one manuscript is to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or primarily associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory for each 20% of the faculty member's research workload. It is acknowledged that not every publication is equal and the quality of publications shall also be considered – such as consideration of journal impact factors or number of times a publication has been cited. The intent is for the faculty member to have established themselves independently as an investigator. In addition, the faculty member should have competitive external funding at a level appropriate to the faculty member's workload and research field. Other metrics of success can include funded internal competitive awards and external research contracts.[2]

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

NIH – Basic Research Grants (R01), Small Research Grants (R03), Academic Research Enhancement Awards (R15), Exploratory/Development Research Grants (R21/R33).

NSF – early Concept Grants for Exploratory Research 9EAGER), Rapid Response Research Grants (RAPID), Small Grants for Exploratory Research (SGER), Faculty Early Career Development Grants (CAREER), large Research Grants for most solicitations, Exploratory Research Grants for many solicitations.

USDA – National Institute of Food and Agriculture formula grants (NIFA)
US DoE

US EPA – Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Grants
PRF/ACS/Cotrell/etc.- Recognized Professional
research granting Institutions

Private foundations – American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Mellon Foundation, North Pacific Research Board, Rockefeller Foundation, etc.

2.3.6 Review of Academic Research for Promotion to Professor

Faculty must demonstrate an **extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments** in academic research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Chemistry. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA, recognizing that UAA has limited research support and infrastructure. In addition, consideration should be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only.

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

---

[1] For example, for a 20% research workload this is three publications, for a 40% research workload this is six publications, and for a 60% research workload this is nine publications, based on six years' service prior to tenure.

[2] *As a general rule research contracts with federal or state agencies do not fulfill the definition of competitive external funding.*

Appendix E: Faculty
Review Guidelines for the Department of English

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of English
October 2013

The goals for the English Department's Promotion, Tenure, and Progression towards Tenure guidelines are:

- To inform new hires of expectations for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion;
- To help faculty make progress to tenure and promotion;
- To provide clear guidelines for candidates who are submitting a file; and
- To assist reviewers in making fair and appropriate judgments about English Department candidates.

Members of the English Department faculty recognize a tension between the formal division of their workloads into distinct categories and the reality of their work as regularly crossing the boundaries of those categories. In their self-evaluations, they attempt to represent their work for evaluation accurately, explaining when necessary why a specific piece of work may appear under more than one heading. The English Department discipline-specific guidelines are coordinated with the University of Alaska University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (UAA FEGs) and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs). The following document is designed to provide guidance to both bipartite and tripartite faculty in the Department of English. Any areas not covered in the English Department guidelines will default to the provisions of the CAS FEGs.

1.0 TYPES OF FILES

The faculty member's file is the focus of the review process and its careful preparation is critical to a successful review outcome. The purpose of the file is to present the faculty member's case for the decision under consideration: progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. Tenure-track faculty undergoing annual review for progression towards tenure prepare an *Abbreviated File*. Faculty scheduled for comprehensive fourth-year review, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive (six-year) post-tenure review prepare a *Full File*. The faculty member's self-evaluation should present a rationale for promotion and/or tenure. See the CAS FEGs, items 4.2 and 4.3 for descriptions of the required contents of the Abbreviated and Full Files, as below.

1.1 *Abbreviated Files* should contain the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae;
2. Self-evaluation;
3. A cumulative Activity Report or Annual Activity Report(s) for the period under review, according to the applicable CBA, signed by the candidate and appropriate administrators;
4. Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Reports for

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

the period under review (when applicable); and
5. Optional selected documentation to support the self-evaluation.

***1.2 Full Files* should contain the following:**

1. Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documentation
2. Section I: Introductory Materials
    a. Initial Letter of Appointment, if necessary for documenting prior years of service;
    b. Curriculum Vitae;
    c. Verification of certificates, licenses, and degrees;
    d. Annual workload agreements for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate administrators;
    e. A cumulative Activity Report or Annual Activity Reports for the period under review, as indicated by the applicable CBA, signed by the candidate and the appropriate administrators;
    f. Feedback from the appropriate administrator in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review (when applicable); and
    g. Copies of Findings and Recommendations from the most recent progression towards tenure, comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is applicable.
3. Section II: Self-evaluation
4. Section III: File sections that describe and document high quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility: teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service.
    a. Although additional evidence of quality teaching may be included at the faculty member's discretion, candidates whose workloads include teaching assignments are required to include the following items:
        i. All student evaluations for the period under review;
        ii. A selected example of a syllabus for each of the different courses taught. In the case of community campus faculty or others who have taught more than eight different courses during the review period, selected sample syllabi should reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas.
    b. Documentation of scholarly achievements should be limited to the period under review. The periods covered in different types of reviews are the following:
        i. annual reviews of untenured faculty – preceding year.
        ii. comprehensive fourth-year review and tenure review – period since hire at UAA; if applicable, years prior to hire at UAA that were credited at time of hire are also part of the period under review.
        iii. promotion – full period since the candidate's last promotion, or the full period since hire, whichever is applicable.
        iv. post-tenure review – three years or six years, depending on the type of review. Tenured UAFT faculty are reviewed every three years. Every sixth year, all tenured faculty undergo a "comprehensive post-tenure review" covering the six years since the tenure review or the last comprehensive post-tenure review.
    c. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, and those years are included within the period under review, documentation of teaching and other scholarly achievements at a prior institution during the credited years should be included as well.

2.0 AREAS OF REVIEW

2.1 Teaching

Teaching activities create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and student attainment of UAA's Instructional Learning Outcomes. It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following six aspects: (1) Instruction and Learning Experiences, (2) Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources, (3) Mentoring Students, (4) Advancing Teaching Excellence, and (5) Advancing Student Excellence (UAA FEG, IV. a, pp. 13-14). The key idea is that the file, and particularly the self-evaluation, should demonstrate how the faculty member creates a pedagogical environment where students can achieve the Student Learning Outcomes.

2.1.1 Description

The faculty member's self-evaluation should address teaching effectiveness at a level appropriate for the relevant review. For comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive post-tenure review, the Full File must include student evaluations for the period under review and selected examples of syllabi for the different courses taught. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program. As faculty advance in rank, they should demonstrate increasing contributions to curriculum development, assessment, mentoring, and/or innovation.

The English Department's disciplinary definition of teaching includes not only classroom performance but the wide range of activities that support the delivery of courses to students which we list below. The Department especially values Community Engagement. With regard to classroom performance alone, we agree with the IDEA research that student evaluations should weigh no more than 30% of the overall evaluation of teaching, when valid and reliable scores are returned.

2.1.2 Examples

In addition to student evaluations and representative syllabi, the file should contain other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Some examples are:

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

14. awards or recognition received by the faculty member;
15. evidence of active involvement in graduate and/or undergraduate thesis committees; and
16. evidence of involvement in student career development (e.g. providing references or introductions).

In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences values faculty engagement in high-impact teaching practices, with special emphasis on the following:

1. undergraduate student research;
2. service learning;
3. instruction focusing on international or intercultural perspectives; and
4. writing intensive courses (courses in which each student produces at least 25 pages of finished writing that is evaluated as part of the course grade).

2.1.3 Criteria

In addition to the criteria cited below, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates must demonstrate *a marked strength* in at least one component of the workload. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program.

2.1.3.1 *Assistant Professor:* *Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching* may be demonstrated by evidence of

- command of subject matter,
- continuous growth in subject field, and
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes.

2.1.3.2 *Associate Professor:* *Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching* may be demonstrated by evidence of

- command of subject matter,
- continuous growth in subject field,
- instructional environment that promotes Student Learning Outcomes,
- involvement in instructional activities (such as curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices), and
- increasing involvement in review and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

2.1.3.3 *Professor:* *Sustained record of excellence in teaching* may be demonstrated by evidence of

- command of subject matter,
- continuous growth in subject field,
- instructional environment that promotes Student Learning Outcomes,
- leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices, and
- leadership in definition, review, and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

2.2 Service

Public, professional, and university service are essential to creating an environment that supports

scholarly excellence, enables shared governance, meets internal operational needs of the university, and enhances the region, state, and world. All faculty members are expected to engage in public, professional, and university service activities, with increasing involvement at higher ranks, as appropriate to the discipline and the missions of the department and the College.

2.2.1 Description

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

2.2.2 Examples

The file should contain evidence of the faculty member's service commitments, and the file should demonstrate increasingly levels of service as the faculty member progresses through the ranks. Service may include the following:

Departmental Level

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

University and College Level

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

Professional Level

- organizing/facilitating conferences, colloquia, and workshops
- managing professional/organizational webspaces
- evaluating manuscripts for publishers, journals, or other professional publications
- serving as a panel chair at a professional conference
- serving as an officer of a professional society
- maintaining active membership in professional societies
- contributing to technical (e.g., digital/electronic) projects
- contributing to dialogue on professional issues for a general audience (such as articles or interviews in newspapers or magazines; interviews or op-ed pieces on radio or television)

Community Level

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

Service that is particularly valued in the College includes but is not limited to the following:

- participation in faculty governance;
- participation in assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and assessment reporting at the

departmental, college, or university levels;
- participation on faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
- mentorship of other faculty;
- participation in accreditation activities;
- participation in advancement and resource development activities;
- professional service that brings prestige to UAA; or
- public service that brings prestige to UAA.

2.2.3 Criteria

In general, the faculty member's service component should be centered in the department for the first four years, gradually broadening into college and university service as the faculty member progresses in rank. In addition to the criteria cited below, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates must demonstrate *a marked strength* in at least one component of the workload.

2.2.3.1 *Assistant Professor:* *Service activities appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank* as exemplified by evidence of
- developing record of departmental, university, professional, and public service; and
- positive impact or outcome.

2.2.3.2 *Associate Professor:* *Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank* as exemplified by evidence of
- increasing involvement in selected areas of service; and
- positive impact or outcome.

2.2.3.3 *Professor:* *Effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of professional service* activities as exemplified by evidence of
- leadership in selected areas of service; and
- positive impact or outcome.

2.3 Academic Research

Academic research and creative activity are vital to the mission of UAA in order to advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the application of knowledge in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society. Faculty members with designated workload effort in this component of faculty work during the period of review are expected to engage in high-quality, significant academic research or creative activities as appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of their department, school, college, or campus and the University. Faculty members whose workloads include research or creative activity are expected to document the outcomes of that activity as evidenced by products, artifacts, creative works, or performances.

2.3.1 Description

Academic research and creative activity may be generated through all forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, transformation/interpretation, engagement, and application—and it contributes to the generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as defined by the respective scholarly community. It is expected that academic research and creative activity will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following six categories: (1) conducting and disseminating academic research, (2) producing and performing creative works, (3) developing and disseminating curriculum and pedagogical innovations, (4) developing and disseminating innovations

in clinical and craft practice, (5) editing and managing creative works, and (6) leading and managing funded research programs. It is anticipated that members of the English department will focus their research efforts in the first of these six categories.

The English department values peer-reviewed publications, whether in print or digital venues, and recognizes the peer-reviewed article as the basic component of academic productivity. The English department values sole and coauthored publications, and it is incumbent upon the faculty member to demonstrate the value of his or her contribution to coauthored essays. To allow both flexibility in reaching research goals and consistency in disciplinary expectations, the English department has established a research threshold of 10 research units for promotion and tenure (with a minimum of 6 units in peer-reviewed publications or 3 articles) and an additional 10 research units (with a minimum of 6 units in peer-reviewed publications or 3 articles) for promotion to professor. The following list is illustrative rather than exhaustive.

2.3.2 Examples

The file should contain evidence of the faculty member's research productivity. English faculty are primarily trained in the evaluation and analysis of creative work rather than its production, but this is an indeterminate border. Faculty may also produce creative work. However, it is recommended for faculty undergoing review to build their files around academic scholarship rather than creative endeavors. The following list is illustrative rather than exhaustive:

Scholarly Work

- A scholarly book published by a recognized academic press = 6 units
- A textbook book that establishes directions for developing research in the field = 4 units
- An edited scholarly book published by a recognized academic press = 4 units
- Ongoing editing of a journal so as to establish directions for developing research in the field = 4 units
- A textbook used for classroom teaching = 2 units
- A peer-reviewed article in an academic journal = 2 units
- An essay in an edited collection or conference proceedings = 2 units
- A regional, national, or international conference presentation in the faculty member's disciplinary specialty = 1 unit
- A book review = 1 unit
- Non-refereed articles = 1 unit
- Entries in reference works or encyclopedias (per reference work) = 1 unit
- Substantial and sustained online activities (e.g. a well-read academic blog or substantial disciplinary website) = 1 unit

Creative Work

English faculty involved in creative work should address the relationship between their creative work and scholarship and comment on how the creative work should be evaluated. The significance of the creative work should ideally be demonstrated through supporting outside reviews.

- Documented publication (digital or print) and/or production of a play, a collection of poems or short stories, a novel, and non-fiction books or collection of essays (≤1 unit)
- Documented participation in public creative performances (≤1 unit)
- Up to 2 research units may be claimed for creative work in faculty files.

Grants

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

All faculty in the College are encouraged to obtain extramural funding to support all areas of their work. While potential sources of extramural funding vary across disciplines, faculty efforts to bring additional resources to the University are valued by the College. Faculty should present evidence of their endeavors to obtain extramural support, such as proposals submitted for extramural funding, funded extramural grants and contracts, documented interactions with philanthropic organizations, or memoranda of agreement with philanthropic organizations, as appropriate to the discipline. Up to 2 research units may be claimed for successful extramurally funded grants.

2.3.3 Criteria

In addition to the criteria cited below, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates must demonstrate *a marked strength* in at least one component of the workload or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

2.3.3.1 *Assistant Professor:* *Generation and dissemination of knowledge* within the discipline or academic field as defined by the appropriate scholarly community as exemplified by

- high-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works, or performances appropriate to the discipline; and
- evidence of a scholarly research program (see UAA FEGs, pp. 41-42).

2.3.3.2 *Associate Professor:* *Generation and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge* of high quality and significance, as exemplified by

- high-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works, or performances;
- evidence of emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the institutions; and
- production of 10 research units (6 units of which should be in 3 peer reviewed publications).

2.3.3.3 *Professor:* *Extensive and sustained generation and dissemination of high quality and significant disciplinary knowledge*, recognized by peers or constituencies outside the institution, as exemplified by

- high-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works, or performances;
- evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institutions; and
- production of 10 research units (6 units of which should be in 3 peer-reviewed publications).

3.0 SUMMARY

At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field and demonstrate the following:

- a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, if teaching is part of the workload – effectiveness in teaching means establishment of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program and formal evaluation of student achievement;
- high-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft, or academic field, with emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution;
- high-quality contributions to the institution through university and professional service;

- a strong record of professional growth with promise for continuing achievement;
- a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field and demonstrate the following:

- a sustained record of excellence in teaching, if teaching is part of the workload – excellence in teaching means maintenance of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, formal evaluation of student achievement, and involvement in ongoing assessment and modification of instructional design;
- high-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft, or academic field, which 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;
- record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement; a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix F:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies
October 2013

The faculty review process for the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies follows the process described in the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

In the department the departmental chair will review faculty as authorized by the applicable CBA. As the department is not large enough to establish a peer review process *within* the department, peer review of candidates will take place in the social sciences divisional peer review committee.

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies has adopted the following guidelines for evaluating faculty. The information in this document is designed to be used by faculty in the preparation of their progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure files and by those responsible for reviewing and evaluating those files.

This document is not designed to be a stand-alone document. It should be used in conjunction with Regents' policy, relevant collective bargaining agreements, UAA's faculty evaluation guidelines and College of Arts and Sciences guidelines. In cases where GES guidelines are incompatible with those other documents, those other documents take precedent.

1.0 TEACHING

Please refer to university faculty evaluation guidelines and College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for general guidelines on the review of teaching activities and suggested forms of evidence.

1.1 Departmental Expectations

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies values a variety of teaching activities, including all of those described in the university and college guidelines. However, faculty members should actively pursue the following, all of which are of particular importance to the department:

- Excellence in teaching, particularly through the use of the High Impact Practices (HIPs) of service-learning and undergraduate research.
- Efforts to ensure that students graduating with a degree in Environment and Society have met the student learning outcomes defined for the major.
- Departmental advising and extracurricular activities that encourage students to pursue prudent career paths and thoughtful reflection on environmental issues.

Marked Strength in Teaching: A "marked strength" in teaching means the innovative and thoughtful use of HIPs to ensure student success in departmental course work and/or in the Environment and Society degree program. Faculty with a marked strength in teaching will show a significant commitment to HIP pedagogy beyond the normal HIP expectations of a faculty member in the department. For example, a faculty member might show evidence of a sustained use of innovative service-learning, an undergraduate

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

research program with publication-worthy research products, or peer-reviewed research products concerned with innovative pedagogy.

1.2 Departmental Peer Review of Teaching

The department engages in a process of peer review of teaching to help the chair determine effectiveness and excellence in teaching and the promotion of an environment that encourages achievement of student learning outcomes in courses and in the Environment and Society major and minor programs in Environmental Studies and Geography. Faculty will be peer-reviewed, if possible, in the spring before they submit their review file.

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

1. The reviewee and the peer reviewer will meet to decide which course(s) are to be reviewed. At least one course taught in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies must be thoroughly reviewed. At this time a schedule for completing the process will be agreed upon.
2. The reviewee will provide the reviewer with the course syllabus, course assignments, and other relevant documents for review. The reviewer will compare these documents to the course content guide.
3. The reviewee will allow the reviewer to sit as a guest in her/his class. Previous to this class the reviewee will brief the reviewer as to lecture/class content and objectives. The reviewer will observe the reviewee to give comments and critique.
4. The reviewer will meet briefly at the end of class with students, without the reviewee present, to gain insight into the teaching strengths and weaknesses of the reviewee.
5. The reviewer will meet with the reviewee and summarize her/his findings. In addition, the reviewer will produce a short report for the reviewee which s/he may or may not choose to include in the reviewee's file but will also be submitted to the department chair to aid in evaluation.
6. The reviewee has the right to write a response to the report and/or ask the chair to have the process repeated one time with a new reviewer.

This process is not meant to contravene any labor contracts.

2.0 SERVICE

Please refer to BOR policy, relevant collective bargaining agreements, UAA's faculty evaluation guidelines and College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for general guidelines on the review of service activities and suggested forms of evidence. In cases where GES guidelines for service are incompatible with those other documents, those other documents take precedent.

2.1 Departmental Expectations

The Department of Geography and Environmental Studies values a number of service activities, in addition to those described in the university and college guidelines. In particular, the department values:

- Participation in the assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting that focuses on the department's GER courses, the Environment and Society major, and minors in

Environmental Studies and Geography.

- Activities focused on curricular improvement in departmental courses and major and minor programs.
- Professional service that results in community engagement and opportunities for students in service-learning and community-based research.
- Professional service that develops linkages between the department and organizations engaged in environmental work, particularly linkages that lead to student opportunities in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning.

Marked Strength in Service: A "marked strength" in service means a significantly active service agenda, beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member in the department, focused on community engagement activities or faculty governance. Generally, such service should have garnered special recognition for the faculty member.

3.0 RESEARCH

Please refer to BOR policy, relevant collective bargaining agreements, UAA's faculty evaluation guidelines and College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for general guidelines on the review of research activities and suggested forms of evidence. In cases where GES guidelines for research are incompatible with those other documents, those other documents take precedence.

3.1 Departmental Definitions

Research in environmental sciences and geography is expected to demonstrate that the faculty member has been engaged in an active program of scholarly enquiry since appointment at UAA as evidenced by the following products:

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

Second tier: Reports written for government agencies, technical reports, research tools and programs. In addition, this tier might also include standard un-refereed publications. N.B. The nature of our disciplines and the department's focus on community-engaged research (see below) ensures that most faculty members will produce a body of second-tier publications that will factor in decisions on tenure and promotion.

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

3.2 Departmental Expectations

The department's emphasis on community engagement extends to research. Research activities are expected to contribute to efforts to enhance community engagement and should, to some extent, seek to serve the public interest.

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to all of the categories listed above, productivity *must* include first-tier publications. At least a portion of the refereed

publications must be first-authored or derived from work originating directly from the faculty member's efforts. Peer-reviewed publications must be in well-respected disciplinary journals or published by well-respected publishers in the discipline.

Note that the publication of a book requires significantly more time and editorial review than a journal article and will be granted greater weight accordingly. Further, articles accepted by major journals in the faculty member's field should also be accorded greater weight than publications in minor journals. Faculty members should clearly note the relative disciplinary status of the journals in which their articles appear in their self-evaluation.

It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide clarification concerning research output that falls outside of the classifications provided above. However, such a claim is not outside of the range of possibility and will be given due consideration. Given the advance of information sharing, the department is open to new and innovative ways of sharing/publishing relevant scientific information.

Marked Strength in Research: A "marked strength" in research means the publication of first tier products significantly beyond the normal expectations of a faculty member in the department as measured either by a production level 50% above the standards set for tenure and promotion or through the publication of products that garners national or international recognition.

4.0 STANDARDS FOR AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REVIEWED ANNUALLY FOR PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE

An assistant professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies must possess a terminal degree in geography, environmental studies or sciences, or a discipline closely allied with environmental studies or sciences.

4.1 General

A faculty member undergoing review for progression towards tenure as an Assistant Professor in the department must provide evidence of or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly achievement. The faculty member must be engaged in activities that lead to continued professional growth and demonstrate the promise of continuing achievement.

4.2 Teaching

A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by the faculty member. This record will be demonstrated by evidence of a command of the subject matter being taught, continuous growth in the subject field, and the maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.

Assistant Professors are expected to be *developing* pedagogy that employs the HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research. In addition, they should be actively pursuing strategies for measuring and reflecting on student learning outcome achievement in their courses, as well as creating mechanisms to enhance student critical thinking and problem solving skills. Assistant Professors should be developing skills as advisors and finding positive ways to engage students in meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

4.3 Service

Public, professional, and university service activities will be exemplified by evidence of a *developing* record of service that has a demonstrable, positive impact or outcome.

Assistant Professors are expected to be developing a service agenda that matches the department's expectations and makes a positive contribution to departmental objectives.

4.4 Academic Research

The faculty member will be engaged in the dissemination of knowledge within the discipline which will be exemplified by high-quality products in geography, environmental studies, or an allied discipline.

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

Assistant professors are expected to be actively pursuing a research agenda through the preparation of first-, second-, and third-tier research products. Third-tier products are particularly important for early career faculty members who are still in the formative stages of their research. As the faculty member nears tenure and promotion it is expected that increasing attention will be paid to first-tier products as demonstrated first by manuscripts in preparation, next by examples of manuscripts that have been submitted and are under review, as progress is made towards the creation of a body of first-tier publications, possibly supported by second-tier publications.

Assistant professors with a workload more heavily weighted towards research than a standard 3:1:1 (teaching: research: service) tripartite appointment are expected to demonstrate the transition from third-tier research products to first-tier publications more quickly. The body of first- and second-tier publications they need to produce is substantially greater than for a faculty member with a standard tripartite appointment, as outlined in the standards for an Associate Professor.

5.0 STANDARDS FOR AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

An associate professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies must possess a terminal degree in geography, or environmental studies or sciences, or a discipline closely allied with environmental studies or sciences.

5.1 General

A faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor in the department must provide clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly achievement. A faculty member at this rank will also demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the faculty workload, or through the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components. In addition, a faculty member will show a strong record of professional growth and promise for continuing achievement. An associate professor will have emerging recognition within the academic field by peers or community members external to the university.

5.2 Teaching

A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by the faculty member. This record will be demonstrated by evidence of a command of the subject matter being taught, continuous growth in the subject field, and the maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.

Associate Professors are expected to have employed the HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research in their courses. In addition they should have established strategies for measuring and reflecting on student learning outcome achievement in their courses, as well as having created mechanisms to enhance student critical thinking and problem solving skills. These strategies should inform and improve the major and minors offered by the department. Associate Professors should be effective advisors in the department and be actively mentoring students through advising, HIPs and other meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

5.3 Service

Public, professional, and university service activities will be exemplified by evidence of an established record of service that has a demonstrable, positive impact or outcome.

Associate Professors are expected to have developed a service agenda that matches the department's expectations and makes a positive contribution to departmental objectives.

5.4 Academic Research

The faculty member will be engaged in the dissemination of knowledge within the discipline which will be exemplified by high-quality products in geography, environmental studies, or an allied discipline. They will demonstrate an emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the university.

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

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

Associate Professors with a workload more heavily weighted towards research than a standard 3:1:1 (teaching: research: service) tripartite appointment are expected to produce research products greater than those described above, dependent on their faculty workload. *However, the department recognizes that faculty members with a heavily weighted research workload will be involved in the production of a substantial number of professional reports and requests for external funding.* As a result, the number of tier-one products may be somewhat diminished. Notwithstanding this caveat, faculty members with a workload more heavily weighted towards research *must* publish more tier-one products than their colleagues with standard tri-partite appointments, somewhat proportional to their workload.

6.0 DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR A PROFESSOR

A Professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies must possess a terminal degree in geography, or environmental studies or sciences, or a discipline closely allied with environmental studies or sciences.

6.1 General

A faculty member at the rank of Professor in the department must provide clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly achievement. A faculty member at this rank will also demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of the faculty workload, or through the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components. In addition, a faculty member will show a strong record of professional growth and promise for continuing achievement. A Professor will have established recognition within the academic field by peers or community members external to the university and will possess a record of effective leadership in university affairs or professional endeavors.

6.2 Teaching

A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by the faculty member. This record will be demonstrated by evidence of a command of the subject matter being taught, continuous growth in the subject field, and the maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.

Professors are expected to show leadership in the use of HIPs of service-learning and/or undergraduate research in their courses. In addition they should show leadership in the measurement of and reflection upon on student learning outcome achievement in their courses and in the major and minor programs in the department. Professors should be leading advisors in the department and be actively mentoring students through advising, high impact practices, and other meaningful extracurricular activities related to their discipline.

6.3 Service

Public, professional, and university service activities will be exemplified by evidence of a record of leadership in service that has a demonstrable, positive impact or outcome.

Professors are expected to be leading the department in a service agenda that matches the department's expectations and makes a positive contribution to departmental objectives.

