

Preparation of a file for evaluation can be a bit unnerving and is always a major chore for candidates. The unnerving part is that candidates are seldom sure about what to include and what to leave out. Obviously one does not want to leave out important things which peers, the department chairs, extended college directors, the dean, and all the others involved in the review process might find valuable and informative. On the other hand, the file should not be too large. This brief set of suggestions is designed to help faculty members who are preparing a file for evaluation make reasonable decisions on what to put into the file and how to organize it.

In preparing a file, keep in mind that it is just one of many being prepared for review. During a typical year at UAA, it is expected that approximately 40 to 50 faculty members will be applying for promotion and/or tenure, and that even more will be undergoing retention and periodic review. With that many to read, reviewers will appreciate well-organized and succinct files.

One way to keep the file concise is to remember that the normal period of review for promotion and/or tenure is from five to six years. That is the period of time on which to concentrate and for which to provide succinct information. Significant items prior to the review period may be briefly outlined in the Vita. (Note: The review period for tenured faculty members undergoing periodic review will be from the full academic year just prior to the date of the award of tenure or the last review, whichever is more recent. Promotion consideration will cover the period from the last promotion or, in cases where there have been no promotions, from the date of initial appointment as a faculty member. Tenure considerations will cover the total period from the date of initial appointment as a tenure-track faculty member.)

Not every item mentioned in this document will apply to all candidates. Some faculty are not involved with or required to undertake research/creative activities. Bipartite faculty may wish to ignore that portion of the file.

The Vita is usually the most critical document in a file. It is the place reviewers will look to find information on formal education; professional development; the results and output from research and/or creative activities; participation in regional, national, and international professional organizations; and any honors and awards. A good format for a vita is essential. Usually colleagues can provide valuable guidance for anyone who needs assistance. While there is some standardization in the form of the vita, there are legitimate variations depending on the field. Engineering formats are not well suited to those in the music department and vice versa. Do not hesitate to ask to see a colleague's vita.

Of particular importance concerning the vita is that peers and others involved in the review process for tripartite workload candidates will be looking explicitly to find output (either research or creative activity) which has been subjected to peer review. For most people this involves the publication of books, monographs, and/or articles in refereed journals. It may or may not involve papers that have been published as part of the proceedings of a national meeting of a professional organization. In the creative arts, the forums will be different but the standards are approximately the same: reviewers want to know that professional work has been subjected to review and subsequently been accepted by professional peers. Thus, when compiling or updating the vita, it is important to clearly show research/creative activity that has been refereed.

FILE ORGANIZATION: Nothing may be added to the file after it has been submitted for review without prior citation except as part of a response to the “Findings and Recommendations.”

The following list includes items that should be in the file. It is not necessarily the best ordering of the documents, but it works well. Certainly there is room for variation; just be certain that the Table of Contents and the Tabs match. There may also be cases where additions/deletions to this list are appropriate.

Suggested File Contents:

- Statement of Application (for promotion, tenure, post-tenure/periodic, or retention reviews)
- Table of Contents
- Current Vita
- Self-Review
- Goals and Objectives
- Past Reviews
- Summary list of courses taught at UAA
- Computer summary sheets for student course evaluations
- Course syllabi
- Summary and documentation of research/creative activities
- Summary and documentation of public service activities
- Summary and documentation of UAA service activities
- Summary and documentation of professional activities
- Summary and documentation of professional development
- Annual Workload Agreements
- Annual Activity Reports
- Supporting Correspondence
- External Reviews
- Other Letters of Reference
- Verification of terminal degree, certifications, etc. earned

Official transcripts are required for verification of degrees and must be included each time the file is submitted for review Official transcripts submitted to Academic Affairs can be verified with a signed memo from Academic Affairs for your file.

All of these items should be presented in a THREE-RING BINDER OF APPROPRIATE SIZE TO HOLD THE DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AND ANY ADDITIONS INCLUDING THE “FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS” OF EACH REVIEW LEVEL. Things tend to fall out if the binders are too small.