6.4 Academic Research

The faculty member will be engaged in the dissemination of knowledge within the discipline which will be exemplified by high-quality products in geography, environmental studies, or an allied discipline. They will demonstrate recognition by professional peers external to the university.

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

As a minimum requirement, faculty members must have published six tier-one products and a substantial

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

Professors with a workload more heavily weighted towards research than a standard 3:1:1 (teaching: research: service) tripartite appointment are expected to produce research products greater than those described above, dependent on their faculty workload. However, the department recognizes that faculty members with a heavily weighted research workload will be involved in the production of a substantial number of professional reports and requests for external funding. As a result, the proportional number of tier-one products may be somewhat diminished. Notwithstanding this caveat, faculty members with a workload more heavily weighted towards research *must* publish more tier-one products than their colleagues with standard tri-partite appointments, somewhat proportional to their workload.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix G:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Geological Sciences

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Geological Sciences
October 2013

The Department of Geological Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty. The information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression toward tenure/tenure /promotion review and by those responsible for assessing review files. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, and the UNAC and UAFT Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA). If there is a conflict between the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, the CBAs and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Procedures for Progression toward Tenure, Promotion, Tenure, and Periodic Review, the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, BOR Policy and CBAs will prevail.

1.0 DEFINITIONS

1.1 Workloads:

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

An example of a bipartite workload is:

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

Examples of tripartite workloads are the following:

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

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

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

1.2 Annual Progression towards Tenure Review for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

All untenured faculty are reviewed for retention annually prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These annual retention reviews will be carried out by:

1. Campus Director, for those faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

extended sites
2. Department Chair as authorized in the applicable CBA (UAFT faculty only)
3. CAS Dean or his/her designee

1.3 4th Year Comprehensive Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty who have completed three years of academic employment and are undergoing 4th year comprehensive review will be comprehensively and diagnostically reviewed by the following:

1. Campus Director, for those faculty whose primary assignment is at one of UAA's extended sites
2. Department Chair as authorized by the applicable CBA (UAFT faculty only)
3. Unit Peer Committee
4. CAS Dean
5. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
6. Provost
7. Chancellor, at the request of the faculty member

1.4 Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be evaluated for tenure by the beginning of the mandatory year at UAA. The current mandatory year for an Assistant Professor to be evaluated for promotion and tenure is the beginning of the seventh year of service at UAA (i.e., after completing 6 years of service in the department). If the faculty member applies for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory year, he/she shall be evaluated on the basis of the performance expectations that would exist at the time of the mandatory tenure review. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA.

1.5 Refereed Publications:

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

1.6 Editor Reviewed:

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

1.7 Non-Refereed Publications:

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

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

2.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

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

The Campus Director (when providing a review), the Department Chair (when authorized by the applicable CBA), and the Unit Peer Review Committee will review, in turn, a faculty member's file and assess the faculty member's performance in all relevant workload components for bipartite and tripartite faculty. This appraisal will note any changes or improvements required for promotion, tenure, and continued professional growth. The appraisal should conclude with a recommendation for or against retention/tenure/promotion.

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

2.1 General Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching

Overview: Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. In addition to the documents specified in Section 6.0 of the CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, a faculty member under review may compile a teaching dossier including sample syllabi, homework, projects, quizzes, exams, and other relevant material to include in the review file to establish a basis for evaluating course content and structure. Additional metrics to establish the effectiveness for success in teaching can include a faculty member's list of courses taught, list of graduate students, syllabi, student evaluations, peer-evaluations of classroom teaching (see below), innovative techniques and pedagogies, curriculum development, and notable student successes. In addition, the chair or another faculty member may observe faculty teaching for the purpose of direct peer evaluation of appropriate and effective teaching methodology, delivery, course content, or other relevant information. The peer observer will subsequently provide the faculty member with a written summary of these observations and any recommendations for improvement. The faculty member should then include the peer reviewer's written summary in the review file (and their response, if any, to this review).

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or conferral of tenure requires evidence of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Candidates should provide such evidence in their self-evaluation of teaching in the files they submit for retention, promotion, tenure, and periodic (post-tenure) review.

IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports: Other data such as IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports in the form of the course numerical summary sheets should be included as part of a faculty member's teaching evaluations.

However, caution must presently be exercised in using the student evaluations for a variety of reasons including the adequacy of: a) sample size; b) student response rates; and the c) IDEA course database. Given the recent adoption of the IDEA course assessment tool during at UAA (since Fall 2007), statistical temporal comparisons involving the same faculty teaching the same course(s), different faculty teaching the same course(s), and comparisons of faculty teaching similar courses at other university campuses will not be wholly reliable until about 10-12 semesters of reliable data are accumulated.

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

Annual Review of Teaching Prior to Tenure (1st three years in rank of Assistant Professor)

Evaluation of the teaching component of faculty workloads (UNAC CBA article 13, UAFT CBA article 5) should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA, the UAA FEGs, and within CAS.

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

1) a command of the subject matter
2) continuous growth in the subject field
3) maintenance of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of the student learning outcomes.

In addition to these general criteria, a sustained record of effectiveness will also include mentoring undergraduate and graduate research. Reviewers should consider all the data in the review file in building a case for a recommendation for retention based on a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

4th Year Comprehensive Review (to demonstrate a sustained record of effectiveness)

Faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, who undergo 4th year comprehensive review must meet CAS requisites for teaching as defined in the CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Criteria for a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

Review of Teaching for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be awarded tenure and to be promoted to Associate Professor, faculty should demonstrate a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon and that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching or research mentoring activities. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their

conclusion.

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

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

Review of Teaching for Promotion to Professor

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching.

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

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

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

III (b). General Guidelines for Evaluation of Service

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

Service includes a combination of departmental, college, university, and professional activities, and all faculty members are expected to contribute service at the departmental, college, and university levels. Moreover, it is anticipated that Geological Sciences faculty will regularly attend and participate in Departmental meetings and committees, and consistent with the Bylaws, perform other duties that the Chair periodically requests. Reviewers should note that professional service of faculty who serve as referees or as members of review committees for journals/books/grant proposals/research programs necessitates substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and

profession, it should not substitute or replace departmental or institutional service.

1st- and 2nd-Year Reviews for progression toward tenure (to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness):

All faculty members undergoing 1st- and 2nd-year reviews are expected to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness in university, professional, and public service. Metrics for a developing record of effectiveness should include a continuing record of service to the Department's academic and professional development, and contributions to college and university committees. Other metrics for a developing record of effectiveness can include contributions to national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and activities related to the faculty member's profession/professional development.

4th Year Comprehensive Retention Review: (to demonstrate a developing record of effectiveness)

Faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, who undergo 4th year comprehensive review are expected to demonstrate evidence of a developing record of effectiveness in university, professional and public service. Metrics for a developing record of effectiveness should include a continuing record of service to the Department's academic and professional development, contributions to college and university committees. Other metrics of service with potential for success can include; contributions to the public and the profession, such as lectures for the public or schools; national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer- reviewed journals in their disciplines; reviewing proposals for funding agencies; hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings; reviewing textbooks; and activities related to the faculty member's profession/professional development.

Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate an increasing record of effectiveness in service. This will be exemplified by evidence of an increasing involvement in selected areas of service that results in a positive impact or outcome. The minimum level of successful service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong and continuing commitment to departmental service as a consensus-builder and team-player in the Geological Sciences' academic and professional development. Other metrics of an increasing record of effectiveness in service can include guiding contributions to the department, college, university and to the faculty member's profession/professional development. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments for funding agencies, chaired sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and holding office in one's professional societies.

Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of effective leadership in service. The minimum level of service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership role in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities.

III(c). General Guidelines for Evaluation of Academic Research/Scholarly Activity

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

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

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

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to generate and disseminate research products. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate high-quality and significant contributions to the profession that have the emerging recognition of peers outside the institution, in addition to demonstrating a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In those cases where a faculty member changes workload categories (e.g., changes from 3:1:1 to 2:2:1), research productivity should be judged on a pro-rated basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

In order for an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. This productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success in obtaining external funding, publishing in peer reviewed journals, and maintaining an active research program that includes undergraduates and/or graduate students. Each discipline has established appropriate measures for meeting this high standard, keeping in mind that the rank of Professor is one of the highest ranks the University can award to faculty. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA. Achieving promotion to the rank of Professor is not a hurdle; rather, it is another level of performance.

3.0 EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH

The Department of Geological Sciences has crafted specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in research. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent minimum standards for retention, promotion and tenure.

Research in the Geological sciences is expected to yield the following products:

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

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

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

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

1st- and 2nd-Year Reviews for Progression toward Tenure:

All faculty members undergoing reviews in their second and third years in rank are expected to have begun the process to generate and disseminate research products. At this level they must show evidence of achievement or definite promise in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high quality and significance. Metrics for potential success will include proposals submitted and funded for external funding, manuscripts submitted or published, students (graduate or undergraduate) for research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

4th Year Comprehensive Review (fourth year in rank):

Faculty members who undergo a 4th Year Comprehensive Review (fourth year in rank) are expected to be well into the process to generate and disseminate research products. At this level they must show evidence of achievement or definite promise in the production of sustained professional growth and contributions of high quality and significance. To demonstrate the developing recognition of peers outside the institution in addition to a record of emerging professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in Research, a faculty member undergoing 4th Year Comprehensive Review on a workload of:

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

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

undergraduate and/or graduate students be involved in the faculty member's research.

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

Research Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

At this level a faculty member must demonstrate high-quality and significant contributions to the profession, with an emerging recognition of peers outside the institution, as well as a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement in Research. The minimum research productivity required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for a faculty member on a workload of:

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

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

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

Academic Research Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The candidate needs to demonstrate a sustained and extensive record of the generation and dissemination of high-quality and significant research products. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate that they have gained the recognition of professional peers outside of the institution in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Geological Sciences. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA, recognizing what level of research support has been developed within a particular researcher's lab, Department, and College. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only. The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of external funding and rate of peer reviewed publication as outlined by their workload category in order to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

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

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix H:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of History

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of History
October 2013

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section I of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines all tenure track and tenured faculty of the UAA History Department located either on the main, satellite or community campuses are covered under these guidelines which are interpreted and implemented within the framework of the UA Board of Regent's Policies (P0.04.04.010-070), the internal governance procedures of UAA, and the relevant Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) of United Academics (UNAC) and the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT). Faculty at these campuses must possess a Ph.D. in history to be eligible for promotion and tenure. Faculty seeking specific information regarding the review process for the various ranks should reference Section VI of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pages 24-28).

These guidelines *articulate* for department faculty expectations and standards of the Department of History for progression towards tenure, promotion and tenure, promotion to professor and post tenure review in Teaching Activities, Service Activities and Research/Creative Activities (if appropriate). The department recognizes that these guidelines represent just the beginning of its responsibility to mentor department faculty over the course of their careers.

These guidelines also serve to *aide* reviewers outside the department so they may make appropriate evaluations of department faculty performance at appropriate levels of review.

These guidelines are general and cannot cover all situations or eventualities. Each individual faculty member undergoing review at whatever level will present a unique record of accomplishment and specialization. In particular these guidelines are no substitute for an authoritative review of individual faculty members' performance as demonstrated in review files prepared by them for appropriate levels of review.

2.0 EXPECTATION FOR PERFORMANCE

Faculty seeking information regarding the specific expectations for performance at various ranks should reference Section V of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pages 20-22).

The University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines provide a broad definition of scholarship (Section III, pages 8-10) – including discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation. The pursuit of scholarship largely falls within three specific areas: Teaching, Service, and Research and Creative Activity. Bi-Partite department faculty must meet performance levels consistent with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching Activities and Service Activities. Tri-Partite faculty must additionally satisfy requirements for Research and Creative Activities.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Specific departmental expectations of faculty performance at various ranks in these three areas follow.

3.0 TEACHING ACTIVITIES:

Teaching and mentoring students is the *raison d'ĕtre* of the university. No faculty activity has a greater impact on the lives of our students and community than this. Effective teaching is, however, more than time spent in class with students. It encompasses a range of activities including, but not limited to, mentoring and promoting student excellence, curriculum and resource development, and the improvement of pedagogy. Through these activities department faculty demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and attainment of Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO's) and UAA's Institutional Learning Outcomes.

The specific aspects which demonstrate effective teaching can be found in the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section IV (pages 12-14).

Junior faculty undergoing Progression towards Tenure Review must demonstrate some combination of one or more of the following aspects:

- Command of their subject matter
- Continuous growth in the subject field
- Effectiveness in creating and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning, attainment of PSLO's and UAA Institutional Learning Outcomes

Junior Faculty undergoing Comprehensive Fourth Year Review should demonstrate some combination of one or more of the following aspects:

- Effectiveness in promoting Department and University SLO's through continuing command of their field
- Effectiveness in mentoring and promoting student excellence
- Curriculum and resource development
- Applying effective instructional design strategies to teaching and learning (pedagogy)
- Other activities promoting attainment of PSLO's

Junior Faculty undergoing Promotion and Tenure Review must demonstrate some combination of one or more of the following aspects:

- Sustained record of effectiveness in promoting Department and University SLO's through continuing command of their field
- Effectiveness in mentoring and promoting student excellence
- Curriculum and resource development
- Applying effective instructional design strategies to teaching and learning (pedagogy)
- Evidence of a sustained record of teaching excellence

Tenured Faculty seeking Promotion to Professor must demonstrate some combination of one or more of the following aspects:

- A sustained record of excellence in teaching
- Sustained professional growth
- The promise of continuing achievement
- An evolving leadership role promoting attainment of Department and University SLO's

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Faculty undergoing Post-Tenure reviews must demonstrate:

- A sustained record of performance appropriate to rank

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Distinguished Teaching Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, page 21 and Section VI, page 27.

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, pages 20-21 and Section VI, page 27.

Faculty under review should demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through a combination of one or more aspects of teaching: instruction and learning experiences, resource development, curriculum development, advancing teaching excellence, mentoring students and advancing student excellence. This can be accomplished through provision of student evaluations and representative syllabi, provision of descriptions of innovative teaching techniques or methods, peer evaluations of teaching, descriptions of new preps or major course content revisions, development of new curriculum, evidence of student success (awards, publications, honors, etc.), or supplemental course evaluation tools.

Evidence of high-impact teaching practices such as writing intensive courses, international or intercultural focused instruction, promotion of undergraduate research or service learning should also be included where available.

The department encourages faculty to engage in development opportunities to broaden and deepen their command of the field and to improve their teaching.

4.0 SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

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

The department desires faculty to engage in service activities appropriate to discipline and rank with increasing involvement at higher ranks. It recognizes the need for junior faculty to develop preferred areas of service while ensuring such commitments do not impact negatively their other professional responsibilities.

The specific aspects which demonstrate effective service can be found in the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section IV (pages 16-18).

Junior faculty undergoing Progression towards Tenure Review must demonstrate:

- A record of service positively impacting the department, university, profession or community.

Junior Faculty undergoing Comprehensive Fourth Year Review should demonstrate:

- A record of increased, effective and positive service in selected areas of department, university,

professional and community service.

Junior Faculty undergoing Promotion and Tenure Review must demonstrate:

- A record of increased, effective and positive service in selected areas of department, university, professional and community service.

Tenured Faculty seeking Promotion to Professor must demonstrate:

- A record of positive and sustained leadership in their selected areas of service to the department, university, profession, and community.

Faculty undergoing Post-Tenure reviews must demonstrate:

- A sustained record of performance appropriate to rank

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Distinguished Service Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, page 21 and Section VI, page 27.

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, pages 20-21 and Section VI, page 27.

5.0 ACADEMIC RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:

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

The specific aspects which demonstrate effective research can be found in the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section IV (pages 14-15).

The consensus within our discipline is that these criteria are met when (Tri-Partite) faculty engage in ongoing efforts to conduct and disseminate their academic research among their fellow historians, students, and the general public. This engagement covers a wide and diverse spectrum of high quality products including, but hardly limited to:

- Books
- Articles in peer reviewed journals (print or electronic)
- Chapters contributed to edited volumes
- Co-authored or edited books or collections
- Conference papers presented internationally, nationally, regionally or locally
- Public presentations
- The ability to secure funding for such projects, post on academic websites, edit a journal, or prepare a museum exhibit

The value of the faculty member's expertise or product must be recognized by their peers within the field beyond the university. The consensus within our discipline is that such recognition can be demonstrated

by:

- The appearance of favorable comment or reviews
- Citations or references to one's scholarship by others
- Nominations for awards or winning awards for one's scholarship
- Invitations to engage in collaborative work
- Invitations to review or edit the works of others
- Invitations to present one's work at conferences, workshops, public lectures
- Nomination for or serving in office in professional organizations
- Receipt of major funding for the pursuit of research
- The solicitation of the faculty member's views or observations, either for fellow scholars or the broader public, based on their expertise

Junior faculty undergoing Progression towards Tenure Review must demonstrate:

- Active engagement in a research agenda to prepare for and produce high-quality and significant research product as specified above.

It is the responsibility of the department to provide appropriate mentoring and guidance as well as a teaching and service load conducive to the pursuit of research but the selection of a research agenda is the responsibility of the individual faculty member based on their training and interests.

Junior Faculty undergoing Comprehensive Fourth Year Review should demonstrate:

- Effective pursuit of a research agenda which has or soon will produce high-quality and significant research product as specified above.

Junior Faculty undergoing Promotion and Tenure Review must demonstrate completion of a research agenda as evidenced by research products that might include any of the following:

- Acceptance for publication of an individually written book manuscript based on original research
- A full length co-authored book based on individual research
- Articles in peer reviewed journals
- Chapters appearing in edited volumes – especially by prominent editors or with other prestigious authors
- The editorship of a collection of essays, critical edition, document collection, or primary source reader

This mix of products may be supplemented by additional works such as:

- Book or article manuscripts written but not yet accepted for publication
- Placement of substantive works on academic websites
- The preparation of a museum exhibit
- The receipt of significant outside funding to pursue research
- Presentation of such research as papers at major conferences

Since the product mix for each individual faculty will vary in terms of type and impact the individual faculty member should specifically address the importance of the product and where it appears in the review materials. Evidence of recognition of such product as specified above should also be provided.

Tenured Faculty seeking Promotion to Professor must demonstrate continued and sustained production of scholarly products and recognition of the faculty member's scholarship as evidenced by some

combination of the following:

- Progress towards completion of a second book manuscript or corpus of work
- Publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals
- Chapters in edited volumes
- Editing a journal
- Presentation of new research at professional conferences
- Application for and awards of competitive research grants
- Recognition of such product as specified above

Faculty undergoing Post-Tenure reviews must demonstrate:

- A sustained record of performance appropriate to rank

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Distinguished Research Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, page 21 and Section VI, page 27.

Faculty may be nominated for promotion to Emeritus/Emerita Professor by members of the department in accordance with University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Section V, pages 20-21 and Section VI, page 27.

The department supports sabbatical leaves and course releases to encourage research.

Reviewers must note: Research is a time consuming and solitary pursuit for historians, frequently taking them far away to locate materials that may be difficult to access and are often in foreign languages. These must be synthesized and assembled into the various forms listed above, also taking time and almost always done alone. Finding and acquiring materials often depends on securing funds from outside organizations. Assimilating and shaping them into products and finding a place for them in appropriate, highly competitive venues (conferences, journals, publishers) requires time, both prior to publication – to write, to secure publishers, to review the work and make revisions – as well as after – for critical reviews and assessment of the work to become available. At best this process takes years (even without issues on the publisher's end) and, especially in the case of collaborative work, is subject to long delays. The department desires faculty who are engaged scholar-teachers, fulfilling their obligations for a considerable teaching load (generally three/three with 25 to 50 students per class) as well as shouldering significant service responsibilities. To pursue research agendas in addition to this, with only occasional opportunities for sabbatical leave or course releases, requires heavy investment of time, energy and effort as Teaching and Service Activities allow.

6.0 THE REVIEW FILE:

Faculty seeking information regarding the specific construct of files for various levels of review and required content for each should reference Section VI of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pages 30-33).

The vehicle to demonstrate faculty performance in all areas of their workload is the Periodic Review File submitted in accordance with schedules laid down in the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements. The faculty member must include within the file required documents and evidence so reviewers may evaluate how well the faculty member has met the criteria set for the appropriate review stage.

Faculty working toward favorable review should provide reviewers the means to navigate the review file, and explain the significance of their various accomplishments through the self-evaluation. The self-evaluation should directly address the expectations for the faculty member over the review period and how they have met those expectations to the appropriate standards in all applicable areas. A strong self-evaluation is thoughtful, reflective and positive, highlighting for reviewers potentially unfamiliar with either the faculty member or the discipline the evidence which demonstrates their performance. University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines provide further description of Self-evaluations in Section VI, Pages 32-34.

A copy of these guidelines should be included in the review file for benefit of reviewers.

7.0 Reviewer Training:

Faculty of the History Department are reviewed by their Chair (UAFT only), the CAS Dean, and their peers at the College and University level. Faculty seeking information regarding training and ethical responsibilities of reviewers should reference Section VIII of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pages 37-40).

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix I:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Journalism and Communication

Prepared by the Faculty of Journalism and Public Communication
October 2013

This document outlines criteria and procedures for the tenure and promotion of faculty in the Department of Journalism and Communications. These discipline-specific guidelines are in accord with the University of Alaska Anchorage University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (UAA FEGs) and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs). The following document is designed to provide guidance to all faculty in J&C.

Nothing in this document shall be construed as removing or modifying the guarantees provided by the above-mentioned documents concerning tenure and promotion.

1.0 OUR MISSION

The department of Journalism and Communication prepares students for professional careers and graduate study while conveying an understanding and appreciation of the vital role that free expression and mass communications play in a global society. Through teaching, research, creative activities, and community engagement, we enrich our community and our profession. The Department of Journalism and Communication at the University of Alaska Anchorage is nationally accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC).[1] Its faculty emphasize the teaching of professional skills. Accredited journalism and mass communications programs also recognize that freedom of expression and freedom of the press are essential to a free society and that the professional education offered by accredited programs should encourage an understanding of the rights enshrined in the First Amendment.[2]

As a scholarly professional program, JPC finds that professional achievement of faculty members in their specific communication areas (journalism, strategic communications, telecommunications and film, integrated media, web design, etc.) is indispensable for the proper education of students, the growth of the program, and its acceptance by various constituencies. Because of this professional nature of the program, evidence of faculty achievement includes, but is expanded beyond, the traditional research criteria to include creative activity and professional achievement.

The three primary missions of the University and Department are teaching, research/creative activity, and

[1] JPC's previous guidelines, on which these are based, were reviewed by Dr. Beth Barnes and members of the 2002 Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) site visit team. These "… professional oriented standards for tenure and promotion" which give "… specific recognition and encouragement to professional liaison and scholarship" were cited in the Department's 2002 ACEJMC re-accreditation report as consistent with ACEJMC accrediting principles.

[2] Journalism and Mass Communications Accreditation, 2012-2013. Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, 2012.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

service. In any promotion review, consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. The primary basis for promotion and tenure will be evidence of the high quality of both teaching and research and/or creative activity, with consideration also being given to evidence of valuable public service or service to the University and/or Department. This Department is committed to excellence in all three areas, but we recognize that equal excellence in each of them in individual cases is rare. Promotion and tenure will generally be awarded only if the evidence shows that a candidate's research and/or creative accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's teaching is also strong, or if a candidate's teaching accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's research or creative accomplishments are also sufficiently strong to meet the requirements for promotion. It will be unusual and exceptional to award promotion merely on the basis of strong performance in only one of these areas.

2.0 PURPOSE OF PROMOTION, TENURE AND PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE GUIDELINES

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

3.0 TYPES OF REVIEWS AND TYPES OF FILES

Faculty members seeking progression towards tenure, tenure and promotion must submit a file that is the focus of the review process. The preparation of this file is critical to a successful review outcome. The file provides the evidence of a faculty member's work during the period under review for the decision under consideration: progress towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. Tenure-track faculty undergoing annual review for progression towards tenure prepare an abbreviated file. Faculty scheduled for comprehensive fourth-year review, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review prepare a full file. See the CAS FEGs, items 4.2 and 4.3, for descriptions of the required contents of the abbreviated and full files. A file should be organized according to the description given in university guidelines. Because faculty from outside the department will review a candidate's file, it is strongly suggested the candidate follow the guideline's recommended format. A candidate may submit as much documentation as he or she wishes in support of the tenure and/or promotion application.

4.0 APPOINTMENT CRITERIA

4.1 Assistant Professor

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

4.2 Associate Professor

The rank of associate professor is the mid-career faculty rank at the University. Faculty members must

demonstrate the following: a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; high-quality and significant 6scholarly contributions to the professional, craft, or academic field; high-quality scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service; and a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution. Non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure.

4.3 Professor

The rank of professor is the highest rank at the University. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor must hold a terminal degree in the discipline or have been granted an exception in lieu of the terminal degree by demonstrating they earned a master's degree (or J.D.) and have seven or more years of professional experience that closely parallels what is done in the classroom and includes substantial accomplishments. They must show clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of the unit. Candidates must have gained recognition in their professional, craft, or academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution and demonstrate the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; contributions of high-quality and significance to the professional, craft, or academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution; demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities; and a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities. This will usually be in the area of their primary responsibility, or through their integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components. A candidate's area of marked strength is one that draws on his or her talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have been previously awarded tenure, or must simultaneously stand for tenure.

4.4 Distinguished Professor

The tenured appointment of Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, or University Professor may be given by action of the Board of Regents on recommendation of unit members and concurrence of the Chancellor and the President. The title of Distinguished Professor or University Professor is considered to be a rare and special achievement. Candidates to be considered for award of the title must be nominated by their department. Following the consideration of the recommendation by the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.

4.5 Professor Emeritus/Emerita

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 professor and who have retired after a minimum of 10 years at the University of Alaska immediately prior to retirement. In exceptional circumstances, other faculty members who have achieved the highest academic rank available to them based on their professional, craft, or academic credentials and position may also be nominated. Following the consideration and

recommendation of the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final appointment.

JPC must attract and retain faculty members who are accomplished practitioners. All prospective faculty members should have significant professional experience. As an academic unit within a university, we also want to attract and retain faculty members who are accomplished scholars. Our criteria for hiring and successful promotion and tenure must accommodate the diversity of individuals needed in our program. We shall seek candidates who have a Ph.D. in journalism, communications, or a related field. A master's degree or J.D. will be accepted in lieu of a Ph.D. if the candidate has seven years or more professional experience that closely parallels classroom instruction and includes substantial accomplishments (holding of significant professional media positions, national distribution of materials produced, national awards for professional media work, etc.). Exceptions to the requirement of the terminal degree for appointments to professorial ranks may be made for individuals whose experience and accomplishments compensate for, or make irrelevant, the lack of a terminal degree. A request for an exception is subject to approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost following receipt of supporting documentation and the recommendation of the dean.

Because journalism and mass communications is a discipline encompassing many fields and the faculty of J&C have wide professional backgrounds, this document should not be taken to be exhaustive in describing the ways that faculty can meet university standards for promotion, tenure, and progression towards tenure. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make the best case in building his or her tenure file. Evidence of the effectiveness in each area below — teaching, service, and research/creative activity—includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. In joint endeavors, the extent to which each person contributes should be identified. We value synergy and high-yield productivity, so some activities may count in more than one category.

5.0 TEACHING

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

It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following six aspects.

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

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

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

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

5.5 Advancing Student Excellence: Writing letters of recommendation or nominating students for scholarships and awards; supporting students' accomplishments, such as Student Showcase, Undergraduate Research Grants, or presentations at professional conferences; and serving as chair of graduate or undergraduate theses, and honors or capstone project committees.

5.7 Criteria

5.7.1 Assistant Professor: Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of

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

5.7.2 Associate Professor: Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of

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

5.7.3 Professor: Sustained record of excellence demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence of

- command of subject matter
- continuous growth in subject area
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes
- leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices, and
- leadership in definition, review, and assessment of student learning outcomes.

6.0 SERVICE

Service to society refers to the function of applying academic and/or professional expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. The members of the J&C faculty recognize the responsibility of service to the profession, to the campus, to the residents of Alaska, and to the regional and national journalism and mass communications organizations. J&C faculty members define service as professional/media participation and leadership in campus, regional, and national academic organizations.

The UAA FEG states, "Public, professional and university service can generally be demonstrated through the following broad categories. However, service activities within these categories can take a number of forms beyond those listed below."

6.1 Public Service

6.1.1 Service to Society:

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

6.1.2 Community-Engaged Service[3]:

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

6. 2 Professional Service

Faculty members engaged in professional service use their academic training, professional expertise, and experience to serve the discipline or society, while contributing to the institutional mission. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty expertise and experience, leads to many different forms of professional service. Nevertheless, there are common distinguishing characteristics that define such service:

- Uses a faculty member's academic, craft, or professional expertise;
- Contributes to the discipline, craft, or professional field and/or the audience or clientele; and
- Demonstrates a clear relationship between the service activities and the goals and mission of the department, college, campus, or University.

[3] UAA Definitions of Community Engagement, Curricular Engagement, Community-based Research, and Engaged Service. Approved by the UAA Faculty Senate and UAA Office of Academic Affairs and submitted by Nancy Andes, Professor of Sociology, and Director, Center for Community Engagement & Learning, May 8, 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

6.4 Criteria

6.4.1 Assistant Professor: Service activities appropriate to discipline, mission and rank as exemplified by

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

6.4.2 Associate Professor: Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission and rank as exemplified by evidence of

- increasing involvement in selected areas of service; and
- positive impact or outcome.

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

- leadership in selected areas of service
- positive impact or outcome; and

- contributions through their work to thoughtful discussion of topics of major concern in the Department and in the wider community.

7.0 ACADEMIC RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY/PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

7.1 Conducting and Disseminating Academic Research

- Conducing basic and applied research and inquiry; community-engaged or participatory action research that appears in books, book chapters, reviews, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals, discipline-specific publications (i.e. law reviews), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, and research notes.
- Editing books, book chapters, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals and conference proceedings, manuscripts, and research notes.
- Serving as a member of an editorial board reviewing publications.
- Funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
- Writing translations, abstracts and reviews.
- Involving undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research.
- Presenting research efforts at refereed national conferences.
- Presenting research before technical and professional meetings.
- Serving as an elected or appointed officer on committees of professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer review as related to research and other creative activities.
- Receiving honors or awards for scholarship.
- Earning grants and contracts, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering grants and contracts.
- Applying research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested;

new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, or educations institutions.

7.2 Producing, Editing and/or Managing Creative Works

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

7.3 Engaging in Professional Achievement

- Participating in juries or review panels judging journalistic work.
- Other evidence of impact on society of research scholarship and creative accomplishment.
- Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms, citation index analysis).
- Transferring or adapting technology transferred or adapted in the field.
- Participating in and description of seminars and workshops (including short descriptions of activity, with titles, dates and sponsor); indication of role in seminar or workshops (e.g. leader, participant).
- Engaging in outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (e.g. consultant, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journal, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions).
- Developing new computer software, video or multimedia programs.

7.4 Developing and Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations

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

7.5 Developing and Disseminating Innovations in Clinical and Craft Practice

- Developing and disseminating novel or creative approaches in clinical or craft practices,

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

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

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

7.7 Criteria

7.7.1 *Assistant Professor:* Generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by…

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

7.7.2 *Associate Professor:* Generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by…

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

7.7.3 *Professor:* Extensive and sustained generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline as exemplified by…

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

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix J:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Languages

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Languages
October 2013

The Department of Languages adopted on February 15, 2013 the following guidelines for promotion and tenure. These guidelines conform to the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines as well as those of the College of Arts of Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. If an area has not been addressed extensively, then the University Faculty Evaluation Guidelines prevail. The Department of Languages Guidelines were established with the goal to help faculty in preparation of their individual faculty review files as well as guide all review bodies outside the department in their evaluation of the Languages' faculty.

The guidelines set the departmental core principles and standards and highlight the expectations within the three components of Teaching, Research, and Service Activities when faculty are considered for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion in accordance with a bipartite or tripartite contract. Bipartite faculty must meet the criteria for effectiveness that is expected in the areas of teaching and service activities. Tripartite faculty are additionally expected to be engaged in ongoing research, demonstrate a successful research agenda, and disseminate peer-reviewed scholarly products. Faculty are expected to show increasing effectiveness and a strong record of accomplishments in all areas of their workloads as progression towards tenure and/or promotion, designating at least one area within their overall performance as their "marked strength."

Terminal Degree: Bipartite and tripartite faculty must hold a Ph.D. in the specific language(s) or related field.

1.0 TEACHING:

All bipartite and tripartite faculty are required to show evidence of effective teaching in their files. Excellence and a sustained effectiveness with depth and scope in teaching underline the Department of Languages' mission. Foreign language proficiency requires a great amount of close work with students. The Department of Languages' faculty strive to guide and motivate students by constantly improving their own methods of teaching and by maintaining scholarship, enhancing their knowledge, and contributing to the department's teaching mission, and/or the pedagogy of the academic discipline as a whole.

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate continuous growth in their subject field. While Assistant and Associate Professors have to show a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching and command of their discipline in all assigned courses and teaching-related activities, Professors are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching and teaching-related activities as well as command of their discipline. The periodic post-tenure review should demonstrate continuing professional development, a substantial record of service, effective and high-quality teaching, and, for tripartite faculty, continuing achievement of significant scholarly work.

The Department recognizes demonstrated evidence of student success within and beyond UAA (e.g.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

intellectual progress and professional development).

Faculty are encouraged to discuss their efforts and achievements in their self-evaluation. However, it is expected that each file provide sufficient documentation that supports the candidate's own view of his/her teaching. Such documentation will yield a more complete portrayal of the faculty's contributions to teaching. Faculty are required to include all institutionally-endorsed student evaluations and representative syllabi for the period under review in their files. However, additional evaluation of the teaching performance may take many different forms. The following document provides a list of activities by which faculty members may demonstrate teaching effectiveness:

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

The Department of Languages views sabbatical leaves as absolutely necessary periods of professional development for faculty members, during which individuals can deepen their command of their discipline.

2.0 ACADEMIC RESEARCH:

In accordance with the mission of UAA, the Department of Languages considers research and scholarship as important components of the tripartite contract. Faculty with a tripartite contract are expected to engage

in research and disseminate their work in the form of papers presented at national or international conferences and peer-reviewed publications in print or digital format. Peer-reviewed publications may include articles, monographs, books, book reviews, essays in edited collections or conference proceedings, entries in encyclopedias or other reference works. Publications may be in the language of choice. Additionally, the department recognizes scholarly work done as editor of a peer-reviewed journal or a book.

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

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

Points will be assigned for research work as follows:

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

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

2.1 Criteria for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor

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

2.2 Criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor

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

eight categories listed above.

3.0 SERVICE:

Service refers to the involvement of the Languages faculty members in meaningful departmental, college, university-wide, professional, and public activities that contribute to the well-being and progress of the University, the community as well as the related professional field/discipline. Both the University and the College guidelines emphasize the value of community engagement. All candidates, regardless of rank, are expected to be engaged in service activities that have a positive impact or outcome.

Junior faculty are expected to show evidence for increased and effective service in preferred/selected areas for their promotion and tenure. These faculty members should have qualifying and effective service commitments to meet this criterion of their workload at the time of their evaluation for tenure and promotion.

Bipartite and tripartite faculty members who apply for promotion to Professor, and Professors undergoing periodic reviews will have to demonstrate a sustained record of public service as well as effective leadership in College and University affairs and in professional service activities.

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

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

3.1 Departmental Level:

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

3.2 University and College Level:

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

- giving guest lectures in classes across the University.

3.3 Professional Level:

- serving as an officer in a professional or scholarly organization;
- editing a professional publication;
- organizing interdisciplinary conferences, colloquia, and workshops;
- attending professional workshops at UAA or outside;
- maintaining an active membership in professional societies;
- evaluating manuscripts for publishers and journals; or
- acting as an evaluator/judge on nationwide scholarship committees.

3.4 Community Level:

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

Service that is particularly valued in the College includes also:

- participation in accreditation activities;
- participation in advancement and resource development activities;
- professional service that brings prestige to UAA; or
- public service that brings prestige to UAA. (CAS FEGs, item 6.2)

4.0 REVIEW:

As described in CAS FEGs, items 4.2 and 4.3, tenure track faculty who are undergoing annual review are expected to submit an Abbreviated File. Faculty who are scheduled for comprehensive fourth-year review, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post tenure review must prepare a Full File. Faculty should carefully read items 4.2 and 4.3 in CAS FEGs to familiarize themselves with the required contents of the respective files.

4.1 Self-Evaluation:

The self--evaluation should be comprehensive and consistent in documenting the faculty member's accomplishments and overall performance. It should be reflective and thoughtful outlining important details and foregrounding the evidence for success and effectiveness for reviewers who might not be familiar with the respective discipline.

Appendix K:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics
October 2013

Introduction

This document defines the policies and procedures for faculty evaluation in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA). The information within this document is designed to be used by a candidate preparing for annual progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic review and by those responsible for assessing review files. It is recommended that a copy of this document be included in the candidate's file (to ensure its availability to all reviewers for use in evaluation), along with the candidate's Narrative Self-Evaluation and any additional documentation regarding the evaluation of the candidate using the criteria discussed below.

This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska's Board of Regents' Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Policies, and the Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). The information in this document cannot supersede the above noted policies and the CBAs. Specifically, if there is a conflict between the policies, CBAs, and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Procedures for Retention, Promotion, Tenure, and Periodic Review, the policies of the CBAs will prevail.

The faculty members of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics have two or three components to their workload divided into five workload units. Workload agreements are made annually based upon the faculty member's appointment at hire and subsequent modifications established between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator: Chair, Director, Dean, Provost, or one of their designees.

Bipartite faculty workloads are comprised of teaching and service. Tripartite faculty workloads are comprised of teaching, service and academic research / creative expression. 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. Scholarship may be derived from, and manifested in, teaching, academic research, creative activity, professional craft practice, and service. Scholarship takes a number of forms including research activities.

The faculty evaluation process will be a review of performance of each component of a workload agreement. Since activity reports and workload agreements may categorize some activities in a manner different from the guidelines in this document, the candidate's Narrative Self-Evaluation should describe these activities according to the categorization in this document. Note that ***compensated*** outside activities such as consulting, providing testimony as an expert (professional) witness, etc. are not part of the full-time commitments of a faculty member and, therefore, cannot be considered as teaching, academic research or creative expression, or service for the purposes of faculty evaluation. Faculty members may request that such be considered for its contribution to continuing faculty development.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

In the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the criteria for evaluating a faculty member are described in the following three categories:

A. Criteria for teaching performance review,
B. Criteria for service review,
C. Criteria for academic research and creative expression review.

A. Criteria for Teaching Performance Review

Teaching is the art and science of sharing knowledge or skill and creating a setting that leads to student learning and the co-creation of student knowledge. Teaching may occur in a formal setting as in direct instruction of credit-bearing courses or as "informal" activities. Teaching activities and teaching effectiveness must be addressed in the performance review and can be demonstrated through various aspects of teaching and learning which include, but are not limited to:

1. Instruction and advancing teaching excellence,
2. Development of curriculum and learning resources,
3. Mentoring students and advancing student excellence.

1. *Instruction and Advancing Teaching Excellence*

Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

(a) Description of courses taught (including descriptions of different course formats);

(b) Description of teaching philosophy and methods and how the methods have evolved for improved student success, including the influence of the candidate's research and expertise;

(c) Discussion with supporting documentation of engagement in professional development activities related to teaching, learning strategies, or student success in mathematics or statistics;

(d) Discussion of student feedback and how this information has been used to improve teaching. This feedback may include, but is not limited to, student responses, collected through a self-designed instrument, on-line instrument, or unsolicited comments, regarding the effectiveness of the teacher. (*The inclusion of IDEA information is required. **Caution** should be observed by the candidate when using IDEA data and by the evaluators when reviewing IDEA data, due to the lack of statistical validity. IDEA information is only one aspect to be considered when evaluating teaching effectiveness.);*

(e) Discussion and documentation of opportunities to mentor other faculty members in teaching, including conducting faculty development activities at UAA and other institutions, or consulting activities designed to improve teaching and learning;

(f) Description and documentation of teaching awards;

(g) Description of scholarly activities related to teaching or mathematics and statistics education and how this information has enhanced teaching;

(h) Classroom visitations by a peer faculty member or department chair may be required for pre-tenure faculty. Summary reports of these visitations may be included in the file at the discretion of the candidate. To ensure a fair and equitable process, the procedures for the visitation and evaluation criteria will be set by the candidate in collaboration with the visiting faculty member. (Criteria for classroom visitations and faculty observations have been proposed but are not currently approved by the Department. These proposed criteria are listed in the Appendix section. This document will be updated when such criteria become the policy of the Department.)

2. *Development of Curriculum and Learning Resources*

Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

(a) Descriptions of the development, implementation**,** or assessment of new, redesigned, or revised courses or curriculum, or the preparation of special topics courses;

(b) Discussion of the impacts that the changes in curriculum have had on the staff of the department, the department offerings, and the students enrolled in the courses;

(c) Descriptions with documentation of textbooks, supplements, interactive tools, assignments, online systems, and new methods for course delivery, and feedback from others familiar with the materials.

3. *Mentoring Students and Advancing Student Excellence*

Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

(a) Discussion of efforts made for advising students in the area of improving academic success, particularly in the timely progress of mathematics and statistics courses and degree completion;

(b) Description of efforts to recruit students into upper division courses or into a major or a minor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics;

(c) Description of independent study or supervised reading opportunities provided for courses or topics not in the current university offerings;

(d) Discussion of other student engagement activities;

(e) Documentation of the outcomes of student mentoring efforts by including letters from students or others assessing the assistance provided by the faculty member;

(f) Description of efforts to support students' goals which may include writing letters of recommendation for graduate school applications, scholarships, academic awards, or similar programs.

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 demonstrate leadership in program-level curriculum development or revisions, provide consistent

contributions to student learning in established courses, and engage in mentoring and advising students.

B. Criteria for Service Review

Faculty members are expected to engage in a diversity of service activities as a part of their workload. Service can be performed within the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the College and University, the profession, and the community, at local, regional, national and international levels. Normally, faculty members are expected to provide a balance of service in each of these areas. As a note of caution, over the course of the evaluation period faculty members should be careful to avoid over-commitment to service related activities that may jeopardize the successful completion of other aspects of their workload.

The types of service activity can be classified under one of two categories:

1. University service,
2. Professional service.

The faculty member will describe and provide documentation for his/her service activities. Evidence may include, but will not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda documenting service, program information, membership lists, and other appropriate items. The lists below are not intended to be exhaustive. If other activities demonstrate accomplishment in this area, the faculty member is encouraged to identify and document them.

University Service

University service comprises activities in the institutional governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, colleges, and institutes. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Active participation in service to or governance of programs, departments, colleges, schools, or the university;

(b) Academic and/or career advisement of students;

(c) Mentoring the student in research and guidance through research presentations or manuscript writing;

(d) Developing and establishing new curricula, curricular format, or programs;

(e) Active participation at program, department, college, and university meetings;

(f) Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the university's mission or operation;

(g) Completion of classroom visitation reports;

(h) Service in support of student organizations and activities;

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

(i) Serving on a mentoring committee for a new untenured faculty member;

(j) Serving on a top-level board, task-force, or committee.

Professional Service

Professional service activities are classified under the following three categories:

1. Service to the discipline,
2. Service to the society,
3. Community engaged service.

1. *Service to the Discipline*

Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Serving in a leadership capacity for local, state, or national organizations (including organizing or facilitating general meetings or other service activities);

(b) Conducting local, state, or national mathematics or statistics student competitions.

2. *Service to the Society*

Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Writing for non-academic publications for specialized audiences;

(b) Providing expertise to community agencies or civic groups (through unpaid consultation);

(c) Testifying before legislative or congressional committees;

(d) Providing expertise to local, state, national, or international governmental agencies;

(e) Serving on public boards, task forces, or committees;

(f) Offering professional workshops to the society.

3. *Community Engaged Service*

Community engagement describes the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation, 2007). Examples include, but are not limited to, the following.

(a) Professional partnership with the community;

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

(b) Using faculty expertise to address a community identified need (through unpaid consultation);

(c) Enhancing student learning or research studies in the community;
(d) Participating on local or national boards.

Although there is no precise formula for the service requirement for specific ranks, the distinction between the ranks is a function of the faculty member's time commitment and or the impact of both the committee itself and the faculty member's contribution. There is the expectation that faculty members at higher ranks or aspiring to higher ranks will have a greater time commitment serving on high-impact committees requiring high levels of faculty effort and serving in positions of leadership, i.e., chair.

C. <u>Criteria for Academic Research and Creative Expression Review</u>

Each tripartite faculty member is expected to engage in academic research. Faculty need to establish a clear and consistent pattern of scholarly production in one or more areas of expertise that is proportional to the research allocation of the workload (e.g., a 2:2:1 contract or a 3:1:1 contract). Academic research will be judged for importance, originality, and quality. The work must be presented in a public forum where its contribution can be judged by peers external to UAA. Excellence in academic research and creative expression may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, the following:

(a) Publishing peer-reviewed research articles or review articles in professional journals or conference proceedings;

(b) Writing or editing books, book chapters, monographs, technical reports, or contributions appearing in non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings.

(c) Developing ideas, methods, and results associated with undergraduate student research, including any research presentations or peer-reviewed publications resulting thereby (*time and effort involved in mentoring students in research and guiding them through presentations or manuscript writing should be listed under service*);

(d) Receiving competitive research funding, grants, awards, or fellowships;

(e) Organizing sessions, workshops, or conferences in the candidate's research field;

(f) Invitations to speak or present research in symposia, colloquia, special lectures, workshops, or other research conferences; presenting research in the form of contributed talks or posters at professional conferences, or meetings.

(g) Serving as a reviewer or referee of articles for a professional journal, serving as an editor of a professional journal, or serving as a reviewer of proposals for funding organizations or professional journals;

(h) Citations of the candidate's research in scholarly publications which could be demonstrated through, for example, MathSciNet, Science Citation Index (SCI), Google Scholar, etc.;

(i) Letters from outside experts assessing the quality and importance of the candidate's

research;

(j) Receipt of research honors and awards granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry

(k) Uncompensated consultation work (*compensated consultation work should be listed under faculty development*);

(l) Writing book reviews or other editorial contributions.

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics expects a faculty with a 3:1:1 workload to be publishing (i.e., having a paper accepted) at a rate of approximately one paper every three years; faculty with a higher proportion of research in their workloads should be publishing at a proportionally higher rate. It should be emphasized that this is an approximate goal and that the more important goal is quality research. High quality research can be produced and disseminated in special circumstances at a lower rate, which should be discussed in the Narrative Self-Evaluation. Faculty members should not necessarily try to meet a target in terms of number of papers published, and a heavy production rate of low quality publications is particularly discouraged.

As an illustration, a faculty member with a 3:1:1 appointment coming up for promotion and tenure after the fifth year should have at least one paper accepted or published at a reputable journal. In addition, the faculty member should be able to provide evidence of continued scholarly production, which could include one or more additional papers in the review process, submission of a proposal for external funding, evidence of collaborative work, preparation of technical reports, conference proceedings, or other evidence such as the items (a)-(l) listed above.

The practice of listing coauthors who have contributed little to a publication is uncommon in the mathematical sciences. Except in unusual circumstances, each coauthor will have made a significant contribution. Coauthors are often listed alphabetically in journals of the mathematical sciences if each coauthor has made an equal contribution. For purposes of clarification, the faculty member is encouraged to include a description of his or her contribution to any coauthored project. Publications in interdisciplinary journals should be considered as equal to publications in mathematics or statistics journals, especially when the article concerns an application of mathematics or statistics. The term `interdisciplinary journal' includes, but is not limited to, two classes of journals, namely (i) journals whose content primarily lies directly between two or more disciplines (e.g., Journal of Mathematical Physics, Journal of Mathematical Biology, etc.) and (ii) journals whose content primarily lies in a discipline outside of mathematics/statistics (e.g., physics, chemistry, biology, engineering, computer science, economics, etc.

Criteria for Tenure

Candidates for tenure who are at the level of Associate Professor will be reviewed for evidence of sustained, long-term success in teaching, service and research (as appropriate) at the level of Associate Professor and the prospects for faculty member's continued professional growth and development.

Appendix

Proposed policy for classroom visitations and faculty observations

Summaries of classroom visitations by a peer faculty member or department chair may, at a future date, become part of the department policy**.** These summaries may be included only if the following procedures have been set in place to ensure a fair and equitable process.

The criteria for classroom visitations include:

(a) A document listing specific evaluation criteria that will be used consistently by all reviewers. The document must be available to all faculty;

(b) Training for faculty observers, chairs and supervisors on the use of the document and on conducting and summarizing faculty observations**;**

(c) Specification that faculty observations may be conducted only by a faculty member of mathematics of equal or higher rank to the person being observed**;**

(d) Requirement that these procedures be followed consistently;

(e) Timely notice of the observation to the faculty member being observed. Faculty member can decline to be observed at that time and can suggest a better time**.**

The criteria for faculty observations include the following categories:

(a) Communication of mathematical concepts, techniques and proofs. The modes of communication may be determined by faculty preference and the delivery method of the class, such as, oral lectures for face-to-face classes, written summaries of lectures, videos of lectures, or specially prepared videos for distance delivery classes;

(b) Effective use of technology to insure student success. Types of technology may vary depending on mode of delivery of the class and faculty preference. Examples of technology are dry erase or electronic boards, tablet PC's, faculty developed websites, or use of various video making equipment and software;

(c) Methods of student involvement in the learning process, such as classroom or internet participation, written or oral recitation sections on homework and exam questions, or other methods developed by the faculty member;

(d) Methods for determining student progress in class and for transmitting progress to students on a timely basis;

(e) Timely notice of the observation to the faculty member being observed. Faculty member can decline to be observed at that time and can suggest a better time.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix L:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Music

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Music
October 2013

The goals for the Music Department's Promotion, Tenure and Progression towards Tenure guidelines are to:

1. Inform new faculty members of expectations for progression towards tenure, tenure and promotion;
2. Help faculty members make progress to tenure and promotion;
3. Provide clear guidelines for faculty who are submitting files;
4. Assist reviewers in making fair and appropriate judgments about candidates in the Department of Music.

These guidelines are intended to be the Music Department's interpretation of university of college guidelines for faculty in Music; however, this document should not be taken to be exhaustive in describing ways that faculty can meet university standards for progression towards promotion, promotion and tenure. Each faculty member has unique strengths and abilities. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make the strongest case when building the progression towards tenure, promotion, and tenure files. These guidelines are meant to instruct but not limit faculty members. That being said, there is prudence in adhering to these guidelines as they are an expression of the music department's expectations for faculty. The Music Department discipline-specific guidelines are coordinated with the University of Alaska Anchorage University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (UAA FEGs) and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (CAS FEGs). The following document is designed to provide guidance to faculty in the Music Department.

1.0 Types of Reviews and Files

The faculty member's file is the focus of the review process. There are three components of faculty responsibilities: teaching, academic research / creative activity, and service, as appropriate to their position and appointment. Candidates need to provide accurate, thorough and clear documentation of achievements for review at the departmental, college and university levels. Faculty members who are candidates for comprehensive fourth year, tenure and/or promotion, and comprehensive (six year) post tenure review shall prepare a complete Full File that describes and documents their scholarly and creative achievements.

Full Files should contain the following:

1. Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documentation in each section;

2. Section 1: Introductory Materials, including;
    a. Initial Letter of Appointment, if necessary for documenting prior years of service;
    b. Curriculum Vitae;
    c. Verification of certificates, licenses and degrees;
    d. Annual Workloads for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

appropriate designated administrators;

e. A cumulative Activity Reports or Annual Activity Reports (according to the applicable CBA) for the period under review, signed by the candidate and appropriate administrators;
f. Feedback from the appropriate designated administrators in response to the Activity Report (if applicable) for the period under review; and
g. Copies of Finding and Recommendations from the most recent annual progression towards tenure, comprehensive fourth-year, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review(s), whichever are applicable.
(UAA FEG, pp. 30 – 31)

3. Section II: Self-evaluation of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity and Service;

4. Section III: Files sections that describe and document high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility: teaching, research or creative activity and professional and university service.

    a. Within the teaching section of the file, candidates are required to include:
        i. All student evaluations from the previous six years (or for all years of appointment if candidate has been in faculty rank fewer than six years) when going for tenure and promotion. For all subsequent reviews, candidate should include student evaluations only since the previous review;
        ii. Syllabi from the most recent courses taught, and for courses in which the faculty member had major revisions. Selected syllabi should reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas.
    b. Documentation of scholarly achievements and creative activity should be limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track position at UAA, or since the last comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review.
    c. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, documentation should be included from those years as well.