After deciding what size binder to use, get two of them and make a complete copy of the file. Files may not be available for return immediately due to ongoing appeals. The files should be organized with tab separators which will allow a reviewer to quickly find the information sought in the file. The tab separators should have typed labels which clearly state what follows in the section and should correspond with the Table of Contents.

Statement of Application

What is the file being submitted for?

Promotion

Tenure

Post Tenure

Retention

Table of Contents

Tabs with words not numbers

Current Vita

SELF-REVIEW:

Self-Reviews often cause consternation on the part of the candidates for promotion and/or tenure. One never knows what to write. The best guidance is to be truthful, brief, and positive. One to three pages should suffice in providing information to reviewers about the candidate's views of him- or herself as a faculty member.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

This section is easier than the Self-Review. It should be brief and to the point, consisting of one to three pages. Simply relate the desired and expected accomplishments for the next couple of years in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity (if applicable), and service

PAST REVIEWS

They are required. Put them in sequentially and without comment.

SUMMARY OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES:

A one- or two-page summary of courses taught during the review period, broken down by year and semester. Other teaching-related activities such as developing lab manuals, preparing special courses, implementing new teaching techniques, etc. should be briefly summarized.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING:

At the UAA MAU, provide the computer summary sheets here for the review period only. Be sure to include all of the summaries for all courses taught or note why some may be missing. They should be organized sequentially. Some faculty also choose to include the student comments. Only Part I of the Summary Sheets **must** be included for review. Part II is optional.

COURSE SYLLABI:

Provide syllabi for each of the courses taught during the review period. This gives the reviewers some input as to how well the candidate's teaching activities are organized.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:

Note: These comments and suggestions apply principally to faculty members on tripartite workload agreements; however, some bipartite faculty engage in research/creative activities during the review period and should report them.

This is a critical part of the review file, and it should be treated accordingly. Keep in mind that reviewers want to know what has been done in the way of research/creative activities during the review period. They do not usually want to see the actual output (i.e., actual books, monographs, paintings, music, etc.). Rather, they want to see a well-organized list of accomplishments. Some faculty submit boxes of books, papers, etc. expecting that reviewers would wish to read all of it. Reviewers do not have the time or the inclination, and often they may not have the vocabulary because the work is out of their field. Reviewers generally prefer a list in the evaluation file. If more is needed as backup material, it may be submitted as supplementary information.

Some helpful lists that might be provided for reviewers are as follow:

1. List of research/creative activity projects conducted at UAA during the review period.
2. List of research/creative activity projects conducted at other institutions during the review period.
3. List of research/creative activity proposals submitted during the review period.
4. List of research/creative projects funded during the review period and the amount of funds and funding agencies.
5. List of published books including the name of the publisher, dates, etc.
6. List of reviewed monographs with appropriate information on publishing agency, dates, etc.
7. List of articles published in reviewed journals, including complete bibliographic citations.
8. List of articles published as reviewed proceedings from national meetings, symposia, technical conferences, etc., including complete bibliographic citations.
9. List of non-reviewed conference papers presented during the review period, including title of the paper, conference title, location, and date.
10. List of technical reports written with appropriate citations.
11. List of books, papers, articles, etc. (with appropriate citations) in which other individuals have referenced your publications.

Note: In the creative arts, this documentation should vary to include such things as juried exhibits, public performances of musical or theatrical works, etc.

Check with your peers for the “expectation” in your department.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

Public service is an important part of every faculty member's employment at UAA. (Note: When the legislature funds this institution, it expects to see some service flow from the institution to the public without charges and hassles. So this is the place to provide reviewers with a list of all of the good things that have been done, within the field of the candidate's knowledge, to aid the general public. Church activities and being a scoutmaster don't count for much here. What counts more is serving on municipal and state committees, being a technical reference source, an art critic, a speech tournament official, etc.)

SUMMARY OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY:

List all of the committees on which one has served, including dates of service (remember—only those during the review period) and level of involvement (chair of a department or committee).

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Provide a list of all of the professional societies to which one pays dues each year and similar professional organizations (even if they don't charge dues).

Paid consultation should be listed here. Some folks are concerned about showing consulting as an activity. Most reviewers look upon paid consulting as a form of recognition of worth. So it is a positive thing to list. Specific amounts of compensation need not be listed. However, listing clients is not necessarily a bad idea, particularly if the clients include prestigious companies.