Please refer to the UAA FEG, pp. 32 – 36 for descriptions of full file elements.

Some reviews (for example, annual review for Progression toward Tenure) require an Abbreviated File, as indicated by the applicable CBA. Abbreviated Files should contain the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Self-evaluation;
3. Annual Activity Report for the period under review signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
4. Feedback from the appropriate designated administrators in response to the Annual Activity Reports for the period under review (if applicable); and
5. Optional selected documentation to support the self-evaluation.

1.1 Teaching

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

1. Instruction and Learning Experiences;
2. Librarianship;
3. Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources;
4. Mentoring Students;
5. Advancing Teaching Excellence;
6. Advancing Student Excellence. (UAA FEG, IV.a, pp. 13-14)

The key idea is that the file, and particularly the self-evaluation, should demonstrate how the faculty member creates a pedagogical environment where students can achieve the Student Learning Outcomes.

1.1.1 Description

The faculty member's self-evaluation should address teaching effectiveness at a level appropriate for the relevant review. For comprehensive fourth-year, tenure and promotion reviews, the Full File must include student evaluations for the period under review and selected examples of syllabi for the different courses taught. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program. As faculty advance in rank, they should demonstrate increasing contributions to curriculum development, assessment, mentoring and or/innovation.

The Music Department's disciplinary definition of teaching includes not only classroom performance but the wide range of activities that support the delivery of courses to students which are listed below.

1.1.2 Teaching Examples

In addition to student evaluations and representative syllabi, the file should contain other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Some examples are:

- Description of an innovative technique or teaching method of special merit;
- Peer evaluation of instruction;
- Description of curriculum development and program planning activities;
- Description of new course preparations or major course revisions;
- Evidence of teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student academic achievements, such as awards, publications, competitions, or other academic or professional recognition;
- Evidence of teaching and mentoring that leads to notable student musical achievements, such as participation in additional master classes, participation in and/or winning musical competitions, or performing in ensembles or operatic roles outside of the University;
- Discussion of results received on student evaluations;
- Discussion of the selection of texts and/or music for a course and the pedagogy behind it;
- Discussion of grading in a course or a performance and the pedagogy behind it;
- Awards and recognition received by the faculty member;
- Evidence of involvement in student career development (e.g. providing references or introductions);
- Incorporation of a high-impact teaching practice (undergraduate student research, writing intensive courses, service learning, and courses offering an international or intercultural perspective).

1.1.3 Teaching Criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Command of subject matter; • Continuous growth in subject field; • Maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.	Sustained record of effectiveness in teaching that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Command of subject matter; • Continuous growth is subject field; • Involvement in instructional activities (such as curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation or high-impact teaching practices.	Sustained record of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Command of subject matter; • Continuous growth in subject field; • Instructional environment that promotes student learning outcomes; • Leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation of high-impact practices. • Leadership in definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

In addition to the criteria cited above, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates may choose to demonstrate *a marked strength* in the teaching component in their workload. At all ranks, faculty must address their establishment of an instructional environment that promotes achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course or degree program.

1.2 Service

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

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

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

Departmental level

- chairing a Music department committee;
- coordinating a Music department program;
- serving on a hiring committee (both within the department or for another department);
- serving as a member of a Music department committee;
- serving on an ad hoc departmental committee;
- chairing a faculty search committee;

- chairing a Music Department committee or ad hoc departmental committee;
- preparing student soloists or ensembles to perform at a University-wide function;
- departmental recruitment;
- student advising;
- service as a faculty advisor to a student club or organization within the department;
- serving on a student recital jury or on an end of semester final examination jury for a division of the department;
- other service to the department that requires a certain time commitment and planning, such as computer lab administrator, etc.

College level

- serving as Chair of the Music Department;
- serving on a college committee;
- chairing college committee;
- participation or leadership roles in a reaccreditation process;
- performing at a college function;

University Level

- serving on Faculty Senate or equivalent governance or curriculum review bodies;
- serving on a University-wide committee;
- chairing a University-wide committee;
- performing at a University-wide function, such as commencement, freshman convocation, graduate hooding ceremony, etc.;

Professional Level

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

Community Level

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

Service that is particularly valued in the College includes but is not limited to:

- participation in faculty governance;
- participation in assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment reporting at the departmental, college or university levels;
- participation on faculty, administrator or staff search committees;
- mentorship of other faculty;

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

1.2.1 Service criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in service that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Developing record of departmental, university, professional and public service; • Evidence of beginning leadership-roles at the departmental level of service; • Positive impact or outcome.	Sustained record of effectiveness in service that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Increasing involvement in selected areas of service; • Evidence of leadership roles at the developmental level and beginning at the College/University levels; • Positive impact or outcome.	Sustained record of excellence in service may be demonstrated by evidence of: • Leadership in selected areas of service at the department, College and University levels; • Positive impact or outcome.

In general, it is recommended that the faculty member's service component should be centered in the department for the first four years, gradually broadening into College and University service as the faculty member progresses in rank. In addition to the criteria cited below, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates may choose to demonstrate *a marked strength* in the service component of the workload.

1.3 Research and/or Creative Activity

Academic research and creative activity are vital to the mission of UAA in order to advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the application of knowledge in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society. Faculty members with designated workload effort in this component of faculty work during the period of review are expected to engage in high-quality, significant academic research and/or creative activities. Faculty members whose workloads include research or creative activity are expected to document the outcomes of that activity as evidence by products, artifacts, creative works or performances.

The file should contain representative documentation of the faculty member's research and/or creative activity productivity. Music faculty are primarily trained in the evaluation and preparation of creative works, although some faculty may choose to participate in research, composition, etc. The following lists are examples of academic research and creative activity, but by no means represent all of the possibilities:

1.3.1 Publications

- A scholarly book published by a recognized academic press;
- A textbook that contributes to music pedagogy;
- An edited scholarly book;

- Editing of a peer-reviewed journal;
- Articles in a peer-reviewed academic journal;
- A chapter of an edited book;
- A book review;
- Articles in a non-peer-reviewed academic journal;
- Presentations at local, state, regional, national or international conferences;
- Compositions for solo instruments, chamber ensembles or large ensembles;
- Musical arrangements for solo instruments, chamber ensembles, or large ensembles;
- Professional recordings

1.3.2 Performances

Music faculty involved in performances should address the importance of this activity, particularly in regards to professional development. It is important to note that music faculty's opportunities may vary greatly depending on the instrument performed.

Examples of performances/creative activity include:

- Performing a solo recital;
- Performing a solo concerto with orchestra;
- Performing as a soloist with an ensemble;
- Performing a major role in an opera;
- Performing with a chamber ensemble;
- Performing as a member of a symphony orchestra as principal chair;
- Performing as a member of a symphony orchestra as a section member;
- Conducting a large ensemble;
- Conducting a chamber ensemble;
- Directing a chorus for an operatic or musical theatre production;
- Creating and performing in a non-Western music ensemble.
- A répétiteur.

Factors which may be used in evaluating performances include any financial support of the performance, either by box office receipts or by funding agencies, any sponsorship of the performance and the scope and type of audience which the performance attracted. This does not mean that a concert in a major venue is artistically more important than a concert attended by a select and knowledgeable audience. In general, however, financial support and audience attendance reflect a public recognition of the performing artist (and the affiliated performing group represented, if applicable).

1.3.3 Reviewing Creative Activity

Objective review of creative effort is frequently difficult to accomplish because of the subjective nature of responses to creative works. Some of these factors which may be considered are listed here:

- The relationship of the work to the faculty member's academic discipline
- The intent and scope of the work and the nature of the projected audience
- Critical responses to the work. Some examples of which are listed here:
  Judgments of recognized experts
  Judgments and opinions of peers
  Published reviews of the work

Other types of public notice

1.3.4 Creative Activity Criteria

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Sustained record of effectiveness in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works performances appropriate to the discipline/instrument at the local, state and regional levels; • Evidence of a scholarly research/creative activity agenda.	Sustained record of effectiveness in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works or performances at the local, state, regional and national levels; • Evidence of emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.	Sustained record of excellence in research and/or creative activity that may be demonstrated by evidence of: • High-quality and significant products, artifacts, creative works or performances at the local, state, regional, national and international levels; • Evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.

In addition to the criteria cited above, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels candidates in music may choose to demonstrate *a marked strength* in the research/creative activity component of the workload.

2.0 Summary

At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field, either by official transcripts or verification from Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) that they have a transcript on file. In addition, they must demonstrate the following:

- A sustained record of effectiveness of teaching. Effectiveness in teaching means establishment of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, and formal evaluation of student achievement;
- High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft or academic field, with emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution;
- High-quality contributions to the institution through university and professional service;
- A strong record of professional growth with promise for continuing achievement;
- A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must document that they hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field, either by official transcripts or verification from OAA that they have a transcript on file. In addition, they must demonstrate the following:

- A sustained record of excellence in teaching. Excellence in teaching means maintenance of an instructional environment that supports student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the course and/or degree program, formal evaluation of student achievement and involvement in ongoing assessment and modification of instructional design;
- High-quality and significant contributions to the profession, craft or academic field, with

emerging recognition by peers or constituencies outside the institution;

- Demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities;
- Record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant achievement;
- A marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities or through the integration of scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix M:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Philosophy

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Philosophy
October 2013

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

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

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

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

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

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

We do not intend to hire tenure track faculty at the instructor level, therefore no one will be eligible for promotion from instructor to tenure-track assistant professor.

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Tenure

"At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, high-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the professional, craft, or academic field; high-quality scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service; and a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advance the mission or

reputation of the unit or institution." (UFEG p.21-2)

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

1. A Ph.D. in Philosophy
2. A sustained record of effectiveness in teaching
3. Service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank
4. Generated and disseminated disciplinary knowledge of high quality and significance
5. A marked strength in at least one component of faculty responsibility
6. Promise of future accomplishments.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

"At the rank of Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; contribution of high-quality and significance to the professional, craft, or academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution; demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities; and a record of sustained professional growth with the promise of continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities." (UFEG p.21)

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

1. A sustained record of teaching excellence
2. Contribution of high-quality and significant scholarship or creative activity to the field
3. A record of effective leadership in university affairs and professional service activities
4. A record of sustained growth with the promise of continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements,
5. A marked strength in one of the components of faculty responsibilities.

1. Ph.D. in Philosophy

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

2. A Sustained Record of Teaching Effectiveness

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

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

may be very important for those faculty who have the opportunity to engage in these aspects of teaching and learning.

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

a. Instruction and Learning Experiences

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

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

Tenure-track faculty are strongly encouraged to have regular visits from the department chair or other tenured faculty members who can evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and provide helpful feedback for their continued development. The description of this process and reflection on it should be included in the self-evaluation.

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

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

b. Mentoring

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

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

c. Advancing Teaching Excellence

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

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

d. Advancing Student Excellence

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

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

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

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

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

1. Supervision of undergraduate research (2 pts per project)
2. Being awarded grants for undergraduate research as faculty supervisor (4 pts per award)
3. Development of new curriculum (3 pts per item)
4. Updating existing curriculum (1-2 pts per item)
5. Attending a week long teaching intensive (3 pts per instance)
6. Leading a CAFÉ or equivalent session on pedagogy (3 pts per instance)
7. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning (3 pts per instance)
8. Supervision of service learning projects (2 pts per project)
9. Integration of community engagement into course (2 pts per project)
10. Engaging in collaborative teaching (1-4 pts depending on extent of collaboration)

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

To demonstrate a marked strength in teaching at the level of associate professor, a faculty member must have a total of at least 10 points from at least 3 different categories listed above in addition to the 45

points required to demonstrate a sustained record of teaching excellence. (To be clear, the required total is 10, but those 10 points must be derived from at least 3 different categories. We are not requiring 30 points with 10 from each of 3 categories.)

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

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

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

For promotion to associate professor and tenure, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate departmental service by achieving 20 points for the period under review.

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

Professional service includes:

1. Convening a conference (5 pts per instance)
2. Chairing a conference session (1 pt per instance)
3. Serving as a referee (3 pts per instance)
4. Organizing a panel for a conference (3 pts per instance)
5. Reading and commenting on colleagues' unpublished work (3 pts per instance)

University service includes:

1. Participating in governance (3 pts per year)
2. Serving on a university wide committee (2 pts per instance)
3. Serving on UAB, CAS CC, or other "high demand" committee (3 pts per instance)
4. Chairing a committee (2 pts per instance in addition to pts for being on committee)
5. Non-departmental work on assessment/accreditation (4 pts per year)
6. Giving talks on campus for UAA audience (2 pts per instance)
7. Serving on search committees outside the philosophy department (3 pts per instance)

Community service includes:

1. Serving on community task forces/committees/boards (3 pts per year)
2. Chairing community task forces/committees/boards (5 pts per year)
3. Giving public talks off campus or on campus for a community audience (2 pts per talk)
4. Being a consultant for community organizations or businesses (2-4 pts per year depending on extent of partnership)
5. Leading workshops for professionals or community members (3 pts per workshop)

6. Planning or participating in events for secondary school students (3 pts per event for planning, 2 pts for participating)

For promotion and tenure at the assistant professor level, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate non-departmental service by achieving 60 points for the period under review. At least 20 points must be for departmental service and at least 20 points must be for service outside the department. The other 20 points can come from any category. To demonstrate a marked strength at this level, faculty members must achieve 75 points.

For promotion to professor, faculty members can demonstrate appropriate non-departmental service by achieving 80 points for the period under review. 30 points must come from departmental service and 30 points must be from outside the department. At least 20 points must be earned through leadership, e.g., chairing a committee, being department chair, being a governance officer, or convening a conference.

To demonstrate a marked strength at the assistant professor level, faculty members must achieve at least 75 points for the period under review.

To demonstrate a marked strength at the associate professor level, faculty must achieve at least 100 points with at least 30 points earned through leadership.

4. Generated and disseminated disciplinary knowledge of high quality and significance

Research in Philosophy can incorporate any of the five forms of scholarship in the University FEG's (p.8). However, the discipline of Philosophy places an emphasis on discovery, integration, and engagement. Though there are many ways to disseminate research in Philosophy, the discipline places value in refereed journal articles, articles in edited books, conference presentations, and book reviews. Translations, formulation of reports and guidelines and books are less common but also typical of Philosophy research. Given the goals of the department and university, the Philosophy Department also places emphasis on community-engaged research and products resulting from community partnerships which may include codes of ethics, guidelines for professions, and a variety of other forms.

An assistant professor standing for tenure should have compiled a research record that shows continuous output, development, and impact or significance.

To show continuous output, faculty members are expected to engage in approximately one research activity a year, though this isn't a strict rule. Research activities include conference presentations, scholarly publications, and community-based or collaborative products of varied forms.

To show development, faculty members are expected to demonstrate having a research record that has evolved in one of three ways, by moving from one topic to another, by becoming more deeply embedded within a topic, or by finding a new application for previous research. New applications can involve applying previous discovery to community problems or issues, as well as moving to an interdisciplinary application of previous discovery.

To show impact or significance, faculty members are expected to build a research record that:

a. Has a broad audience
b. Is peer reviewed
c. Is cited by others
d. Is innovative
e. Has breadth and complexity

f. Is interdisciplinary
g. Involves community engagement
h. Results in invitations to present or referee
i. Is published or presented in significant venues

Obviously, no candidate for tenure is expected to have research that incorporates all of the listed signifiers of impact. Faculty members must make the case for their particular file based on these indicators (and perhaps others). Given the mission of the philosophy department, consideration should especially be given to research that is peer reviewed, has breadth and complexity, involves community engagement, or is interdisciplinary. Research that meets these standards reveals both a greater amount of effort and a higher quality outcome than is typical of other research.

a. Authoring a book published through a recognized academic press (24 pts)
b. Authoring a textbook through a recognized publisher (16 pts)
c. Refereed journal articles (8 pts)
d. Edited book (5-8 pts)
e. Book reviews (3 pts)
f. Encyclopedia entries (2-5 pts)
g. Non-refereed articles (2-5 pts)
h. Case studies (2 pts)
i. Article in conference proceedings (2 pts)
j. Presentation at national or international conferences (4 pts)
k. Presentation at regional conferences (2 pts)

For publications of the following sort, two additional points should be given.

l. Interdisciplinary publications
m. Community based/engaged research
n. Collaborative publication

For promotion and tenure at level of assistant professor, faculty members must achieve a total of at least 36 points with at least 24 points coming from categories a, b and c.

For promotion to professor, faculty members must achieve a total of at least 44 points with at least 24 points coming from categories a, b, and c. Additionally, at least 8 points must come from invited activities to demonstrate recognition of peers outside the institution.

For faculty members to demonstrate a marked strength in the research component of their workload at the rank of assistant professor, they must achieve a total of at least 44 points with at least 32 points coming from categories a, b, and c.

For faculty members to demonstrate a marked strength in their research component of their workload at the rank of associate professor, they must achieve a total of 52 points with at least 32 points coming from categories a, b, or c, and at least 12 points coming from invited research activities.

Summary of PTR Guidelines for Philosophy

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

No one will be eligible for promotion from non-tenure track instructor to tenure-track assistant professor.

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure

1. Teaching effectiveness
    a. Total of 35 points with at least 15 points earned in the category of Instruction and learning experiences.
    b. Marked strength: at least 8 points from at least 2 categories on p.5.
2. Service appropriate to discipline, mission and rank
    a. Total of at least 60 points with at least 20 points earned in departmental service and at least 20 points earned in service outside the department.
    b. Marked strength: Total of at least 75 points.
3. Research and Scholarship
    a. Total of at least 36 points with at least 24 points from categories a-c on p.8.
    b. Marked strength: total of at least 44 points with 32 points coming from categories a-c on p.8.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

1. Teaching excellence
    a. Total of 45 points with at least 20 points earned in the category of Instruction and learning experiences.
    b. Marked strength: at least 10 points from at least 3 categories on p.5.
2. Service appropriate to discipline, mission and rank
    a. Total of at least 80 points with at least 30 points earned in departmental service, at least 30 points earned in service outside the department, and at least 20 points earned through leadership (These are not 20 additional points but 20 of the 80.).
    b. Marked strength: Total of at least 100 points with at least 30 points earned through leadership.
3. Research
    a. Total of at least 44 points with at least 24 points from categories a-c on p.8 and 8 points from invited research activities.
    b. Marked strength: total of at least 52 points with 32 points coming from categories a-c on p.8 and 12 points of invited research activity.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Scorecard for reviewers
For Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and tenure

Teaching

Area	Points earned	Associate	Full
(a) Instruction and learning		15 required	20 required
(b) Mentoring			
(c) Advancing teaching excellence			
(d) Advancing student excellence			
total		35 total points required	45 total points required
Marked strength categories		8 points (in addition to the above 35) from at least two categories on p.5	10 points (in addition to the above 45) from at least three categories on p.5
points			

Service

Type	Points	Associate	Full
(a) Departmental		20 required	30 required
leadership			15 required
(b) Professional		At least 20 required from categories b-d	At least 30 required from categories b-d
(c) University			
(d) Community			
(e) leadership (a-d)			20 required
total		60 total	80 total
Marked strength		75 total	100 total, 30 leadership

Research

Type	Points	Associate	Full
Categories a-c (p.8)		24 required	24 required
Categories d-k			
Categories l-n			
Invited			8 required
Total		36 required	44 required
Marked strength		44 total, 32 from (a)-(c)	52 total, 32 from a-c, 12 invited

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix N:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Physics and Astronomy

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Physics and Astronomy
October 2013

Research in physics and astronomy is expected to yield the following results:

Primary: Refereed publications which shall consist of research articles in recognized journals or books in the field.

Secondary: Non-refereed publications.
Conference proceedings.
Conference presentations.
External grants or funding.
Internal grants or funding.
Patents or other commercializable technology
Resources at a facility granted through a competitive process (such as telescope, accelerator, or supercomputer time).

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to both primary and secondary categories, productivity must include publishing in refereed journals or books and seeking research support in the form of direct funding and/or support from national or international labs.

For publications, the level of productivity necessary for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion should depend on the quality of publications and the faculty workload category. Faculty should demonstrate the quality of their work. There are many ways of demonstrating quality. Examples include (but are not limited to): prestige or impact factor of the journal, citations, and impact in the field of study. In addition, faculty members publishing in large collaborations should demonstrate that they have made a significant contribution to the collaboration. For example, supporting letters from the leader(s) of the collaboration would be sufficient.

1st Progression towards Tenure Review

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member undergoing 1st year retention review must demonstrate definite promise or evidence of achievement in research. This could best be accomplished by having a minimum of one manuscript in preparation for submission to a refereed publication. However, this recommendation is flexible, allowing for new faculty startup time. Reviewers should look for indications of real potential in this critical year and offer guidance where possible, especially by noting areas where improvement is needed.

2nd Progression towards Tenure Review

By the end of the 2nd year, a **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member should demonstrate definite promise or evidence of achievement by having at least one manuscript submitted to a refereed publication. Faculty should demonstrate beginning the pursuit of funding for their work as an indicator of potential in research. Reviewers should continue to note areas where improvement is needed, and to acknowledge progress made from the previous year.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Comprehensive 4th Year Review

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member undergoing 4th year comprehensive review should be able to show a definite promise or evidence of achievement as a research faculty. At the time of this review, faculty should have at least one refereed manuscript accepted for publication as well as at least one additional manuscript in preparation for submission to a refereed publication. The faculty member should demonstrate attempts to obtain internal and/or external funding in order to maintain their research program. Successful applications for funding will be considered meritorious as will successful applications for experimental/computing time at national facilities. Reviews at this time should indicate any remaining areas of needed improvement as the faculty member approaches the critical review for tenure and promotion.

Academic Research Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A faculty member should demonstrate evidence of high-quality and significant achievements in research in order to be awarded tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Productivity in research in physics and astronomy should minimally be indicated:

For a **3:1:1** faculty member:

a) by having at least three* manuscripts accepted for publication in refereed journals during employment by UAA, and

b) by obtaining either internal or external funding to support research activity, or actively seeking external funding and demonstrating high evaluations on proposals by external referees.

For a **2:2:1** faculty member:

a) by having at least four* manuscripts accepted for publication in refereed journals during employment by UAA, and

b) by obtaining external funding to support research activity.

* These numbers are a guideline, with flexibility allowed for candidates that can demonstrate very high quality or impactful publications.

Non-monetary or in-kind support received from national or international laboratories to enable research programs may also be given as evidence in support of research success.

Promotion to Professor

A **3:1:1** or **2:2:1** faculty member must demonstrate evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant accomplishments in research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor of Physics and/or Astronomy. Reviewers should weigh both the number and quality of refereed publications produced plus research funding received and/or support awarded at national labs to determine whether promotion is warranted. In consideration for this rank, local reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA. In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only.

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

Physics and Astronomy: Discipline-specific teaching guidelines

The University-Wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines outlines six aspects of teaching and learning:

- *Instruction and Learning Experiences*
- *Mentoring Students*
- *Advancing Teaching Excellence*
- *Advancing Student Excellence*

The most important criterion for evaluating teaching in physics is the category *Instruction and Learning Experiences*, which is the practice of our craft of teaching (whether it is in a lecture, or lab, etc.). Qualities of a good physics or astronomy teacher include:

- Complete and in-depth coverage of the material of the course
- Clarity of delivery of the material
- Command of their subject matter
- Enthusiasm and humor
- Motivating and inspiring students
- Accepting questions and answering them clearly
- Uniform application of standards when grading
- Consistency of standards with others in the department
- Ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning
- Thoughtful use of technology
- Discussion of real-world examples
- Willingness to enact changes in order to improve as a teacher

Physics and Astronomy candidates should include in their file whatever materials they feel can identify or highlight these qualities, to the standards outlined in the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, namely:

Progression towards Tenure Reviews

By the 4th Year Comprehensive Retention Review, the candidate should demonstrate achievement of, or the promise for, a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching and continuing contribution of high-quality scholarly achievements in teaching..

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching

Promotion to Professor

A candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Review file items which can substantiate sustained excellence include (but are not limited to):

- teaching awards (or other professional recognition of teaching),
- letters of commendation from other faculty or students,
- development of curriculum,
- development of innovative teaching methods,
- success at mentoring undergraduate research, and
- publication of papers related to physics pedagogy.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

An excellent teacher also "leads by example" with his or her peers, and so candidates may include evidence demonstrating leadership in teaching, such as (but not limited to):

- design of effective teaching strategies that are shared and discussed with other faculty,
- identifying and initiating solutions to challenges in teaching,
- chairing peer mentoring committees, or
- participating in peer review of teaching.

At a minimum, physics candidates at *any* level of review should include documentation of the following aspects of their teaching:

- Summary of classes taught, including a brief description of each course, and approximate enrollment
- Syllabi from each course taught (*required by University-Wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*)
- Student evaluations (*required by University-Wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines*)
- Peer review: evaluations of the candidate's teaching by other faculty members from Physics and Astronomy

... and, optionally:

- Examples of assignments or tests given
- Examples of classroom materials (such as handouts, etc.)
- Examples of measures of student outcomes (such as grade distributions, etc.)
- Results of national standardized learning assessment tools (such as the Force Concept Inventory)

There are very few national, standardized learning assessment tools for physics. The most well-known one, the Force Concept Inventory, only covers a small part of what a student should be learning. In the absence of such objective criteria, the best measure of instructor quality is peer review.

Student evaluations of physics teaching present special challenges to interpret. Physics classes, when taught to generally-accepted standards at the University level, are challenging and difficult. This causes many of our classes to receive student evaluation scores lower than University averages, no matter the quality of the teacher. For this reason, results of student evaluations should be considered in the context of the particular class: in particular, its level of difficulty and the attitudes of the students entering. Also, as the IDEA instrument in particular rarely provides enough statistics for a both a representative and reliable evaluation, alternative student evaluation instruments may be used by the candidate.

Physics and Astronomy candidates are also encouraged to participate in the aspect of *Mentoring Students,* usually through the involvement of students in research. Candidates may demonstrate this aspect of their teaching with documentation of student research activities (in particular, products of student research projects such as papers or presentations at conferences, etc.)

A candidate may include evidence of any of the other aspects of teaching from the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, but these are not mandatory. For Physics and Astronomy, examples of such evidence include (but are not limited to):

Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources

- Written course materials written or revised by the candidate (such as lab manuals)
- Examples or descriptions of online/software/computer materials (such as software for running lab equipment or analyzing lab data, instructional animations, applets, apps, etc.)
- Curriculum documents such as CAR's, PAR's, and CCG's

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Advancing Teaching Excellence

- Summary of the candidate's professional development activities related to improving teaching
- Summary of how weaknesses in teaching were identified by the candidate, and steps taken to make improvements
- Evidence of participation in peer evaluation activities

Advancing Student Excellence

- Copies of recommendation letters written for students
- Grant applications submitted by students advised by the candidate
- Documents related to serving on a thesis committee for a student
- Documentation of advising

In addition to these specific examples, any other evidence relevant to the description of these teaching aspects from the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines may be considered.

Librarianship is minimally relevant to Physics and Astronomy as a criterion for evaluation.

Physics and Astronomy: Discipline-specific Service Guidelines

Because the Physics and Astronomy Department normally functions as a "committee of the whole", a candidate at *any* level of review is expected to be an active participant in department-level decisions involving issues such as curriculum, scheduling, recruitment of faculty, and department procedures and policies.

Beyond this, all faculty members are expected to engage in public, professional, or university service activities as described in the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Candidates are expected to:

Progression towards Tenure Reviews

Progress toward promotion requires scholarly contributions to the unit and institution through service. By the 4th Year Comprehensive Review, the candidate should show evidence of achievement of, or promise for, the continued contribution of high-quality scholarly achievements in service.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires high-quality scholarly contributions to the institution through university, professional, or public service.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor requires a record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities.

Examples of evidence include (but are not limited to):

Public Service

- Participation in science fairs
- Speaking with K-12 students about science or careers in science
- Public talks or other public outreach promoting science or the University
- Outreach activities to local industry

Note: Non-discipline-related Public Service activities (such as volunteering or charity fundraising, not related to science) is minimally relevant to Physics and Astronomy as a criterion for evaluation.

Professional Service, and Service to the Discipline, Craft, or Professional Field

- Refereeing publications, or serving as editor, for a peer-reviewed journal
- Refereeing research proposals (e.g. for a funding agency)
- Activity related to governance of a professional organization (e.g. the APS or AAPT)
- Organizing meetings and conferences
- Maintenance and Operations for a collaborative experiment
- Monitoring shifts for a collaborative experiment
- Service observations at a telescope facility

University Service

- Serving on University committees
- Participation in faculty governance
- Fundraising or advocating for the department or the University
- Additional departmental service (such as search committees)

In addition to these specific examples, any other evidence relevant to the description of these service aspects from the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines may be considered.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix O:
Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Political Science

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Political Science
October 2013

I. Introduction

The Department of Political Science, in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), has adopted the following guidelines for evaluating faculty for progression towards tenure, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. This document is designed to be used by faculty preparing files for their progression towards tenure, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review and by those responsible for assessing review files.

The inter-related nature of "faculty scholarship" that was embraced by the April 2012 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEG) mutually reinforces this attribute of political science. This integrative aspect of scholarship—"discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation"—is at the heart of political science, a social science with "perhaps the least definite boundaries and the widest concerns" of any. As noted in the FEG, the review process must emphasize the quality and significance of faculty scholarship and not necessarily the quantity of work done. Therefore, throughout the review process, university and professional peers should assess the candidate on the basis of each of the six FEG criteria outlining the nature of faculty scholarship.

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

II. Evaluation of Teaching

High-quality and effective teaching is important, and the department expects faculty to have a solid record of teaching in order to be recommended for tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to professor. The FEG defines effectiveness as follows: "Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and attainment of UAA's Institutional Learning Outcomes."

Given the importance of teaching for all university faculty members, thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this component of each faculty member's workload is critical. Candidates are encouraged to have a separate section in their review files that provides a comprehensive self-evaluation offering substantive evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in relation to teaching. They are further encouraged to address one or more of the following aspects of teaching, as appropriate to their own situations:

- Instruction and learning experiences
- Resources to support curriculum or library holdings
- Developing and building curriculum and learning resources
- Advising and mentoring students

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

- Advancing teaching excellence
- Advancing student excellence

The faculty member should compile a teaching dossier, responsive to the FEG criteria, which includes relevant material to establish a basis for evaluating the FEG criteria noted above.

For comprehensive reviews (such as fourth-year pre-tenure reviews or promotion reviews), faculty members are required to submit the numerical summary sheets from the official student evaluations of all courses the faculty member taught during the review period, e.g., University- or college-wide evaluation instruments (currently the IDEA Evaluations). Faculty members are encouraged to include their official numerical summary sheets at every review. They are also encouraged to include other evidence of teaching, including any other department-generated evaluation forms. Evaluation of teaching should not be based solely or primarily on student evaluations, however, and caution must be exercised in relying on any such student evaluations in reviewing faculty members.

Progression towards Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

An assistant professor is expected to have evidence of achievement or continuous professional growth for effectiveness in teaching and to demonstrate promise for continued growth in the field of teaching. In the annual reviews of teaching prior to tenure, if the data persuade reviewers that a faculty member displays evidence of achievement, definite promise, or continuous professional growth in effective teaching, this will help build the case for an overall conclusion that the candidate is making progress towards tenure. If problems in teaching exist, reviewers should clearly specify what they are and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before her or his next review.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor, with tenure, requires clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishment, a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, and strong professional growth in this area. Suggestions for improvement in teaching made in prior reviews should have been acted upon, and reviewers should detect no significant difficulties with teaching using data available in the review file. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusions.

Promotion to Professor

A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor requires an extensive record of sustained professional growth and a record of excellence in teaching, with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in teaching beyond the accepted level for the rank of associate professor.

Reviewers should recall that the rank of professor is the highest academic rank the university can bestow, so additional material which may lend support to an evaluation of excellence in teaching should be included in the file. Such additional material may include (but should not be limited to) teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty members or from students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, evidence that the faculty member's teaching has contributed to student success, or other professional recognition of teaching.

III. Evaluation of Academic Research and Scholarly Activity

In the field of political science, reviewers should evaluate a faculty member's work based on the outcomes of such work, as evidenced by products, artifacts, or creative works appropriate to this discipline. In this context, peer-reviewed publications are understood to be manuscripts that, prior to publication, undergo a process of detailed review by experts in this field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes, a recommendation for immediate publication, or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book for which the manuscripts were submitted.

Non-peer-reviewed publications are manuscripts not subjected to review by an external reviewer or experts in this field of study and are considered to be a secondary level of research. Examples of non-peer-reviewed publications may include but are not limited to (a) research articles in non-refereed journals; (b) technical reports; (c) non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials; (d) presentations at conferences; and (e) articles in popular magazines which serve to enhance public understanding of politics.

Such academic research and scholarly activity should advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the production of knowledge "in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society." In all cases, the candidate should provide evidence of scholarly research and publication that extends and reaches beyond her or his dissertation research and has gained recognition outside of the university as contributions to the field. In subsequent years, political scientists often continue to do research in the same field as their dissertation. Such a research program is entirely appropriate, provided that the candidate has extended or deepened the research after completing the dissertation.

To assist reviewers in ascertaining the faculty member's research and scholarly accomplishments during the review period, the faculty member may include copies in his or her review file of all manuscripts that are in preparation, submitted, under review, or published.

In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity. Faculty members should always be evaluated on the basis of the whole body of their research to date. Reviewers should note, however, that such earlier work does not satisfy any requirement to demonstrate local research activity while at UAA.

Other scholarly accomplishments should also be considered in the evaluation. These might include, for example, success through basic and applied research; community engaged or participatory action research; involvement of undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research; supervision of senior essays , theses, and other student research; capstone projects; mentoring of students that leads to presentation of their academic research; editorship of academic or scholarly publications; organization of scholarly conferences or symposia; successful applications for external grant support; leadership in multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative research projects; private, public, or internal proposal-writing; and other forms of recognition by external peers.

Foremost among the peer-reviewed publications that faculty members should have for review for progress towards tenure, promotion, and tenure are:

- Books and monographs
- Book chapters
- Edited books, e.g., annotated editions or books with several contributors
- Articles, including substantial essays and commentaries

- Book reviews

Among works in this first category, other things being equal, those which make the greatest contributions to scholarship in political science are more significant for review than lesser works; those with substantial scholarly writing by the faculty member under review are more significant than briefer works; co-authored works are less significant than single-authored works, depending on the contributions made by each author; and peer-reviewed works are more significant than non-peer-reviewed works. Research published in this category of publications is essential for promotion and tenure.

In a second category of lesser publications that, together with publications in the first category, contribute to a faculty member's record of published research are the following:

- Columns and op-ed pieces
- Occasional writings
- Brief, informal essays
- Reports, professional and technical

Some journals that publish articles by faculty members in political science solicit contributions from qualified authors but do not subject these contributions to peer review (though they are subject to expert editorial review), yet are as reputable and influential as leading peer-reviewed journals in political science. Reviewers should treat articles and book reviews published by political science faculty members in such prestigious journals (e.g., *The American Scholar*, the *Claremont Review of Books*, *Commentary*, *Foreign Affairs*, the *Wilson Quarterly*, etc.), which may be more "public" in nature than peer-reviewed scholarly journals, as being just as significant as research published in peer-reviewed journals—an exception to the general rule that peer-reviewed publications are more significant than non-peer-reviewed publications.

Similarly, on the more public side, publishing in *The New York Times* or *The Wall Street Journal* (or other such newspapers with an international reputation) is clearly more significant than publishing in the *Anchorage Daily News*, although both kinds of contributions contribute to a faculty member's overall record of research.

Reviewers should understand that the broad boundaries of political science may mean that professors will publish articles, books, or chapters that might be considered history, literature, classics, philosophy, natural science, economics, legal studies, etc., and that all those publications are a legitimate and recognized part of political science, which does not respect narrow disciplinary boundaries. Reviewers, including those outside the department, should not discount such work by ascribing narrower boundaries to political science.

Political science faculty should recognize that their reviewers (even other political scientists) may not fully appreciate the significance of their scholarly accomplishments. Therefore, political science faculty are advised to use their self-evaluations to educate their reviewers about that significance.

Progression towards Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to demonstrate definite promise or continuous professional growth in producing high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishment in research through documentation in their files showing progression towards tenure. The candidate should demonstrate growing progression towards meeting the expected departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure. In particular, as candidates approach their four-year comprehensive review, they should have a record of published written work and other products of research.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty standing for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure should demonstrate strong professional growth, clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments, and emerging recognition for contributions in their research and scholarship.

The minimum standard for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure is at least one published book or completed book manuscript accepted for publication or a strong, substantive body of scholarly articles published in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Such criteria should have primary emphasis for purposes of evaluation. Other scholarly publications, such as chapters in books, especially in refereed volumes, and edited volumes, should also be considered in promotion and/or tenure evaluation.

Promotion to Professor

In order for an associate professor to be promoted to professor, the candidate must demonstrate an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies within and outside the University. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of sustained professional growth, with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements beyond the accepted level for the rank of associate professor.

Productivity will be measured by a continued rate of success—beyond the rate required for promotion to associate professor—in publication of books, refereed publications, or other fruits of scholarly research noted above, keeping in mind that the rank of professor is the highest rank the university can award to faculty.

IV. Evaluation of Service

Public, professional, and university service are essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly excellence, enables shared governance, meets the internal needs of the university, and enhances the region, the state, and the world. Faculty members are expected to engage in public, professional, and university service activities, with increasingly significant involvement at higher ranks.

Evaluation of the service component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice, as defined in the FEG. In regard to service to UAA, a candidate must gain internal recognition for and provide evidence of effective leadership. Another dimension of service is engagement, which is defined as involvement in one's scholarly work beyond the university and serving the broader interests of society or significant segments thereof. The category of public service or service to society should be broadly understood to encompass activities related to popular and non-academic initiatives, publications, audiences, and other institutions beyond the university.

We recognize that public good products may take diverse and plural forms. They may include local, regional, national, or international projects. Public goods may include workshops, programs, archives, centers, electronic resources, or other projects that sustain community partnerships and contribute to disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge. Non-university partners may include government agencies, public stakeholders, civil society, news and on-line organizations, non-profit stakeholders, and other educational institutions, e.g., K–12 public and private schools. Examples may include collaborating or partnering with governments, inter-governmental, educational, or other public institutions; offering expertise to community agencies or civic groups; testifying before legislative or congressional committees; providing public policy analysis; program evaluation; technical briefings for local, state, national, or inter-governmental agencies; serving on public boards, task forces, or committees; and

offering and developing training or professional development workshops.

Professional service should be broadly understood to include activities that serve the discipline of political science or society as a whole, while at the same time contributing to the institutional mission of the university. Service to the professional discipline of political science will also be an element for review and evaluation for progression towards tenure, promotion, and tenure.

Again, university service is an important element of the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty of the department. Service to the department, college, and campus or university system will be given consideration, including administrative responsibilities, governance activities, faculty development, advancing teaching excellence, and advancing student excellence.

Progression towards Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to demonstrate evidence of achievement, definite promise, or continuous professional growth in producing high-quality contributions and promise for continued contributions in the area of service to the university and broader society through the documentation in their file.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate undergoing review for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor should demonstrate strong professional growth and a record of high-quality contributions to the institution, as well as public service. Emerging recognition outside of the university for high-quality contributions to the field will be taken into consideration in the review.

Promotion to Professor

In order for an associate professor to be promoted to professor, the candidate must have a demonstrated record of effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of professional service activities outside the university, as well as a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in service productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of associate professor.

V. Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure reviews will be conducted according to procedures adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences, considering both the overall record of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service and the particular achievements of the faculty member during the period under review. A faculty member under review should demonstrate continued contributions during the period under review which meet the standard required for promotion to the rank held. Post-tenure review of an associate professor prior to the review for promotion to full professor should be the occasion for identification by reviewers of areas of strength and weakness, so that deficiencies can be rectified by the faculty member before the review for promotion to full professor.

VI. Designation as Distinguished Professor

Faculty members may be designated as distinguished professors, in accordance with policies adopted by the UA Board of Regents and the University of Alaska Anchorage. The departmental role in this designation may take one or more of the following forms: (1) initiating the recommendation through a formal request prepared and endorsed by one or more faculty members other than the faculty member

proposed for the designation; and (2) reviewing a recommendation submitted by other faculty members. In the latter case, the chair or a designated faculty member in political science should organize a review involving at least all members of the faculty in political science who hold the same rank as the faculty member proposed for the designation.

Departmental expectations for recommendation of a faculty member for this designation entail outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and service beyond those required for promotion to professor.

VII. Award of Emeritus Status

Faculty members who retire from the University may be awarded emeritus status, in accordance with policies adopted by the UA Board of Regents and the University of Alaska Anchorage. The departmental role in this award is to recommend that this status be awarded to deserving retirees and to assist them as much as possible in preparing the file required for applying for this status. The chair or a designated faculty member in political science has chief responsibility for making such recommendations and, with aid from administrative staff and faculty colleagues, providing such assistance to retiring faculty members who have been recommended.

VIII. Departmental Faculty Review Process

The initial review of UAFT faculty is conducted by the department chair (UAFT faculty only). The initial review of UNAC faculty and the next review for UAFT faculty is by a faculty peer-review committee. Provided that the department has enough faculty to meet the standards of the CBA (i.e., five faculty where at least three are full professors), the department may choose to recommend to the dean an internal tenure and promotion committee, consisting of selected tenured UAA professors of political science at a higher rank than the candidate for promotion or tenure. Each member of the committee would read the file and the research and scholarly work of the candidate and judge it on the basis of his or her professional expertise in order to make a joint recommendation. That joint recommendation would be communicated to the next level of review by the chair of the committee.

In default of enough political science faculty members to form a departmental peer review committee, political science faculty are reviewed by the CAS Social Sciences Peer Review Committee.

Appendix P:

Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Psychology

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

October 2013

Ratified by the Psychology Department Faculty 1.28.2013

Revised: October 7th, 2013

The Psychology Department's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (PFEGs) are designed to prepare faculty members for successful tenure and promotion reviews across their careers. These guidelines are intended to help faculty members document their achievements in teaching, research, and service at each stage of career development. The department's expectations for tenure and promotion, therefore, are very developmental in nature. They emphasize professional growth across the career. The PFEGs will be used by the Director of Psychology, the Psychology Department Peer Review Committee, and other review bodies when evaluating a file submitted for progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. The Director of Psychology serves as the Dean's designee for all annual performance reviews.

General guidelines for promotion and tenure are described in UAA's 2012 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and CAS's 2013 Guidelines for Progression towards Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Reviews. The UAA and CAS guidelines outline the review process, types of review, and expected file content for each type of review. Those guidelines also describe the standards for tenure and promotion, using general terms such as *'effective in teaching,'* or *'marked strength in research.'* However, the UAA and CAS guidelines do not describe how to translate general terms into specific standards in Psychology. What, for instance, is a 'marked strength in research' for UAA's Psychology faculty, and how do faculty and their reviewers know if that standard has been reached? Therefore, throughout Fall 2012, UAA's Psychology faculty worked together to articulate departmental standards for teaching, research, and service that represent the collective values of the department and are flexible enough to fit the various workloads of its faculty. The current document represents the unanimous view of UAA's Psychology faculty about one path by which they can be evaluated in their progression towards tenure and promotion. The path described below is by no means the only path to tenure and promotion, and faculty are free to chart alternative paths, but the path below will likely be the most common path and is the most clearly charted path for Psychology faculty to follow and be evaluated.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Part 1: Criteria for Progression towards Tenure and Promotion in the Psychology Department

(based on Section V. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT AND TENURE, pages 20-23 of the "University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines" published June 6th, 2012 and the "CAS Guidelines for Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review" published October, 2013)

Progress as an Assistant Professor towards Tenure and Promotion

Assistant Professors must submit a file annually that will be reviewed to determine whether or not they are making adequate progression towards tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology. In this file, Assistant Professors working toward achieving tenure in the Department of Psychology should demonstrate:

(1) evidence of a terminal degree in the discipline;

(2) evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching appropriate for their assigned workload, where effectiveness in teaching means establishing instructional environments that support student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the courses taught and/or the degree programs and engaging in formal evaluation of student achievements;

(3) evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field and sufficient for their assigned workload;

(4) evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service appropriate for their assigned workload;

(5) a strong record of professional growth across the review period with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements; and

(6) evidence of progression towards developing an area of marked strength in at least one component of their assigned workload.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor*

When Assistant Professors stand for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology, their review file must demonstrate:

(1) evidence of a terminal degree in the discipline;

(2) clear and convincing evidence of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching appropriate for their assigned workload, where effectiveness in teaching means establishing instructional environments that support student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the courses taught and/or the degree programs and engaging in formal evaluation of student achievements;

(3) clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research that are sufficient for their assigned workload and with an emerging level of recognition within their academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution;

(4) clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service appropriate for their assigned workload;

(5) a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements; and

(6) evidence of a marked strength in at least one of the components of their workload that draws on their unique talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution.

*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.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

To be promoted to the rank of Professor in the Department of Psychology, faculty members must demonstrate:

(1) evidence of a terminal degree in the discipline;

(2) clear and convincing evidence of an extensive and sustained record of excellence in teaching appropriate for their assigned workload, where effectiveness in teaching means establishing instructional environments that support student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the courses taught and/or the degree programs and engaging in formal evaluations of student achievements;

(3) clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research within their academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution and are sufficient for their assigned workload;

(4) a demonstrated record of effective leadership in university affairs and in a range of professional service activities appropriate for their assigned workload;

(5) a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements;

(6) evidence of recognition within their academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution and demonstration of the likelihood of maintaining that stature;

(7) evidence of a marked strength in at least one component of their workload that draws on his or her unique talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution.

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

Submitting a Review File

Candidates should consult the UAA FEGs and the CAS FEGs to determine the documents that must be submitted for each type of review: progression towards tenure, fourth-year comprehensive, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. The Psychology Department strongly recommends, however, that candidates submit documents summarizing their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as part of all reviews in order to make the best use of the review process with regard to future promotion and tenure considerations.

Part 2: Expectations for Progression towards Tenure and Promotion in Psychology

Rating Scale to be used for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

The following rating scale will be used by the Director of Psychology and Psychology Department Peer Review Committee when evaluating each component of a faculty member's workload:

5 = *candidate far exceeds Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload (shows clear evidence of a marked strength in area)*

4 = *candidate exceeds Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload (shows some evidence of a marked strength in area)*

3 = *candidate shows evidence of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload*

2 = *candidate has not shown evidence of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload, but does show promise of meeting expectations*

1 = *candidate has not shown evidence or promise of meeting Psychology Department expectations for years in rank and type of workload or has failed to effectively document achievements*

A rating of '3' means that the faculty member is meeting the department's expectations in teaching, research, and/or service for their assigned workload; ratings of '4' or '5' provide evidence of a marked strength. Therefore, candidates for promotion need to achieve a minimum rating of '4' or '5' in one component of their assigned workload and a minimum rating of '3' in the other component(s) of their assigned workload.

There are three charts in this document that outline the Psychology Department's expectations in teaching, research, and service by years in rank. The charts are color coded according to the following legend:

Chart row color legend:

Blue indicates that all faculty, regardless of rank, need to meet row expectations (a minimum rating of '3').
Purple indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') beginning in 2nd year as Assistant Professor.
Green indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') beginning in 3rd year as Assistant Professor.
Pink indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') when they stand for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure.
Peach indicates that faculty should be meeting row expectations (a minimum rating of '3') when they stand for promotion to Professor.
Khaki indicates what is necessary to receive a designation of a marked strength (a minimum rating of '4').

Psychology Department Teaching Expectations for Years in Rank

Faculty members whose workloads include teaching should prepare files documenting that they are meeting the Psychology Department's expectations for years in rank and workload. The chart below outlines teaching expectations for faculty in the Psychology Department. The chart and sections A through E that follow will assist faculty in documenting their teaching activities. The chart and following sections are not exhaustive and faculty can propose other ways of documenting their teaching. These guidelines should be used in conjunction with the CAS FEGs to document teaching accomplishments and

write the self-evaluation of teaching.

In the chart below, an 'X' indicates that a faculty member needs to demonstrate that they are meeting departmental expectations for the teaching activities listed for their rank. Faculty members who provide persuasive evidence in their files of successful teaching activities in each of the boxes with an 'X' in the chart below will earn a minimum rating of '3' from the rating scale provided above. A faculty member who exceeds the expectations listed in the chart (either by engaging in activities that are only expected at a more advanced rank or engaging in more activities than expected) will be given a '4' or a '5,' which can contribute to the designation of a 'marked strength' in teaching. A rating will be assigned to each row in the chart by the Director of Psychology during his or her review. If the candidate's receives a rating below a '3' in any review that is pre-tenure or in anticipation of promotion, the Director will make suggestions about how to improve the rating in subsequent reviews.

	Psychology Department Teaching Expectations for Years in Rank				
	evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	Evidence or definite promise of a record of effectiveness in teaching	clear and convincing evidence of a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching	clear and convincing evidence of an extensive and sustained record of excellence in teaching
Teaching Activities	***Assistant Professor Year 1***	***Assistant Professor Year 2***	***Assistant Professor Years 3+***	***Promotion to Associate Professor***	***Promotion to Professor***
Demonstrate <u>rigorous course-based instruction</u> through carefully prepared syllabi, appropriate and challenging course work and assignments, and adequate student course evaluations (see Section A below)	X	X	X	X	X
Engage in <u>at least one</u> professional development activity that promotes teaching excellence <u>each academic year</u> (see Section B below)	X	X	X	X	X
Engage in individualized instruction or mentoring of <u>at least one student</u> per semester that promotes student excellence (see Section C below)		X	X	X	X
Engage in <u>at least one</u> activity that advances or promotes teaching excellence per year (see Section D below)			X	X	X
Engage in <u>at least one activity</u> aimed at				X	X

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

building/developing curricula and/or learning resources per year (see Section E below)					
Hold <u>at least one</u> major department, campus, or disciplinary <u>leadership</u> position in teaching or curriculum development (e.g., Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Dishonesty, Chair of UAB or GAB, Curriculum Review for APA, Accreditation efforts)					X
Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in teaching				Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a significant contribution to the University's teaching mission	Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a significant contribution to the University's teaching mission

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Expectations for Documenting Teaching Activities

Section A: Expectations for Documenting Course-Based Instruction

(1) Summarize courses taught during the review period (including semesters and sections) and note:
   a. new course preparations
   b. major revisions to course or syllabus

(2) Include the most recent syllabus (including a detailed description of all major course assignments and projects) for each course taught during the review period. If a significant change in a course has been implemented, an older version of a syllabus should be included. The syllabus will be reviewed to determine whether or not it:
   a. Adequately reflects the course description, instructional goals, and student learning outcomes specified in the Course Content Guide (CCG)
   b. Includes appropriate and rigorous methods to assess individual differences in student mastery of course material as specified in the CCG.
   c. Assigns reading from textbooks, journal articles, monographs, and/or other sources appropriate for the level and content of the course.
   d. Contains clear and objective grading criteria for all components of the grade, including exams, papers, projects, presentations, and in-class participation (if specified in the CCG). *Note: the Psychology Department strongly recommends that extra credit should not be in excess of 3% of total course grade, and that faculty should avoid awarding points for mere attendance.*
   e. Contains all necessary information about the course including course number, section, days and times, and prerequisites.
   f. Contains all necessary information about the Instructor including phone number, e-mail address, office location, and in-person and/or online office hours.
   g. Contains information about how academic dishonesty, plagiarism, or other unethical behavior will be handled.
   h. Contains information about how late work or missed exams will be handled.
   i. Contains information about professional student conduct.

(3) Include copies of all student course evaluations for all sections taught during the review period and summary table(s) and or graph(s) to organize course evaluation data. *Note: If you are missing course evaluations for one or more sections, explain why these evaluations are missing.*

(4) Include copies of any peer evaluations from the review period.

(5) Include additional materials in support of teaching effectiveness (e.g., a link to an instructor e-portfolio, brief videos of classroom demonstrations or discussions).