Note: Professional registrations or certifications may be included here, but also be sure to include them in the vita.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

This is the appropriate place to show reviewers that the candidate has been actively trying to keep pace with his or her field. It is an appropriate place to list any of the following:

1. Short courses taken during the review period.
2. Professional conferences attended.
3. University classes taken.
4. Summary of sabbatical leave activities.
5. Other activities undertaken to keep from becoming an outdated, boring, dull professor type.

ANNUAL WORKLOAD AGREEMENTS:

These are required. They should be included without comment, but do organize them in sequential order.

ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORTS:

These are required. Just include them in sequence and without comment.

SUPPORTING CORRESPONDENCE:

This is critical material. Supporting correspondence is another way of saying letters of reference. The objective is to make the University proud of itself by being proud of you. The way to do that is to show the University that one is recognized as a teacher, as a research/creative person, and as a professional who provides services as needed.

Letters of reference can be very impressive when they come from your peers, acquaintances, and colleagues at other university campuses. For example, Harvard, MIT, and Stanford letterheads carry more influence than UAA letterheads because they come from institutions outside of UAA and because they come from prestigious institutions. This is not to suggest letters with a UAA letterhead should not be included. These are of value and should be included. Just recognize that they will be read with less interest than letters from other universities, professional organizations, corporations, etc. Letters from friends and former students at UAA do not carry as much weight as letters from the executive secretary of the national professional organization to which one might belong. Letters from local representatives to the legislature usually are not worth a lot because we all know that he/she just wants to get reelected. Letters from the Governor will be read with great interest. So be careful in choosing whom one asks to submit such letters. Remember that UAA wants to know that the faculty member is well recognized beyond the University, within professional circles. National recognition is very important. International recognition is even better.

Clearly, not only is the letterhead important, but the content of the letter is important as well. It should speak to one's abilities as a teacher, as a research/creative person, and as a professional. Letters which say, "I've known Jake for 15 years and he's as good as they come" are not helpful. Letters which say, "Her private showing at the Domineque Art Gallery in London was a major success and a fine reflection upon the faculty and program at UAA" are most valuable. It is a good idea to provide some background material for the persons asked to submit reference letters. Otherwise, they may not know what would be most helpful to include.

VERIFICATION OF DEGREES:

Official transcripts are now required at the time of initial appointment; however, faculty hired prior to 1991 may not have been required to submit official transcripts and will need to have them sent to the Office of Academic Affairs. A copy of the diploma is not sufficient.

For the review file, official transcripts are required for verification of the degree and must be submitted each time a file is submitted for review. A verification memo from Academic Affairs stating that official transcripts are on file will also be accepted.

ADDITIONAL HINTS:

1. The total thickness of the complete file should be no more than one or two inches. Any thicker than that is a waste of time for both the preparer and the reviewer.
2. Do not include personal pictures.
3. A very brief (one-page) Summary Page outlining career highlights may be included. This is not mandatory but is sometimes helpful to give the reviewer a better perspective of the person seeking promotion.
4. The file has to represent the candidate. Do a creditable job in putting it together, and it will work to for you.
5. The basis of the evaluation is the performance of duties as a professional. If one fails to perform as a professional, no amount of face-lifting efforts in the file will automatically result in a promotion. Time in rank by itself is not reason enough for promotion either.
6. Count on a significant amount of time to put the file together. A reasonable estimate may be from 40 to 100 hours.

IMPORTANT FINAL NOTE:

If a particular document (letter of reference, results of an article submitted for publication, etc.) has been requested and is late or is expected and is not yet available at the time the evaluation file is submitted, the candidate must cite that document in a brief statement which explains the situation. The candidate may then include the document in the file when it arrives.

Nothing may be added to the file after it has been submitted for review without prior citation as above except as part of a response to the "Findings and Recommendations."

Pages taken from David C. Junge, PhD, School of Engineering, December 7, 1988, "Suggestions for Preparation of a Faculty Evaluation File," University of Alaska Anchorage.