Section B: Expectations for Documenting Activities Contributing to Professional Development as an Instructor

(1) Summarize consultation with peers/mentors in the Psychology Department at UAA or elsewhere to improve your syllabus, assignments, and other course materials.

(2) Summarize attendance at workshops, teaching intensives, or conferences (e.g., Blackboard or eLive courses, CAFÉ presentations, Difficult Dialogues, Terman Teaching Conference) directed toward improving teaching.

(3) Summarize readings and research completed in support of professional development as an instructor.

Section C: Expectations for Documenting Individualized Instruction or Mentoring that Promotes Student Excellence

(1) Summarize any work you did mentoring students during the review period, including:

a. Serving as the Chair or Committee Member for:
    i. senior theses,
    ii. master's theses
    iii. doctoral dissertations
b. Supervising independent research projects or independent study courses (please list them)
c. Supervising teaching or research assistants. *Note: If you have mentored numerous students during the review period in differing roles the Psychology Departments recommends that you please create a table summarizing your mentoring work with students across the review period.*

(2) Summarize any work you did to advance student career development such as:
a. Writing grants that included undergraduate or graduate student support
b. Assisting students in writing and submitting their own intramural or extramural grant proposals
c. Writing letters of recommendation for undergraduate (e.g., Nursing), graduate programs, scholarships, or jobs
d. Submitting nominations of students for awards or scholarships
e. Assisting students with preparation of conference presentations or publications.
f. Assisting students with development or preparation of e-portfolios, curriculum vitae, or applications to graduate school or for internships.

Section D: Expectations for Documenting Activities that Advance and Promote Teaching Excellence

(1) Summarize any involvement in and recognition for activities that advanced or promoted teaching excellence in Psychology courses or elsewhere in the University during the review period such as:
a. high-impact teaching practices you have incorporated into your own teaching
    i. service-learning or community-engagement
    ii. involving undergraduates in research
    iii. teaching writing-intensive courses with more than 25 pages of graded written work per student
b. Innovative teaching strategies such as incorporating interactive theater or indigenous teaching practices into your coursework
c. Mentoring colleagues or other professionals in your discipline such as:
    i. conducting workshops for faculty or professionals in your field (e.g., CAFÉ workshops, creating and/or serving on a panel on teaching at a conference)
    ii. providing clinical supervision for colleagues
    iii. observation and evaluation of peers' teaching
    iv. consulting with colleagues on selection and use of instructional materials, tools, and resources related to teaching

(2) Publications on effective pedagogy that you have produced during the review period such as writing articles, books, or book chapters on teaching effectiveness or strategies
(3) Documentation of SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Activities) such as implementing new teaching methods (e.g., problem-based learning), the development of innovative assignments and grading techniques, content analyses of teaching materials, the utilization of student focus groups within classes, formal reflections on teaching experiences and innovations, and research on the effectiveness of teaching innovations
(4) Teaching awards, fellowships, grants, or other forms of internal or external recognition for teaching activities
(5) Involvement or leadership roles in regional, national, or international teaching conferences or programs

Section E: Expectations for Documenting Activities Building and Developing Curriculum and

Learning Resources

(1) Summarize any involvement in curriculum development work conducted on behalf of the Psychology Department or other department(s) across campus during the review period. This would include activities such as:
    a. Revising or developing new courses, programs, or degrees
    b. Creating teaching manuals, materials, or software
    c. Setting up or enhancing laboratories or equipment for teaching
    d. Developing new instructional delivery platforms (e.g., distance or web-based environments).
    e. Playing a leadership role in one of the department's curriculum committees (Undergraduate Studies Committee; Clinical Training Committee; PhD Committee) or subcommittees
    f. Leadership in definition, review, and assessment of student learning outcomes in Psychology or UAA (such as serving as the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator for the BA/BS, MS, or PhD program, serving as Chair of CAS Course and Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Academic Board, or Chairing the ad hoc Faculty-Senate Committee on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism)
    g. Involvement in or playing a leadership role in external curriculum review (such as being asked to serve as an external reviewer of a new Honors college at another university or being asked to review curriculum for an external program undergoing APA accreditation).

Psychology Department Research Expectations for Years in Rank

Faculty members whose workloads include research activity must document that they are actively conducting research and disseminating the findings through publication and presentation. The chart below communicates the Psychology Department's expectations for research productivity at each career stage. Sections A through C that follow the chart illustrate how faculty can document their research productivity. The chart is not exhaustive and faculty can propose alternative ways of documenting their research productivity.

In the chart below, an 'X' indicates that faculty members need to demonstrate that they are meeting departmental expectations for the level of research productivity listed at the given rank. Faculty members who provide persuasive evidence in their files of successful research activity in each area with an 'X' in the chart will earn a minimum rating of '3' from the rating scale provided earlier. Faculty members who provide enough evidence that they exceed the expectations listed in the chart (either by engaging in activities expected at a more advanced rank or engaging in more activities than expected by the department) will be given a rating of '4' or a '5,' which can contribute to the designation of a 'marked strength' in research. A rating will be assigned to each row in the chart by the Director of Psychology during his or her review along with suggestions about how the faculty member might improve his/her future rating if necessary.

	Psychology Department Research Expectations for Years in Rank

Research Activities	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant scholarly contributions in research within their academic field	clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research within their academic field with an emerging recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution	clear and convincing evidence of high-quality, significant, and scholarly contributions in research within their academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution
	Assistant Professor Year 1	***Assistant Professor Year 2***	***Assistant Professor Years 3+***	***Promotion to Associate Professor***	***Promotion to Professor***
Conduct a program of high-quality and significant academic research; involving students in one's research and efforts towards securing funding for research are highly encouraged (see section A below)	X	X	X	X	X
Disseminate research through presentations at professional conferences and publication in peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, monographs, and grants (see section B below)		X	X	X (accumulate at least 6 RPs per 20% of workload – see section B below)	X (accumulate at least 12 RPs per 20% of workload – see section B below)
Gain recognition from professional peers or community members external to the institution as a researcher or scholar within one's academic specialty (see Section C below)			X (provide evidence of emerging recognition within field)	X (demonstrate the development of recognition within field)	X (demonstrate clear recognition within field)

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in research				Exceed departmental expectations for RPs at rank or make a significant contribution to the University's research mission	Exceed departmental expectations for RPs at rank or make a significant contribution to the University's research mission

Section A: Expectations for Documenting a Program of Research

(1) Summarize all activities related to the development and maintenance of an active program of research including:

a. conducting basic and/or applied research and inquiry;
b. conducting community-engaged or participatory action research;
c. developing infrastructure to facilitate data collection for multiple researchers (e.g., acquiring/preparing lab space, software, and other equipment);
d. involving undergraduate or graduate students in conducting research, assisting with data collection, lab maintenance, data analysis.

(2) Summarize all activities related to developing and maintaining a program of funded research including:

a. leading research projects or contracts, including multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative projects task forces;
b. writing proposals to funding agencies (private, public, and internal);
c. being awarded funding including research grants and contracts;
d. managing budgets of grants and contracts;
e. selecting and supervising research staff;
f. preparing reports for funding bodies.

Section B: Expectations for Documenting Research Productivity through the Accumulation of Research Points

(1) Summarize your research activities during each review period by providing a list of all presentations, publications, and descriptions and documentation of other research activities listed above.

(2) Use the *Research Point Assignment Guidelines* below to chart your accumulation of the Research Points (RPs) that are expected for promotion. The Psychology Department has established that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should accumulate 6 RPs total during their time in rank (at UAA or elsewhere) for each 20% of the workload devoted to research. Promotion to Professor requires the accumulation of 12 RPs across one's career.

Research Point Assignment Guidelines

Tier I Research Category	*Type of Research Product*	*Research Point Value*
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (PRAs):	Peer-reviewed journal article	**1.0**
	PRA with student 1st author	**1.25**
	PRA in high impact journal (Impact Factor 3+)	**1.5**
Books:	Book 1st or 2nd author	**3.0**
	Book later author	**1.5**
	Book 1st or 2nd editor	**2.5**
	Book later editor	**1.5**
	Chapter 1st author	**0.75**
	Chapter later author	**0.5**
Extramural Grants:	Funded multi-year project	**2.5**
	Funded 1 year project	**1.5**
	Student grant funded	**1.0**
	Proposal not funded	**0.5**
Tier II Research Category	*Type of Research Product*	*Research Point Values*
International or national conference presentation:	1st author or student as 1st author	**0.25**
	Later author	**0.20**
Regional conference presentation:	1st author or student as 1st author	**0.20**
	Later author	**0.10**
State or local conference presentation:	1st author or student as 1st author	**0.10**
	Later author	**0.05**
Intramural grants:	Funded	**0.25**
	Student grant funded	**0.10**
	Not funded	**0.10**
Innovations in clinical practice or research:	Published treatment/test/assessment/manual	**1.00**
	Patented material	**1.50**
Publication in a journal or other periodical that is not peer-reviewed:	Author of a test bank or instructor's manual	**0.10**
	Published book or film review	**0.10**
	Newspaper editorial	**0.10**
	Article in professional newsletter	**0.10**
	Invited comment in a journal	**0.10**

Of the 6 RPs required (per 20% of workload) for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

a. at least 3 RPs must be earned for research products in which the candidate is the first author;
b. at least 4 RPs must be earned for research products in which UAA is stated as the candidate's institutional affiliation;
c. at least 4 RPs must be earned for research products listed in the Tier I category, and
d. no more than 2 RPs can be earned for research products from the Tier II category.

Of the 12 RPs required (per 20% of workload) for promotion to Professor:

a. at least 6 RPs must be earned for research products in which the candidate is the first author;
b. at least 8 RPs must be earned for research products in which UAA is stated as the candidate's institutional affiliation;
c. at least 8 RPs must be earned for research products listed in the Tier I category, and no more than 4 RPs can be earned for research products from the Tier II category.

Section C: Expectations for Documenting Recognition External to the Department and/or Institution

Summarize all evidence of recognition of your scholarly achievements outside the institution including:

a. having sole-authored publications;

b. publishing an article with extraordinary impact (document journal impact factor; number of citations, number of downloads);
c. earning external research awards;

d. being awarded extramural grants;

e. serving as an editor, associate editor, or article editor for a peer-reviewed journal;

f. being invited to give an address to a national or international conference, another university, or community organization;

g. conducting research-related service (e.g., journal reviewer);

h. including external review letters in file (especially those from reviewers who are not research collaborators or mentors as per the CAS FEGs);

i. having one's research highlighted in news or other publications or outlets external to the university;

Psychology Department Expectations for Faculty Service

The following section presents expectations for service for faculty members in the Psychology Department with 20% of total workload devoted to service. Expectations will be adjusted for faculty members who have more or less of their workloads devoted to service as negotiated with the Dean of CAS.

The Psychology Department recommends that service activities be restricted in the years prior to applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, with expectations increasing with advancement in rank. A faculty member who is exceeding expectations for years in rank is likely showing a marked strength in service. An 'X' in the box below indicates that a faculty member should be engaged in the minimum amount of service activity in that area to achieve a '3' on the rating scale.

Service Activities	**Psychology Department Service Expectations for Years in Rank**				
	Evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Evidence or definite promise of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Evidence of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	Clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant contributions to the institution through university and professional service	A demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities
	Assistant Professor Year 1	***Assistant Professor Year 2***	***Assistant Professor Years 3+***	***Promotion to Associate Professor***	***Promotion to Professor***
Engage in student support activities including, <u>at a minimum, academic and career advising</u> (See section A.3 below)	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in Governance activities, including, <u>at a minimum, attendance and participation in bi-weekly department meetings</u> (See section A.1 and A.2 below)	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in <u>at least one</u> of the Department's Standing Committees (Undergraduate Studies Committee, Clinical Training Committee, or Ph.D. Committee)	X	X	X	X	X
Participation in <u>at least one</u> additional Departmental Committee (e.g., BSCN, a search committee, Website committee, subcommittees such as the Adjunct Faculty Approval Committee, eportfolio Group, ad hoc Committee on Student		X	X	X	X

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Professional Conduct) (see Section A.2 below)					
Engage in <u>approximately 10 hours per semester</u> of professional service to the community or discipline (see Section B below)			X	X	X
Leadership of <u>at least one</u> Departmental Committee or Subcommittee (e.g., chair Undergraduate Studies Committee, serve as Outcomes Assessment Coordinator, Ph.D. Outcomes Committee Chair, a search committee chair, or BSCN Coordinator)			X	X	X
Membership <u>on at least one</u> college- or university-wide committee (e.g., serving as a member of IRB, IACUC, the Undergraduate Research Task Force, Faculty Senate, a Faculty Senate standing or ad hoc committee)				X	X
Demonstrate significant disciplinary or campus leadership (e.g., Department Chair, CTC Coordinator, PSC Director, IACUC or IRB Chair, UAB or GAB Chair, Faculty Senate President or officer, Chair of Faculty Senate standing or ad hoc Committee, Chair of the CAS Curriculum Committee, chair of a community advisory board)					X
Demonstrating a 'marked strength' in service				Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a significant contribution to the University's service mission	Exceed departmental expectations for years in rank or make a significant contribution to the University's service mission

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Expectations for Documentation of Service Activities

The following list of activities that fulfill a faculty member's service obligations is based on the UAA FEGs (June, 2012). This list is not exhaustive and a faculty member may propose other service activities. The Psychology Department recommends that a faculty member consult with the Department Chair if he or she wishes to count a non-traditional form of service toward fulfilling the service component of his or her workload.

Section A: Documentation of University and Departmental Service

(1) Document governance and administrative activities at the department, college, campus or university level, such as:
   a. department chair, academic program coordinator, or center director;
   b. contribution to department, college, campus or University policy development and governance activities;
   c. collaboration within and across campus communities on projects, initiatives, and other University-wide activities.

(2) Document academic and faculty development activities including:
   a. mentoring other faculty members;
   b. participating in faculty, administrator, or staff search committees;
   c. organizing, directing, and/or implementing academic development activities;
   d. participating in academic program development and accreditation activities;
   e. attending and participating in department meetings and subcommittees to monitor, evaluate and/or refine course offerings and improve quality of instruction

(3) Document student support services during the review period including:
   a. student advising (academic and career);
   b. serving as faculty advisor to student organizations;
   c. developing outreach activities and programs that enhance the University's ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;
   d. developing and maintaining services and programs that support student engagement with the curriculum;
   e. facilitating activities that integrate residential living and learning on campus, or engage non-resident students in campus activities.

Section B: Public, Professional Service, and Service to the Discipline Activities

(1) Document any service to society during the review period including:
   a. Writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to specialized audiences or providing expert commentary on radio or television programs or in news outlets;
   b. guiding technology transfer activities;
   c. collaborating or partnering with governments, education, health, cultural or other public institutions;
   d. contributing expertise to community agencies or civic groups;
   e. testifying before legislative or congressional committees;
   f. providing public policy analysis, program evaluation, technical briefings for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies or local organizations;
   g. serving on or assuming leadership positions on public or agency boards, task forces, or committees;
   h. developing and offering training or professional development workshops and other demonstrations or dissemination of professional methods or techniques.

(2) Document any community-engaged service during the review period such as:

a. "…community-engaged service is distinguished by its focus on collaborative, jointly developed projects designed to apply concepts, processes, or techniques to community identified issues, concerns, or problems, which result in community change and development…." (see p. 16 of UAA FEGs).

(4) Document any professionally-related service activities that utilize a faculty member's academic or professional expertise to contribute to the discipline or professional field and/or the audience or clientele such as:

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

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

Appendix Q:

Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Sociology

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Sociology

October 2013

1.0 Introduction

The Sociology Department values teaching, research, and service activities that support the mission of the University and reflect the professional commitments of our discipline. As a department, we are committed to promoting evidence based decision-making, encouraging an appreciation for the empirical methods of the social sciences, and in preparing students and community members to work effectively and collaboratively in settings characterized by complexity, rapid change, and high levels of cultural diversity. We provide these guidelines in the hope that they will encourage faculty performance that supports these goals.

These guidelines are intended to provide guidance rather than a series of specific requirements. It is important that faculty members have a clear understanding of their obligations as members of the University community, but equally important that we recognize that individual career paths will differ and that success as a sociologist may take different forms. It is particularly important to realize that sociologists with different areas of specialization will find success in different ways. It is our view that crude formulas to measure accomplishment such as counting teaching assignments or publications may appear precise on their face, but in reality could lead to misleading results when activities that are nominally similar are qualitatively different.

Assigning values to particular categories of performances in advance of the actual performance poses important questions of fairness and accuracy. We know that the assignments and the accomplishments of governance committees, for example, may vary somewhat from year. And individual members of a committee may perform at very different levels in a given review period. Similar problems face evaluators of refereed publications. While studies measuring the prestige of academic journals offer some general guidance, it is clear that two articles published in the same edition of a journal may ultimately have a very different impact on the discipline. The quality of the work, where it can be objectively demonstrated, is as important to us as the quantity.

We cannot ignore or evade our responsibility to make difficult qualitative judgments about professional performance. We believe that the best approach to this problem involves careful consultation as workloads are developed.

For these reasons, we prefer guidelines that communicate reasonably clear standards to candidates and reviewers without setting arbitrary limits that ignore real qualitative distinctions between nominally similar work products. We respect the independent professional judgment of our colleagues and we want to maximize the ability of faculty members in Sociology to shape their own careers while encouraging them to do so in a framework that respects our obligations to our colleagues, to the University, to our students, and to the larger community. We have not attempted to rank the prestige of academic journals, the difficulty of committee assignments, or any other activity that we engage in as faculty members. Instead, we prefer that those who feel that work is either substantially above or below average make an effort to persuade reviewers that this is the case. It is our hope that this approach will strike a balance between the need to make departmental expectations clear and our commitment to allowing our colleagues to find their own distinctive paths to academic success.

2.0 Evaluation of Teaching Activities

Teaching is fundamental to the mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage and to the Department of Sociology. The Department trains students in the empirical study of society. This includes the systematic and evidence-based interpretation and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. We value instruction that is innovative, rigorous and demonstrates the empirical methods and theoretical traditions of sociology. The Sociology Department shares the pedagogical commitments of the University of Alaska and the College of Arts and Sciences. Teaching activities that are particularly valued in the Department include but are not limited to those that:

- prepare students to work productively in environments characterized by complexity, rapid change, and high levels of cultural diversity;
- develop curriculum and learning resources that promote collaboration and evidence-based problem solving;
- mentor students in research projects, presentations, and community service activities;
- advance teaching excellence;
- advance student excellence.

Documentation of Effective Teaching

Faculty members are expected to document the outcomes of their teaching endeavors. The Department of Sociology will evaluate the products of teaching to the degree appropriate to faculty rank and workload. The Department anticipates that evidence of effective teaching could be documented in a variety of forms, including but not limited to:

1. Basic
   - Syllabi
   - Assignments
   - Student Opinion Surveys (at minimum, faculty must include the quantitative summarize of the official student opinion surveys, but faculty can also include other surveys)
   - Peer evaluation

2. High impact
   - Community engaged learning opportunities
   - Books of the Year activities
   - Writing intensive classes (at least 20 pages of graded writing)
   - Hosting guest speakers and serving as guest lecturer
   - Mentoring Students for Showcase papers, Undergraduate Research Proposals, etc.
   - Developing internships
   - Including students in on-going research

3. Work with students outside of courses
   - Student academic advising
   - Faculty Advisor for Student Clubs
   - Serving on graduate committees, Honors thesis committees and Interdisciplinary Degree committees
   - Writing letters of recommendation
   - Mentoring graduates for career planning

- Field Trips

4. Curriculum development (including revision)
   - Development and revision of CCGs
   - Conversion of course to a distance course
   - Program review
   - Assessment

5. Professional development
   - Participation in CAFE teaching seminars
   - Participation in other teaching seminars
   - Faculty book groups
   - Conducting Teaching workshops for colleagues
   - Attending public events on campus
   - Integrating current research into curriculum
   - Working with Library to shape the social science collection
   - Mentoring and collaborating with colleagues in teaching activities

Teaching Criteria for Progression towards Tenure, Promotion and Tenure

Teaching activities will be evaluated according to their scope and effectiveness. In reviews of faculty teaching, the quality and significance of contributions will be given careful consideration. In general, faculty members are expected to provide high-quality instruction that reflects the most current standards in our field. Faculty members with teaching assignments may engage in a variety of teaching activities including introductory courses, GERs, and more specialized upper-division offerings. The Sociology Department recognizes that some teaching commitments are more demanding than others and that faculty may at times specialize in some forms of teaching to the exclusion of others.

The evaluation of faculty teaching will be guided by a basic framework of rank-specific criteria:

Progress as an Assistant Professor: The review of assistant professors in their progression towards promotion and tenure will be based on the faculty member's sustained and demonstrated record of potential effectiveness in teaching, as exemplified by

- command of subject matter; and
- continuous growth in subject field; and
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure will be based on the faculty member's sustained and demonstrated record of effectiveness in teaching, as exemplified by

- command of subject matter; and
- continuous growth in subject field; and
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes; and
- involvement in instructional activities such as curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices; and

- increasing involvement in definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Promotion to Professor: Promotion to full professor will be based on the faculty member's sustained record of excellence in teaching, as exemplified by

- command of subject matter; and
- continuous growth in subject field; and
- maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes; and
- leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technological innovation, or high-impact teaching practices; and
- leadership in definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

3.0 Evaluation of Academic Research Activities

Academic research is crucial to UAA's mission to "discover and disseminate knowledge." As such, the Department of Sociology expects faculty members with research components in their workloads to generate and disseminate sociological knowledge through research. The Sociology Department shares the research goals of the University of Alaska and the College of Arts and Sciences. Research activities that are particularly valued in the Department include but are not limited to those that:

- conducting basic and applied research;
- writing journal articles, books, reports, grant proposals, etc.;
- presenting research findings at professional meetings or public forums;
- engaging in community-based or participatory action research;
- assessing approaches to teaching methods and techniques;
- involving undergraduate students in ongoing faculty research;
- supervising/mentoring student research, independent study, or capstone projects that lead to the professional presentation of academic research.

Documentation of Research Activity

Faculty members are expected to document the outcomes of their research endeavors. The Department of Sociology will evaluate the products of research to the degree appropriate to faculty rank and workload. The Department anticipates that evidence of research productivity will appear in a variety of forms, including but not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles;
- Books (authored or edited);
- Book chapters;
- Grant proposals for extramural funding;
- Grant proposals for intramural funding;
- Research reports;
- Citations of the faculty member's published work;
- Reprints of the faculty member's published work;
- Refereed book reviews;
- Presentations at local, regional, national, or international conferences;
- Presentations at public forums;
- Products of student research (e.g., presentations, reports, posters, etc) conducted under the direct supervision and/or mentorship of the faculty member.

Research Criteria for Progression towards Tenure, Promotion and Tenure

Products of research may vary greatly in the weight they receive depending on their scope, publication in a refereed venue, and impact within the discipline of sociology. In reviews of faculty research productivity, the quality and significance of research products is given careful consideration. For example, published work will receive more weight than unpublished work (e.g., an article under review), just as a funded research grant proposal will receive more weight than an unfunded proposal. However, unpublished work or unfunded proposals could still be highly relevant when reviewing one's progression towards tenure, promotion or tenure if these works constitute evidence of an ongoing scholarly research agenda (see UAA FEGs, pp. 41-42).

The Department of Sociology recognizes that peer-reviewed articles in generalist sociology journals are the basic benchmarks for academic productivity in the discipline. To allow both flexibility in pursuing a scholarly research agenda and consistency in disciplinary expectations, the Department has established a research threshold that is equivalent to three articles in peer reviewed publications for promotion to the rank of associate professor and awarding of tenure. The equivalent of three additional articles in peer reviewed publications (for a total of six articles) is required for promotion to full professor.

The Department embraces its responsibility to make critical judgments about the quality and significance of sociological research that goes well beyond crude article counts. In fact, the Department is best situated to make these qualitative assessments given that its members have firsthand knowledge of the research standards and expectations in the discipline of Sociology. For example, peer-reviewed articles are useful indicators of research productivity, but not exclusively so. The Department values all forms of discovery and dissemination (see "Products of Research Activity" above) and will take these into account when evaluating research activities. Furthermore, given the often lengthy interval between initial submission and eventual publication, the Department will consider articles that are currently in the review pipeline. Thus, the article thresholds outlined above should be viewed as guidelines amenable to interpretation based on the Department's expertise within the discipline. In unusual cases two articles may suffice and four may be inadequate depending on their overall quality and significance.

The evaluation of faculty research will be guided by a basic framework of rank-specific criteria:

Progress as an Assistant Professor: The review of assistant professors in their progression towards tenure will be based on the faculty member's demonstrated ability to generate and disseminate knowledge within the discipline of Sociology, as exemplified by

- high-quality and significant research products; and
- evidence of a scholarly research agenda.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure will be based on the faculty member's demonstrated ability to generate knowledge within the discipline of Sociology, as exemplified by

- high-quality and significant research products; and
- evidence of emerging recognition by professional peers external to the institutions; and
- evidence of a scholarly research agenda; and
- publishing the equivalent of three articles in peer-reviewed journals.

Promotion to Professor: Promotion to full professor will be based on the faculty member demonstrating an extensive and sustained effort to generate knowledge within the discipline of Sociology, as

exemplified by

- high-quality and significant research products; and
- evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institutions; and
- evidence of a scholarly research agenda; and
- publishing the equivalent of six articles in peer-reviewed journals.

4.0 Evaluation of Service Activities

Faculty service activities are crucial to UAA's mission. They support the discovery and dissemination of knowledge, community engagement, and shared governance of the University. While all faculty members are expected to engage in University, professional, and community service activities, we expect that faculty members will at times emphasize some service activities and perhaps exclude others. The appropriate mix will be determined by taking into account the changing needs of the University, College, and Department. The Sociology Department shares the service commitments of the University of Alaska and the College of Arts and Sciences. Service activities that are particularly valued in the Department include but are not limited to those that:

- involve leadership in significant assignments;
- involve community service;
- involve outreach to underserved communities;
- cultivate undergraduate research through mentoring;
- enhance UAA's international reputation;
- enhance UAA's reputation in the discipline of Sociology.

Documentation of Service Activity

Faculty members are expected to document the outcomes of their service endeavors. The Department of Sociology supports service expectations that are appropriate to faculty rank and workload. We anticipate that evidence of service activity will appear in a variety of forms, including but not limited to:

- authorship of papers and reports;
- letters of acknowledgement, thanks and support from professional colleagues;
- letters of acknowledgement, thanks and support from students and community members;
- evidence of presentations in local, regional, national, or international events;
- evidence of organizational efforts leading to presentations, conferences, symposia, and other events that enhance the prestige of UAA.

Service Criteria for Progression towards Tenure, Promotion and Tenure

Service activities will be evaluated according to their scope, duration, and significance. In reviews of faculty service productivity, the quality and significance of contributions will be given careful consideration. In general, faculty are expected to progression towards increasingly responsible service assignments. Service assignments will be particularly valued to the extent that they demonstrate the application of substantial professional expertise and leadership. All faculty members are encouraged to engage in a variety of activities involving service to the University, community, and the profession. The Sociology Department recognizes that some service commitments are more demanding than others and that faculty may at times specialize in some areas of service to the exclusion of others.
The evaluation of faculty service in Sociology will be guided by a basic framework of rank-specific criteria:

Progress as an Assistant Professor: The review of assistant professors in their progression towards tenure will be based on the faculty member's demonstrated ability to provide service to the University, profession, or community that is based on professional expertise. Such service may be demonstrated by providing evidence of:

- successful participation in high-quality and significant service assignments such as departmental, Faculty Senate, and college-wide committees; and/or
- successful participation in search committees; and/or
- manuscript review for academic journals and publishers; and/or
- active participation in professional organizations; and/or
- active participation in community service organizations.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure will be based on the faculty member's demonstrated ability to assume increasing levels of responsibility and leadership in providing service to the University, profession, or community that is based on professional expertise. Such service may be demonstrated through a combination of:

- evidence of increasingly responsible service assignments;
- evidence of emerging recognition by professional peers external to the institutions;
- evidence of emerging recognition by community leaders;
- authorship of committee and task force reports, appeals board findings;
- manuscript review for academic journals and publishers;
- organization of scholarly presentations and significant campus and community events.

Promotion to Professor: Promotion to full professor will be based on the faculty member demonstrating an extensive and sustained effort to provide service to the University, profession, or community that is based on professional expertise. Such service may be demonstrated through:

- evidence of leadership in high-quality and significant service accomplishments, including leadership of the Faculty Senate, the Department, a major University Committee, and/or a major professional association in which sociologists play a prominent role;
- evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institution;
- evidence of recognition by community leaders;
- authorship of works such as committee and task force reports, and appeals board findings.

5.0 Evaluation of Marked Strengths

UAA's promotion and tenure guidelines stipulate that prior to promotion from on rank to the next faculty must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one component of their workload. The previous section defines the basic level of performance in each area (teaching, research, and service). This section defines 'marked strengths' in each area. Marked strength in teaching means pedagogical activities which yield demonstrable high impact outcomes. Marked strength in research means exceeding research output required for rank. Marked strength in service means exceeding service activities required for rank.

6.0 Emeritus Professor:

The Sociology Department will review applications for Emeritus/Emerita status and make a recommendation in accordance with University faculty evaluation guidelines.

Appendix R:

Faculty Review Guidelines for the Department of Theatre and Dance

Prepared by the Faculty of the Department of Theatre and Dance

October 2013

INTRODUCTION

The UAA Department of Theatre & Dance subscribes to the principles of promotion and tenure as outlined by the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE) in their publication *ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines*, which is modeled on the *USITT* (United States Institute for Theatre Technology)*Tenure and Promotion Guidelines*. UAA is currently a member of ATHE.

The ATHE document goes into great detail and is quite lengthy. It provides guidelines for most theatre positions, some of which are not applicable to UAA either because the position does not exist, or because our faculty have assumed hybrid positions, combining elements of multiple positions to meet department needs. At times artistic personnel may try on new roles through necessity (i.e. the department needs someone to direct a production), or an artist expresses a desire to explore other creative avenues (i.e. a costume designer asks to light or direct a production in an effort to learn or expand their creative potential).

ATHE strongly supports the university tenure system for theatre professionals citing the implicit dangers that exist between academic freedom and responsibility, particularly where it overlaps with issues of public taste and tolerance. Tenure allows theatre faculty to teach, perform, and produce with the best interests of the students in mind.

In this document we will attempt to summarize the cogent points laid out in the ATHE guidelines; isolate those things unique to UAA's Department of Theatre & Dance, and explain how the Anchorage theatre community is different from other theatre communities in the lower forty-eight, and the special considerations this presents for department faculty members.

For those peer review committee members and administrators desiring more detailed information on the topics covered in this document specific page numbers will be provided from the ATHE guidelines which can be accessed at the ATHE website (Google *ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines)*. While we feel it is extremely important for evaluators to be informed about the unique nature of theatre particularly when it comes to the nature of collaboration and public performance, the department also subscribes to the notion that it is the candidate's responsibility to be informed on the policies of the university and college.

TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THEATRE

Research and creativity for theatre professionals are linked together under the heading of scholarship by ATHE. Research for theatre professors is broken down into the two most traditional forms, that leading to publication, and that leading to creative production which can include dancing, choreography, acting, directing, designing, playwriting, stage management, technical direction, etc. The concept of creative production can apply to areas related to or outside of theatre such as art, music, computer science, film, and advertising, just to name a few.

Historical, technical, and performance theory investigation, as well as analysis and synthesis of information, expertise, imagination, creativity, talent, and skill are all requisite elements of production scholarship. The end product is usually a public performance, ideally validated by a professional peer review. "The production of plays and performances and the study thereof constitute the discipline of theatre. In recognition of the artistic component of theatre, institutions of higher education include creative achievement as an official component for promotion and tenure consideration." (ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 3)

Even NAST (the National Association of Schools of Theatre) states in their accreditation guidelines that "creative activity must be regarded as being equivalent to scholarly efforts and publication when the institution has goals and objectives for the preparation of theatre professionals in practice-oriented specializations."

Of particular importance is that aspect of theatre and dance where individual practitioners (i.e. directors, actors, designers, choreographers, etc.) do not always get to choose the projects they work on, nor the budgets, talent, space, or working conditions, all of which necessitate compromise. Since the work is usually collaborative by nature it can be difficult to assess an individual's contribution separate from the shared vision of the production team. As a result, the context of the production/s must be taken into account when it comes to evaluation.

Evaluation must also be done in the context of the department's overall goals. In the case of UAA's Department of Theatre & Dance, those goals would include (1) the development of new talent; (2) training of theatre and dance artists for the profession or to teach; (3) preparation of students for graduate training; (4) opportunities for students to experience all aspects of theatre production; (5) service as a cultural resource to the university and state-wide community.

Finally, it must be acknowledged unlike the scholar who submits only successful publications for review, the theatre and dance professor is generally denied such selectivity since the majority of their creative output will be subject to public scrutiny. Given this fact and the subjective nature of judging art, it is incumbent on departments to require expert documentation of a reasonable sample of an artist's work. Like scholars in other areas, candidates in theatre and dance should have the right to select the work that will be evaluated and the right of reasonable refusal when it comes to compiling a list of external reviewers.

AREAS OF EVALUATION: THEATRE SCHOLARSHIP: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE PRODUCTION

Theatre & Dance faculty are required to provide evidence of achievements in scholarship leading to publication or creative production. This research can include, but is not limited to, books, journal articles, performance reviews, or authorship of original plays or screenplays. Presentations at professional conferences, writing grants, or editing journals would also be included as scholarly activities, as would publication of books focused on areas of specialization in the theatre (e.g. design, projections, directing, etc.), or specifically theatre pedagogy.

In preparing works for public exhibition theatre artists and dancers meet the requirements of research and creative production as they create, collect, analyze, and synthesize data while working collaboratively with other artists. Documentation of these efforts which take place before and during the rehearsal period can include, but is not limited to, designs, drawings, models, photos, recordings, and prompt books, as well as interviews, reviews, and evaluations related to a production by qualified professionals. Once again, all this information must be assessed with an eye on the production context.

TEACHING

In theatre and dance there are two forms of teaching which must be considered, formal and informal. Formal teaching would include traditional lecture and studio classes, seminars, labs, and independent studies. Informal teaching would include rehearsals and performance; working alongside students as a guest artist; advising, coaching, designing, and mentoring. Within this context it is expected that the candidate exemplifies the qualities of artistic excellence, collaboration, ethical integrity, as well as being an effective teacher. At UAA there is clearly crossover between teaching and creative assignments, which is to be expected in a department that defines production as the "heart" of its program.

SERVICE

While service is essential to the successful candidate, it is probably the most difficult to assess as it relates to UAA's Theatre & Dance program for the following reasons.

1) Theatre labs are held on Fridays when students are out of class. Sets and costumes are built with manpower and Fridays are the days when that manpower is available. Additionally, much of the work done by students in the shops involves chemicals, paints, and power tools, which translates to the need for supervision. These two factors combined often make it difficult for theatre faculty involved with the technical side of theatre to sit on traditional committees which typically hold meetings on Fridays which are convenient to the majority of other university faculty members.
2) Anchorage has a unique theatre community and each faculty member's relationship to local theatres may be defined differently in a professional sense. Some faculty members are not union members (AFTRA/SAG, AEA) and consequently will have an easier time of finding service opportunities within the local theatre community. Other faculty members may be union members as a proviso to their being hired at UAA and will find restrictions when it comes to working without a contract. In this same regard, goals of faculty members may vary. One faculty member may be in the position of helping a particular theatre grow, bringing attention to the university and providing additional creative outlets for students. Another faculty member may focus on helping local theatre grow as a profession overall, in part through union membership and education so as to create more paying job opportunities. Both of these goals serve a valuable function. While there are no resident union or commercial theatres operating in Anchorage (occasional visits by the Perseverance Theatre coming closest) it is important that students be instructed according to what they will encounter in the profession nationally, as opposed to one set of rules for the profession, while observing another set of rules for Anchorage. This disparity would also apply to members of the technicians' union (USITT), and consideration of union membership and the ethical constraints it can impose on a candidate must be given consideration. Just as it is in other disciplines, professional ethical guidelines must be adhered to, even though the lower forty-eight is 2000 miles away. Distance does not equate to a different set of rules.
3) There are community productions which may be regarded as service and it is up to the candidate to identify those projects and define in what ways those projects fall within the parameters of university service.
4) While all professors spend time in service to their students, that commitment is often inordinate within the performing arts. Developing artistic skills and coaxing out talent is often a time consuming prospect. Long hours are devoted to rehearsals for productions, and faculty prepare students for auditions for graduate school and the profession, often some years after actually graduating from the institution. The faculty adheres to the idea that their responsibility to the artist does not end when that student graduates, but continues on until the student finds their way to their next stepping stone.
5) Volunteering in professionally related organizations outside the university (i.e. ACTF, ACDF, The Northwest Drama Conference, LDI, USITT, etc.), as well as committee work within the

university and department (i.e. peer review, search committees, adjudication, etc.) also represent significant components of the candidate's portfolio.

THE TENURE PROCESS

While CAS has counseled departments not to delve into issues regarding process when dealing with this document about department-specific promotion and tenure guidelines, there are a few unique considerations for theatre and dance artists which should be addressed at the time of hire.

Incoming candidates are highly encouraged to review the expectation of their job within their job description and when they receive their letter of hire. Workload requirements need to be agreed upon by both the administration and candidate and both should have a clear understanding of what those responsibilities entail. For example, In the case of UAA's Department of Theatre & Dance the scenic designer also functions as the technical director. This would typically reflect several jobs rather than one, which in addition to the actual scenic artistry would include prop design and construction. Also, in addition to teaching two classes per semester, our scenic designer is responsible for designing four main stage productions per year, either by direct design or through the mentoring of a student. As technical director this individual will also have to see the construction of the set designs through to completion. This requires providing a complete set of working drawings with specific details on how a set is to be built, as well as making sure all the materials and hardware are purchased before construction begins. Our technical director also triples as shop manager and needs to train each student on the various power tools they will need to know how to operate, or be certified to run. This is a time consuming, safety oriented, ongoing process for there are always new students coming into our shops (scenic and costume).

While the department does have a half-time scene shop supervisor who can help with some of these tasks, that person cannot be in the shop at all times when builds are taking place. This requires the TD/Designer/Shop Manager to cover for those times when the half-time supervisor cannot be present or else all construction stops, which cannot happen on a big build. The overall impact of these kinds of demands, combined with the rigid timelines which theatre production imposes on its participants, can restrict the candidate's ability to participate on committees, advise students, or participate in the myriad other activities that most professors undertake, especially on Fridays, which is the day that all theatre labs occur. While the department understands the value of its members participating in university governance, the department tries to approach the problem as it does most problems, as a problem for the department collective as opposed to the individual professor. As a result the candidate's service to the community and university must be viewed within the context of the demands of production, and that context must be clearly defined at the time of hire so that both parties understand what will be required, and what can be reasonably expected. In the end it will be how well the candidate meets those expectations that will determine if they are eventually tenured. (For a more detailed discussion refer to page 7 of the ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines)

Any questions the candidate has about expectations should be addressed in writing from the appropriate administrator at the time of hire or shortly thereafter. "It is expected that the candidate will be able to demonstrate growth in pedagogy, scholarship, and artistic excellence, with a clear developmental agenda rooted in the expectations set forth at the time of hire." (ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 8)

Factors for Tenure: Guidelines for tenure and promotion are established at the University and college levels.

While guidelines for tenure review are those established by CAS, the department of Theatre & Dance plans to investigate the idea of a "pre tenure," or "mock tenure" review, the purpose of which would be to provide the candidate with more specific guidance. This review would be an informal review conducted by the department's tenured faculty, intended to identify areas where expectations are not on track for

tenure while allowing the candidate the time to address any potential shortcomings.

Files: File composition for tenure and promotion is established by University Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and the applicable CBA.

EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

An appropriate approach to assessment of theatre professors is through feedback from outside professional artists in the field. ATHE recommends that "scholarship in the form of creative production requires independent professional (non-institutional, non-departmental) evaluation". (ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 12) Where external reviews are required, a portfolio of selected materials will be provided by the candidate which documents their scholarship, and a referee solicitation letter outlining the type and scope of review requested. ATHE even recommends that the evaluation process leading to tenure be ongoing with outside evaluations of selected performances done at least once a year until the process is complete. (ATHE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, page 13)

Once again, external reviewers are encouraged to attend public performances of the candidate's work because so much of success is dependent on context (i.e. talent, facilities, budget, etc.), factors which would be difficult to document in a portfolio, pictures, or even a recording. However, if such a visitation is impossible the candidate is encouraged to use all technological means available to document their achievements. All materials should be of a high quality and represent the duties required for the candidate's position and area of expertise. The sample should contain a fair amount of creative work, but as in other fields should be allowed to be selective, as opposed to containing everything the candidate has put before the public.

ATHE suggests that a list of potential responders agreed upon by both the department and the Dean be kept on file for evaluation purposes. "… Institutions should be prepared to underwrite the cost of bringing external evaluators to campus for the on-campus production. It is important that, in so far as possible, such jurors or experts be without professional or personal connection with the teacher artist under review and that they have the appropriate credentials for assessing the candidate." (ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 13)

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The following is an abbreviated list of what the candidate's submitted materials should show. (For more detailed information see the ATHE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, page 15.)

• Production Expertise: Demonstrates in a professional manner the candidate's artistry, creativity, and organization and management skills; strengths in their area of specialization (i.e. lighting designer, costume designer, director, choreographer, vocal coach); knowledge of materials and methods in design and production; overall understanding of the theatrical process; safety procedures, regulations, and ethical standards; knowledge of new technologies; knowledge of history, literature, history, analysis, period styles, etc.

• Personal and Process Skills: Demonstrates communication, collaborative, and supervisory and management skills; planning, procedural, and fiscal management skills.

• Review would also be based on evaluations by peers in the areas of specialization, such as outside work with other professionals, and evidence of other outreach activities such as seminars, conference presentations, publications, awards, honors, and reviews (though it should be noted that very few productions are currently reviewed in Anchorage).

EXPECTATIONS FOR THEATRE PROFESSIONALS

It is important for theatre professionals to recognize that while their desire to pursue excellence as an artist is understood, their first priority is to understand their academic and professional responsibilities as an educator within the context of the university's overall mission. Strategies for meeting expectations in teaching, service, and scholarship should be developed early on, and mentoring should be sought from sources like CAFÉ; peers within the department; peers from departments in the same division, while keeping in contact with the department chair throughout the process. Of particular importance to Theatre & Dance is collegiality and collaboration. While individuals in other academic disciplines might be able to function somewhat effectively in a vacuum, such is not the case in theatre or dance where nothing would reach the public without the unification of ideas and collaborative effort.

Theatre & Dance Department Specific Criteria for Promotion to Specific Ranks:

Assistant Professor: Assistant Professors on the tenure track submit a file each year starting with their second year and each year thereafter until they apply for Promotion (to Associate Professor) and Tenure, usually in year 5 or 6, with 7 years considered the limit. The year 4 review will be comprehensive, representing a trial run to assess the candidate's readiness for tenure and promotion. Criteria:

• Teaching: The candidate shows a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching as demonstrated by evidence of command of subject matter; continuous growth in subject field; maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes.

• Service: The candidate demonstrates a developing record of university, professional, and public service appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank, and which exhibits a positive impact or outcome.

•Research or Creative Activity: The candidate shows evidence of the generation and dissemination of knowledge within the specified discipline (theatre or dance; performance or technical) as defined by their appropriate scholarly community; exemplified by high quality and significant scholarly products, creative works, or public performance.

•Standards of Review: Candidate shows evidence of or definite promise of high-quality and significant achievement appropriate to the field as defined in the position description guidelines for Theatre & Dance.

Associate Professor: Assistant Professors must be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with permanent tenure no later than their seventh year of employment. However, a candidate can submit a file for review for promotion and tenure during any prior year. Criteria as follows:

• Teaching: The candidate shows sustained record of effectiveness in teaching as demonstrated by evidence of command of subject matter; continuous growth in subject field; maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes; evidence of involvement in instructional activities (i.e. curriculum development, mentoring, technical innovation, high impact teaching practices); increasing involvement with in review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

• Research or Creative Activity: The candidate shows generation and dissemination of knowledge of high quality and significance within the specified discipline (theatre or dance; performance or technical) as defined by their appropriate scholarly community; exemplified by high quality and significant scholarly products, creative works, or public performance and evidence of an emerging level of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.

• Service: Candidate demonstrates a record of service contributions appropriate to discipline, mission, and rank exemplified by evidence of increasing involvement in selected areas of service, as well as a positive impact or outcome.

• Standards of Review: The candidate with the terminal degree will show clear and convincing evidence of high quality and significant scholarly achievement; a strong record of professional growth; promise of continuing achievement; a marked strength in at least one component of faculty responsibility; emerging recognition within the profession, craft or academic field by peers or community members external to the institution.

Professor: Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon achievement, distinction, and the impact of one's contributions, not duration of employment. An Associate Professor may submit a file for promotion at any time. However, time in rank may be a consideration to the extent that the effect of certain contributions builds and gathers force over time. Criteria:

• Teaching: The candidate shows sustained record of excellence in teaching as demonstrated by evidence of command of subject matter; continuous growth in subject field; maintenance of instructional environment that promotes achievement of student learning outcomes; leadership in curriculum development, mentoring, technical innovation, high impact teaching practices; leadership in definition, review and assessment of student learning outcomes.

• Research or Creative Activity: The candidate shows extensive and sustained generation and dissemination of high quality and significant knowledge within the specified discipline (theatre or dance; performance or technical) recognized by peers or constituencies outside the institution; exemplified by high quality and significant scholarly products, creative works, or public performances, and evidence of recognition by professional peers external to the institution.

• Service: Candidate must show effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities exemplified by evidence of leadership in selected areas of service; evidence of a positive impact or outcome.

• Standards of Review: The candidate with the terminal degree will show clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high quality and significant scholarly achievement; sustained professional growth; promise for continuing achievement; marked strength in at least one component of faculty responsibility; recognition within the profession, craft or academic field by peers or community members external to the institution; record of effective leadership in university affairs or professional endeavors.

THEATRE POSITION SPECIALIST PAGES

ACTOR/ACTING INSTRUCTOR

Note: It is assumed that the person instructing actors will have performed as an actor and will therefore meet or exceed the qualifications listed below.
A stage actor is an artist who studies a role in a play, builds a character based on the playwright's script and the stage director's concept, and then interprets that character in public performance. The actor may also be a creative participant in the developmental process in devised work where the performance is created with or without text. The responsibilities of the actor include rehearsing the play with the director and creative ensemble (which may include the dramaturge, music director, choreographer, fight coordinator, vocal coach, etc.) and performing the role in a public performance. Stage actors often also perform in media such as television and film. Although accomplished actors vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the actor includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Excellence in play analysis and character study, with the ability to explore, comprehend, and portray a variety of complex personalities.
2. Skilled in using the imagination and in storytelling and in interpreting diverse characters and roles.
3. Ability to portray emotional range and control and have presence in live performance.
4. Excellent vocal range, fluidity and control; knowledge of vocal anatomy and physiology and principles of sound production such as dynamic and tonal quality.
5. Skilled in vocal approaches to character and style and in stage dialects, verse and classic and contemporary dialogue.
6. Ability to effectively interpret the character through physical gesture, dance, stage combat, and movement with skills such as strength, flexibility, and stamina.
7. Ability to make effective use of costume in character interpretation.
8. Skilled in concentration, observation and physical relaxation techniques.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, from classic to contemporary genres.
2. Excellence in textual and structural analysis of characters and stories.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting and costume.
4. Knowledgeable about actor training methods such as Stanislavski, Strasburg, Meisner, Michael Chekhov, etc.
5. Knowledge of current performance trends including theories of acting and performance style.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
2. Excellence in working within the theatrical creative process, exhibiting promptness, preparedness, flexibility, and a responsible attitude toward the creative work.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the stage actor requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. The work of the stage actor must also be evaluated within a perspective of the resources available to the production (the director, cast, performance space and production support.) Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the actor may be available through

ATHE's Acting Focus Group, Actors Equity Association (AEA), Screen Actors Guild (SAG), and American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA).

DIRECTOR/DIRECTING INSTRUCTOR

The stage director is an artist who is responsible for preparing a theatre production for public performance by researching, casting, rehearsing, staging, collaborating with designers and the production team, and managing the time and (in some cases) the budget. The director develops the stylistic interpretation of the drama unique to the production in collaboration with the acting and production ensemble. The production should be accessible to the audience. Though accomplished stage directors vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the stage director includes:

A. Production Expertise

1. Excellence in play analysis and conceptualization and ability to articulate ideas in appropriate terms for actors, choreographers, musical directors, playwrights, dramaturgs, voice and movement directors, designers, and public relations staff.
2. The ability to develop over time a unique director's aesthetic that can be evidenced through a portfolio of creative work.
3. Skill at stage composition and picturization; ability to tell a story through effective staging and storytelling techniques.
4. Knowledge of movement, including period movement, for acting, dance, and stage combat, and the related spatial requirements.
5. Ability to demonstrate clarity of expression and to create a visual and aural atmosphere that illuminates the world of the play.
6. Ability to test the boundaries of language, form or style in the unique circumstances of production.
7. Ability to coach actors with various levels of expertise and to prepare them for effective performance experiences.
8. Understanding of the related production areas—choreography, stage voice and dialects, stage movement and combat, costume design, lighting design, sound design, stage rigging and pyrotechnics.
9. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association (AEA), the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), and the Society of American Fight Directors (SAFD).

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting and directing techniques, visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, and costume.
3. Knowledge of the history of art (artists, historic styles, and genres), architecture, and decor.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history.
5. Knowledge of current performance trends including performance studies and theories of acting and directing.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills to secure sensitive translation of directorial concepts into effective productions.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings
3. Knowledge and application of fiscal management skills.

August 25, 2014 – under review by UNAC and Provost's Office – not fully approved

4. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
5. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
6. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the stage director requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Stage directors must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production to create stage productions that are both artistically and technically sound and can be realized within the constraints of budget and available labor for the producing organization. The work of the stage director must also be evaluated within a perspective of such constraints as acting pool, artistic and technical support and facilities and production resources. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus. Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the director may be available through the ATHE Directing Focus Group and the Stage Directors and Choreographers (SDC).

Note: For directors who focus on directing stage musicals, see the specialist page on musical theatre for additional expertise expected in that area.

PLAYWRIGHT

The playwright is the artist who writes the play, which serves as the foundation for the exploration and performance by the creative ensemble. Playwrights may also collaborate with the stage director, dramaturge, designers and actors in developing the playscript. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiencies typically required of a playwright includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Advanced technical skills in dramatic construction.
2. A deep understanding and demonstrated ability to use theories and methods of script analysis, criticism, and dramaturgy in the development of theatrical and dramatic works.
3. Possessing careful and insightful observation of human behavior and interaction.
4. Skills in researching and expertise in storytelling.
5. Ability to write illuminating dialogue and effective action.
6. Ability to develop engaging characters and complex character interactions.
7. In developing a script in collaboration with the creative ensemble, flexibility and ability to effectively handle feedback to make positive change in the developing the playscript.
8. Ability to connect with an audience through the embodied script.
9. The ability to develop a work from concept to finished product.

B. Literature and History
1. A working knowledge of theatre history and theory and various ways each may influence the creative process
2. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
3. Excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.

Overall excellence from the playwright requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the

areas noted above. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized theatrical production, both on and off campus when the playwright's scripts are accepted for performance or when a reputable leasing company or established publisher publishes the scripts.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the playwright may be available through the ATHE Playwrights and Creative Teams Focus Group, ATHE's Dramaturgy Focus Group and the Dramatists Guild of America.

FIGHT CHOREOGRAPHER/ FIGHT DIRECTOR

The fight director (or fight choreographer) is a movement specialist who has particular expertise in stage combat and who is responsible for teaching and coaching those special skills and collaborating on performances for scenes involving combat or stage violence. Teaching activities may involve (but are not limited to) (1) fundamentals and practice of stage movement (anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation and alignment, breath, balance, strength); (2) a wide variety of movement techniques; (3) textual analysis and interpretation; (4) development of stage presence; (5) group ensemble techniques; (6) stage combat skills; (7) creating character or style through gesture and physicalization; and (8) physical stamina and safety. Coaching activities may involve, but are not limited to: (1) working with director and production staff to design staging and physical elements of a production; (2) coaching performers (individuals or groups) to fulfill the physical demands of the production; (3) coaching performers in textual analysis and application to the performance; (4) coaching movement demands of the production; (5) coaching performers in effective technique which maintains or develops the strength and stamina of the body and ensures the safety of the actor in meeting those demands, (6) providing a resource for period styles of movement and dance; (7) professional consultations with individuals and professional organizations seeking training in specific movement techniques.

Though accomplished fight directors and choreographers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the movement specialist/fight director includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Fundamental knowledge of anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation techniques, and body alignment.
2. Fundamental knowledge of movement systems as demonstrated through study with various recognized stage movement/stage combat practitioners and institutions devoted to the study of stage movement.
3. Knowledge of other approaches to performance (including stage acting, dance, and vocal performance), physical approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation, stage movement design and its application to theatrical or musical production.
4. Knowledge of training methods in stage combat including unarmed combat and various weapons.
5. Knowledge of recorded materials from film, television and electronic media.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for designing stage movement or combat and/or coaching of productions.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and physical theatre techniques.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the fight choreographer/director requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Fight directors and choreographer must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production, collaborating with directors, voice specialists, designers and performers in a shared vision of the creative work. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the fight choreographer/fight director may be available through the ATHE Acting Focus Group, the Association of Theatre Movement Educators, Movement Theatre International, SDC (Stage Directors and Choreographers), and the Society of American Fight Directors.

MUSICAL THEATRE SPECALISTS
The area of musical theatre is a prime example of an area where "blended" specialties predominate, requiring a unique combination of expertise. Job descriptions for musical theatre faculty may fall into several categories. The most common ones are: musical theatre director/actor, choreographer/dance, or voice coach/conductor or music director. Faculty teaching musical theatre will necessarily understand all three areas of music, voice and dance and there will often be some crossover in proficiency. It is the rare individual who will have equal expertise in all three areas. Furthermore, a faculty member who specializes in musical theatre needs to have a solid background in musical theatre performance and be skilled at curricular organization, assessment (academic and creative) and constructive mentorship of students.

MUSICAL THEATRE DIRECTOR/ACTOR
The musical theatre stage director is an artist who is responsible for preparing a musical theatre production for public performance by researching, casting, rehearsing, staging, collaborating with designers and the production team, and managing the time and budget. The musical theatre director develops the stylistic interpretation of the performance unique to the production in collaboration with the acting and production ensemble. The production should illuminate the work of the playwright/librettist and composer and be accessible to the audience. The musical theatre actor is an actor with specialized training and expertise for performance in the musical theatre genre. The specialist pages for Actor and Director outline the fundamental production expertise, knowledge base and administrative skills expected of the musical theatre actor and director. For faculty who are specialists in musical theatre, the range of proficiency typically required includes additional proficiencies such as:

A. Production Expertise
1. The ability to perform and/or direct and teach the acting style found in traditional musical theatre as well as the evolving performance styles of the contemporary musical theatre.
2. The ability to connect scenes of spoken word, music expression and dance/movement illustration into an integrated coherent storytelling performance.

B. Literature and History
1. The unique history and development of the musical theatre genre including the contributions of opera, operetta, ballad opera, vaudeville etc.
2. An understanding of music theory, song structure, story through song, vocal capabilities, instrumentation, and music genres.

3. Knowledge of historical and stylistic dance genres.
4. Knowledge of vocal repertoire for all ranges of singers.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Understand the professional musical theatre market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
2. Overall excellence from the musical stage director and actor requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above (along with the knowledge outlined in the director and actor specialist pages). Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the musical theatre actor/ director may be available through the ATHE focus groups in Acting, Directing, and Musical Theatre/Dance.

CHOREOGRAPHER

A choreographer is an artist who is responsible for creating original works of choreography sometimes in collaboration with additional artistic collaborators for public performance.

A. Production Expertise
1. Significant competency in performing in multiple forms of dance, including but not limited to: ballet, tap, jazz, modern, folk and contemporary forms.
2. The ability to choreograph for, teach, train and adapt to performers at various levels of expertise, including those with little or no dance training and of all ages.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of the history and development of dance as a performance genre.
2. The history of multiple forms of dance utilized in traditional and contemporary styles.
3. Knowledge of major choreographers and their unique styles and contributions.

C. Administration
1. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with designers and performers in a variety of professional and academic settings.
2. Understand the professional dance market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
3. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the choreographer requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Choreographers must have the ability to direct and teach the chosen performance style as well as to push boundaries of the form toward unique expression. Choreographers must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production to collaborate in creating stage productions that are artistically unified. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

PERFORMER - DANCE

A dance performance artist is an artist who investigates movement phrases set by a choreographer and then interprets those phrases in public performance. The dance performance artist may also be a creative

participant in the developmental process in devised work where the choreography is created in collaboration or with other arts-based collaborators. The responsibilities of the dance performance artist include rehearsing the choreography with the choreographer and/or other collaborators and performing the role in a public performance. Dance performance artists often also perform in media such as television and film.

Although accomplished dance artists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the dancer includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. The ability to explore, comprehend, and embody a variety of choreographic styles.
2. Skilled in using the imagination in interpreting diverse choreographic styles.
3. Presence in live performance.
4. Excellent movement range, fluidity and control; knowledge of anatomy and physiology and principles of sound technique quality.
5. Ability to effectively interpret the choreography through physical gesture, dance and movement with skills such as strength, flexibility, coordination and stamina.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of the history of various dance styles and choreographic genres.
2. Knowledgeable about dance training methods across a range of techniques such as ballet, modern the various jazz genres, tap and world culture dance.
3. Knowledge of current performance trends including theories of movement and performance style.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Understand the professional dance market and maintain connections to the professional world to prepare students to perform in a myriad of professional avenues.
2. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with performance.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the movement specialist may be available through the ATHE Acting Focus Group, the Association of Theatre Movement Educators, Movement Theatre International, and SDC (Stage Directors and Choreographers).

MOVEMENT SPECIALIST

The movement specialist is an artist who is responsible for training and coaching students and/or professional performers in the use of the physical body for theatre performance. The movement specialist's job is to foster artistic growth, personal freedom, and safe and respectful exploration of the physical components of communication, and effective, efficient motion. Within his or her own unique expertise, specialists practice creativity and freedom of expression; empower students/clients, themselves and the organization; promote research into related fields. To achieve these objectives movement specialists will employ reasonable and accepted practices such as: visual demonstration and modeling, physical contact, written text, observation, and discussions that foster understanding.

The movement specialist's work with students/performers in production includes, but is not limited to: (1) Collaborating with the director and production staff to design a unique physical life for a production and a work process for the movement coach and or choreographer; (2) Creating a process for the performing artist in which they create, enter and inhabit the internal and external elements of a performance space; (3) Assisting in the ability of a physical instrument to maintain freedom from tension, vivid expression, a released and aligned vertical silhouette, and remain responsive to the world of the

script while demonstrating specific physical character dynamics implementing the imagination; (4) Coaching the physical and experiential crafting of a specific character life involving physical, vocal, and experiential choices that are related to the character, not the performer, including: rhythm, tempo, styles, strength and articulate character definition, and choreography; and (5) Developing a warm up process specifically designed to address the demands of the rehearsal period and the production.

The movement specialist may also be engaged in: (1) Consultations with professional artists, teachers, and other professionals from all walks of life in the public sector; (2) Direction and/or creation of dramatic works, performance pieces of original work; (3) Teaching of other approaches to performance including: acting, musical theatre, singing or performing in film, television or broadcast media, vocal approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation; and (4) Research and scholarship including, but not limited to, historical investigations, pedagogical advances, and performance reviews. Though accomplished movement specialists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the movement specialist includes:

Production Expertise

1. Fundamental knowledge of physical training pedagogies as demonstrated through study with various recognized physical training practitioners and institutions devoted to the study of physical pedagogies. Movement specialists will often have received training in multiple approaches to the discipline. A few examples of these training methods are: dance, tai chi, yoga, period styles, combat, physical comedy, acrobatics, mime, mask, clown, or any one of many body use or movement techniques or approaches: Lecoq, Decroux, Bartenieff, Laban, Michael Chekhov, Alexander, Feldenkrais, Meyerhold, Suzuki, Pilates, Williamson, Bioenergetics, *Commedia dell'Arte*, Improvisation, Martial Arts, Viewpoints, and RasaBoxes.

2. The movement specialist employs practices that assist with appropriate self-use and mechanical issues concerning the body (the instrument). These issues range from general care to corrective work. The movement specialist/teacher works with the development of the intuitive and kinesthetic understanding of the performer. A movement specialist will devise a process for creating an articulate body that demonstrates technical proficiency, full physical commitment and ease along with the integration of physical skills. This may include but is not limited to:

A) Examination of the muscles and the skeletal aspects of the body to foster optimum alignment, which is the ability to maintain a vertical silhouette within the body that demonstrates ease and radiates an engagement with the self and with the environment.
B) Tension release to facilitate ease of motion and the technical proficiency of the body.
C) Understanding of the process of respiration that supports all physical processes.
D) Teaching of movement skills and/or dance pedagogy to increase strength, flexibility, control, articulate self-use, and as elements of improvisation.
E) Addressing physical mannerisms as they affect the student/client.
F) Clarity and specificity in the physical shaping of movement dynamics.
G) Physical definition of character – training the body to be emotionally and physically connected to the specifics of the text.
H) Styles training – the ability to inhabit a physical and experiential reality other than one's own, including styles that may range from *Commedia dell'Arte* and Restoration manners to twenty first century dance.

3. A movement specialist will assist the student/performer in the exploration of the body as an expressive tool of the creative imagination. This may include but is not limited to:

A) Teaching physical articulation and the use of the body as an instrument of perception and expression facilitating the transformation of the body.
B) Developing the ability to externalize and communicate the character's goals/objectives and inner state through movement, with or without text.
C) Increasing the powers of concentration, observation, and sensitivity to others; and applying these skills to working collaboratively in groups.
D) Assisting in the achievement of attaining the skill, confidence and freedom of expression required to play diverse characters and to convincingly convey differences of age, physical condition, class position, historical period, and emotional attitude.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for designing stage movement and/or coaching of productions.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and physical theatre techniques.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the movement specialist requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Movement specialists must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production, collaborating with directors, voice specialists, designers and performers in a shared vision of the creative work. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the movement specialist may be available through the ATHE Acting Focus Group, the Association of Theatre Movement Educators, Movement Theatre International, and SDC (Stage Directors and Choreographers).

VOICE SPECIALIST1

1 These guidelines incorporate definitions and standards established by VASTA (Voice and Speech Trainers Association) in its document "Promotion, Tenure, and Hiring Resources," 2002. www.vasta.org/publications/ promotion_tenure_hiring/PTH_Resources.pdf

The voice specialist is an artist who is responsible for training and coaching students and/or professional performers in the use of the voice and dialects for theatre performance. The voice and speech trainer's job involves (but is not limited to) teaching student and/or professional performers, coaching students and/or professional actors for performance, consultations with professional voice users in the public sectors. Teaching activities may involve (but are not limited to) (1) fundamentals and practice of voice production (vocal anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation and alignment, breath, pitch and resonance, tone and speech, dynamic control); (2) singing technique; (3) textual analysis and interpretation; (4) public speaking and presentation skills; (5) group speaking techniques; (6) vocal extremes; (7) accent modification; (8) dialect acquisition, (9) voice and speech for stage, film or broadcast media, (10) creating character or style through voice and speech; and (11) vocal health.

Coaching activities may involve, but are not limited to: (1) working with director and production staff to design vocal elements of a production; (2) coaching performers (individuals or groups) to fulfill the vocal demands of the production - audibility and intelligibility as well as vocal dynamics, group speaking or other special demands of the production; (3) coaching performers in textual analysis and application to the performance; (4) providing dialect resources and coaching performers to speak with accents appropriate to the demands of the play; (5) coaching performers in effective technique which maintains or screaming and shouting; (6) providing a resource for pronunciation of unusual terms and names as well as textual and language analysis and research; (7) professional consultations with individual professional voice users seeking voice, speech or communication training for their employees, or professional organizations seeking training in specific voice or speech techniques. Though accomplished voice specialists vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the voice director/coach includes:

Production Expertise1

1 For more detailed information, please refer to VASTA's document, *Guidelines for the Preparation of Voice and Speech Teachers*, adopted and amended the summer of 1995

1. Fundamental knowledge of vocal anatomy and physiology, physical relaxation techniques, principles of sound production (such as dynamics and tonal quality), vocal health, acoustic and perceptual training.
2. Fundamental knowledge of voice and speech systems as demonstrated through study with various recognized voice and speech practitioners and institutions devoted to the study of voice and speech.
3. Knowledge of other approaches to performance (including stage acting, singing or performing in film, television or broadcast media), vocal approaches to character and style, textual analysis and interpretation, public address and interview skills, vocal design and its application to theatrical or musical production.
4. Specialized skills may include phonetics systems and the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), dialect acquisition, accent modification, vocology, singing, verse drama, narration, voiceover and broadcast media, vocal extremes such as shouting and screaming, vocal direction for theatre, nonwestern vocal traditions such as keening, chanting, overtone singing.
5. Knowledge of recorded materials (such as samples of dialects, character voices, vocal styles) from film, television and electronic media.

Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in analysis of scripts to delineate the historical, literary, and stylistic considerations in preparation for vocal design and/or coaching of production.
3. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, including the history of acting, performance styles, and stage voice techniques.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history as a context for theatrical production and style.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration

1. Excellence in oral and written communication skills.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Understanding of rehearsal process, management and scheduling.
4. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the voice specialist requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the

areas noted above. Trainers, coaches and vocal directors must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production, collaborating with directors, designers and performers in a shared vision of the creative work. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the voice specialist may be available through the ATHE Acting Focus Group, the Voice and Speech Trainer's Association (VASTA), the Fitzmorris Voice Work, The Lessac Institute, the Linklater Center for Voice and Language, the National Center for Voice and Speech, and the Voice Institute.

DESIGNERS1

1 These descriptions are modeled on "USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines," 2000, pages 12-15properties, puppets, projections, etc.

Theatre productions require a team of designers who work with the director to create the aural and visual world of the play. Listed below are the primary categories of designers but productions may also utilize special designers to create such elements as stage properties, puppets, projections, etc.

COSTUME DESIGNER

The costume designer is an artist who designs the costumes that enhance a given production in general and characterization in particular. The designs should also enhance or harmonize with the other visual elements such as scenery and lighting. The range of proficiency typically required of a costume designer includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Excellence in creating sketches, renderings and drawings in various media.
2. Knowledge and ability to manipulate the elements of design.
3. Knowledge of the materials and methods of costume construction, including fabrics, pattern development, fitting, tailoring, etc.
4. Knowledge of movement for acting, dance, and stage combat and the related requirements of costumes.
5. Knowledge of fabric modification, including dyeing, painting, lamination, and distressing.
6. Knowledge of techniques in makeup, hair, wigs, and masks.
7. Knowledge of safety procedures and regulations as they apply to costume construction.
8. Understanding of the related production design areas—scenic design, lighting design, makeup design.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres.
2. Excellence in textual analysis of scripts.
3. Knowledge of historical dress, including ethnic dress and accessories, nonwestern and unique theatrical costume, Western theatrical costume, and differing national styles of historic dress.
4. Knowledge of historic textiles and decoration.
5. Knowledge of art history as it relates to dress.
6. Knowledge of social and popular history, including period manners and movement.
7. Knowledge of the history of makeup, hair, wigs and masks.
8. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral and written communication.
2. Ability to work and collaborate with various artists, technologists, and technicians, many of whom may

be unskilled students with various levels of experience.
3. Excellence in fiscal management, including budget development and material acquisition.
4. Ability to oversee the technical execution of costumes.
5. Knowledge of studio and wardrobe personnel management and scheduling as needed in planning for productions.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Excellence from the costume designer requires the ability to consistently integrate knowledge with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of a given production to produce costume designs that are both artistically and technically sound and within the limitations of budget and available labor for the producing organization. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in production, either on or off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the costume designer may be available through ATHE's Design and Technology Focus Group, the Costume Designer's Guild, the Costume Society of America, and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

LIGHTING DESIGNER

The lighting designer is an artist who designs the theatrical lighting for productions. Theatrical lighting should express the lighting designer's visual interpretation of the production and support, reinforce and enhance the artistic statements of the other members of the production team. Lighting is a combination of artistic work and technical knowledge and ability. Traits exhibited by individuals usually include both of these areas, but in wide variance. Many excellent lighting designers know or attribute little importance to technical details leaving that work to electricians. Other lighting designers have a highly technical background and organize many or all of the technical details themselves, considering that to be an important part of the lighting design process. The range of proficiency typically required or the lighting designer includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Ability to communicate design intent verbally and to also use devices such as story boards, overlays to renderings, sketches, lighting lab demonstrations, etc.
2. Knowledge of the theories and behavior of light (e.g., optics, reflection, refraction, etc.)
3. Knowledge of color theory in both light and pigment.
4. Technical knowledge of current lighting equipment and the ability to apply this technology to a given production.
5. Knowledge of theories on the psychological perception of light.
6. Ability to interpret theatrical movement, speech, and song in terms of light.
7. Knowledge of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to lighting design.
8. Knowledge of safety codes and regulations affecting lighting.
9. Knowledge of energy conservation methods appropriate to lighting.
10. Basic knowledge of the use of light as a design element in other media, such as film, television, and architecture.
11. Abilities in hand and/or computerized drafting.
12. Understanding of the related production design areas—scenery, costume, makeup, and sound.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and the textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting and costumes.

3. Knowledge of art history (artists, historic styles, and genres), especially in the use of light.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral and written communication needed to describe the sensitive translation of the design ideas into a theatrical reality.
2. Ability to work and collaborate with various artists and technicians with various levels of experience.
3. Ability to oversee the technical execution and operation of lighting in production.
4. Excellence in the development and management of budgets for lighting equipment and personnel.
5. Knowledge of lighting personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher-level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Excellence in lighting design requires the ability to consistently integrate knowledge in the above areas with an understanding of the conceptual aspects of a given production. The result should be a design that is artistically and technically sound and within the limitations of budget, available labor, and equipment of the producing organization. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the lighting designer may be available through ATHE's Design and Technology Focus Group, the Professional Lighting and Sound Association and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

SCENIC DESIGNER

The scenic designer is an artist who designs scenery (and often properties) that enhance a given production. The scenery should visually express the stylistic interpretation of the drama unique to the production. It should meet the needs of the actors and the director (and sometimes dancers and choreographers) by allowing for appropriate staging and dance spaces, both within the scene and from scene to scene. Further, the setting should complement and integrate with the other visual elements of the production such as costumes and stage lighting. Though accomplished scenery designers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the scenic designer includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Excellence in recording and simulating the his/her intentions for the setting in sketches, story boards, renderings, or scale models; drafting of plans and sections; execution of painter's elevations; scheduling and listing equipment and material selection; and painting to reflect the collaborative choices made by the production team.
2. Knowledge about the impact of color, line, shape, texture, movement, and composition, and demonstrated excellence in manipulating these design elements.
3. Knowledge of the materials and methods of scenic construction, rigging and shifting, properties, and scenic painting.
4. Knowledge of movement for acting, dance, and stage combat, and the related spatial requirements.
5. Understanding of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to scenic design.
6. Understanding of the related production design areas—costume design, lighting design, and sound design.
7. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association.

B. Literature and History

1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, and costume.
3. Knowledge of the history of art (artists, historic styles, and genres), architecture, and decor.
4. Knowledge of economic and social history.
5. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral, written, and graphic communication skills to secure sensitive translation of designs into workable scenery.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technicians in a variety of professional and academic settings
3. Knowledge of fiscal management of scenic production, acquisitions, and maintenance.
4. Ability to assess the accurate technical execution and operation of the scenic elements of the production.
5. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
7. An understanding of professional ethics and practice associated with theatre and performance.

Overall excellence from the scenic designer requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Scenic designers must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production to create scenic designs that are both artistically and technically sound and can be realized within the constraints of budget and available labor for the producing organization. Such expertise is demonstrated by participation in realized production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the scenic designer may be available through ATHE's Design and Technology Focus Group, the International Organization of Scenographers, Theatre Architects and Technicians, Professional Lighting and Sound Association, United Scenic Artists, and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

SOUND DESIGNER

The sound designer is an artist whose primary responsibility is designing sound for the theatre to enhance a given production. The sound should aurally express the stylistic interpretation unique to the production. Though accomplished sound designers vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the sound designer includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Excellence in the sharing of ideas and concepts in the artistic arena with other artistic staff (i.e., director, other designers, dramaturge, etc.).
2. Ability to collaborate with artistic staff and support the direction of the production within an aural environment. Ability to share sound design ideas with others through both verbal and aural means.
3. Knowledge and ability to manipulate current audio technology and systems, both reinforcement and recording/playback.
4. Knowledge of technology and system analysis and equipment assembly processes for both reinforcement and recording/playback.
5. Knowledge of acoustics and spatial effects on acoustics.
6. Knowledge of psycho-acoustics and the effects of sound in a human environment.
7. Knowledge of basic rigging, electrical, and electronic techniques/technologies as related to sound design.

8. Understanding of the techniques and skills of directing as they relate to sound design.
9. Understanding of the related production design areas—costume design, lighting design, and scenery design.
10. Knowledge of standard safety procedures and regulations as well as those prescribed by various related professional organizations such as Actors Equity Association.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in textual and structural analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production.
3. Knowledge of music history and music genres.
4. Understanding of basic musical composition principles.
5. Knowledge of economic and social history.
6. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Excellence in oral, written and aural communication skills needed to secure sensitive translation of designs into reality.
2. Ability to effectively work and collaborate with various artists and technologists in a variety of professional and academic settings.
3. Knowledge of fiscal management of audio production, acquisitions, and maintenance.
4. Ability to assess the accurate technical execution and operation of the aural elements of the production.
5. Understanding of studio personnel management and scheduling.
6. Excellence in the higher level planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
Overall excellence from the sound designer requires the ability to integrate knowledge consistently in the areas noted above. Sound designers must work with an understanding of the conceptual requirements of any given production to create sound designs that are both artistically and technically proficient and can be realized within the constraints of budget and available labor for the producing organization. Such expertise is demonstrated in participation in production, both on and off campus.

Additional information about the expertise and skills expected of the sound designer may be available through ATHE's Design and Technology Focus Group, the Audio Engineering Society, Professional Lighting and Sound Association, and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

STAGE MANAGER / PRODUCTION MANAGER1

1 This description is modeled on the "USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines," 2000, pg. 17.

Those charged with evaluating the work of design and production professionals should expect to address appropriate issues including the following when assessing stage managers and production managers. Stage managers practice a discipline in which their creative achievement is devoted to enabling and implementing a theatrical work of art. Theatre is a collaborative art involving the contribution of writers, actors, directors, designers, technicians and an audience. Stage management is the component of this process responsible for the interaction of all these participants, both on the artistic and the human plane.

The process of planning, rehearsing and performing a theatrical work of art is a paradigm for group activity, the equivalent in the theatre field to traditional research. Successful work requires collaborative efforts from faculty and students. The disciplines of stage and production management are central to this process. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth of knowledge and ability in any one area,

the range of proficiencies typically required of a stage manager or production manager includes:

A. Production Expertise
1. Understanding scenic, costume, lighting and sound design practices.
2. Ability to interpret designer's renderings, models and/or sketches and to communicate effectively with all members of the design and production team regarding:
3. Resources of time and/or funds to accomplish project
4. Computer resources to support production process as appropriate (scheduling, spreadsheets, database, etc.)
5. Materials commonly used in scenic construction and their safe use.
6. Safe handling procedures for scenic equipment and materials used in scenic construction
7. Safe stage operations and stage maintenance, including stage rigging and machinery, stage lighting equipment, and stage audio equipment.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and demonstrated excellence in textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of theatrical production history, with emphasis on elements of scenery, properties, lighting, costumes and sound.
3. Knowledge of art history, especially architecture and decor, and understanding of how designers use such knowledge.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).

C. Administration
1. Responsible and adaptable communication with an ability to handle and coordinate diverse groups of artistic personalities with tactful discipline and a sense of humor.
2. Establishing a creative environment by combining the ability to anticipate, prioritize, and solve problems with calm sensitivity and grace under pressure.
3. Demonstrated success in collaborative accomplishment in important work with artists of the contemporary American theatre.
4. Competence in higher levels of planning required in seasonal or repertory contexts.
Manager/Production Manager may be available through the ATHE Theatre Management Focus Group, Actors Equity Association, the Stage Manager's Association, the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

TECHNICAL DIRECTOR1

1 This description is modeled on the "USITT Tenure and Promotion Guidelines," 2000, pg. 16.
The technical director is an artisan/scholar/teacher charged with directing the technical aspects of a theatre's production operation. The technical director typically oversees the work of staff, student, and volunteer technicians, and sometimes student designers. Thus, the technical director must be evaluated as both a practicing technician and an administrator. Though individuals vary greatly in their depth or knowledge and ability in any one area, the range of proficiency typically required of the technical director includes:
A. Production Expertise
1. Knowledge of theatrical, scenic, costume, lighting and sound design practices.
2. Ability to effectively translate the designer's renderings, models and/or sketches into practical stage settings, commonly requiring the following:
3. Skill in communicating technological solutions, including technical drafting, sketching, model building.
4. Knowledge of the materials commonly used in scenic construction, the strengths of these materials and their safe use.
5. Skill in the various methods of scenic construction, including plastics fabrication, metalworking,

carpentry, and cabinetwork.
6. Knowledge of the safe handling procedures for scenic equipment, hand and power tools, and materials used in scenic construction.
7. Skill in using computer software to support the production process as appropriate (spreadsheets, database, CAD, etc.).
8. Skill in stage operations and stage maintenance, including stage rigging and machinery, stage lighting equipment, and stage audio equipment.

B. Literature and History
1. Knowledge of dramatic literature, including historic genres, and excellence in the textual analysis of scripts.
2. Knowledge of the history of theatrical production, with emphasis on the visual elements of scenery, properties, lighting, sound, and costumes.
3. Knowledge of the history of art, especially architecture and decor, and understanding of how designers use such knowledge.
4. Information literacy (the ability to research and vet information from appropriate sources).