



To: Provost and Vice Chancellor Elisha Baker,
University of Alaska Anchorage

Fr: Kimberly Swiantek,
UAA Governance Office

Re: Corrections to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

On March 1, 2013 the Faculty Senate approved a consent agenda which included corrections to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

Please see the attached documents for more information.

If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Provost

Approved Disapproved

Comments:

12/03/2013

Elisha Baker, Provost and Vice Chancellor

Date

Chancellor

Approved Disapproved

Comments:

14/03/2013

Tom Case, Chancellor

Date

Procedures for proposing changes to the faculty evaluation guidelines are described on pages 33-34 of the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines under the heading "Review and Approval of Changes to University-wide Guidelines". Consistent with those procedures Vice Provost for Faculty Services Marian Bruce has worked in consultation with the Faculty Senate President, Faculty Senate E-board, and the Provost Baker in identifying errors in the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and proposing corrections to that document. Those corrections have been carefully reviewed by all parties and are presented in brief in the consent agenda below. Further details are present in the "new FEGs with corrected pages only.pdf" document supplied as an informational item to this Faculty Senate agenda.

The Faculty Senate President presents the following to the Faculty Senate as a Consent Agenda.

Summary of corrections to new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

- 1) Corrected references to BOR Policies (pages 6 and 7)
- 2) Corrected inconsistencies describing processes for review:
 - a. Page 24 said annual progression toward tenure review would be reviewed by Dean/Director or Campus Director/President. This should be and, per the more detailed description page 28.
 - b. Page 25 left out that the tenured department chair may review a post-tenure review file, as detailed on page 28. Added this.
 - c. Page 28 left out peer review committees from the process for annual retention reviews, as detailed on page 25. Added this.
 - d. Page 28 erred in not saying that 4th Year Comprehensive Reviews can go to the Chancellor upon request of the faculty member, per UNAC CBA 9.2.1. Added this.
- 3) Corrected descriptions on how much material the promotion review file should contain (i.e., "evidence for this review shall cover the time period since. . .") (pages 25, 31). Currently the wording includes phrases, "since last comprehensive review," "since last comprehensive fourth year," "since last comprehensive post-tenure review." This wording could mean that promotion files could include as little as one year's worth of material. Deleting these phrases maintains the status quo (i.e., tenure/promotion files would include material since hire in tenure-track position, promotion after tenure would include material since last promotion).
- 4) There are conflicting references throughout to comprehensive post-tenure review being both a Full File and an Abbreviated File. The comprehensive post tenure review (i.e., 6th

year review) is supposed to be an abbreviated file, as agreed upon in the current UNAC CBA 9.2.4, so all references to comprehensive post tenure review as a Full File (pages 27, 30) were removed.

- 5) Minor corrections made to avoid confusion: changed “full review” to “major review” (page 27) for consistency; corrected the omission of the word “abbreviated” from “Descriptions of Abbreviated File Elements” (page 33, table of contents).

Table of Contents

I. PURPOSE..... 5

II. PRINCIPLES..... 5

III. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 7

 Overview of Faculty Responsibilities 7

IV. EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION, & POST-TENURE REVIEW 10

 Evaluation of Faculty Scholarship 11

 a. Teaching and Learning..... 12

 b. Academic Research and Creative Activity 14

 c. Service..... 15

 Compensated Outside Activities..... 18

V. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT AND TENURE..... 20

 Introduction..... 20

 Definitions of Academic Ranks and Appointments..... 20

 Definition of Tenure 22

 Consideration of Time in Rank for Mandatory Tenure Review 23

 Denial of Tenure 24

VI. EVALUATION PROCESS AND REVIEW CYCLE..... 24

 Introduction..... 24

 Types of Evaluation 2425

 Review Cycle..... 27

 a. Comprehensive Fourth Year, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Post-Tenure Reviews..... 2728

 b. Annual Progression Towards Tenure Review 28

 c. Third year and Sixth year Post-Tenure Review 28

 Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Faculty with Joint Appointments..... 29

 Right of Grievance and Complaint 29

 Full and Abbreviated Files..... 30

 a. Full File..... 30

 b. Abbreviated File..... 3132

 c. Descriptions of Full File Elements..... 32

 d. Descriptions of Abbreviated File Elements 33

 Review and Approval of Changes to University-wide Guidelines..... 3334

 Relationship of Unit Documents to University-wide Guidelines 34

Formatted: Highlight

Relationship of Departmental Documents to Unit Documents.....	35
Review and Approval of Unit and Departmental Documents	<u>35</u> 36
VII. ANNUAL WORKLOADS AND ACTIVITY REPORTS	36
Introduction.....	36
Annual Workload.....	37
Annual Activity Report.....	37
VIII. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS AND CANDIDATES	37
Introduction.....	37
Election and Composition of Peer Review Committees.....	38
Ethical Standards for Reviewers	39
Ethical Standards for Candidates	40
Mandatory Training of All Reviewers.....	40
Continuous Renewal	40
Appendix I – The Scholarly Agenda	<u>41</u> 42

The guidelines in this document serve as the foundation and broad framework of standards for the faculty evaluation system at UAA. Within this framework, each of the units and their constituent departments have the responsibility to establish comprehensive unit-specific evaluation guidelines and procedures² that conform to the University guidelines and that are reflective of their diverse academic, disciplinary, craft, and professional fields.³ In this way, the system has been developed to recognize and honor the inherent diversity of faculty work, with the goal of supporting and encouraging faculty to bring together their unique talents into a cohesive and integrated scholarly practice. Furthermore, the system recognizes and supports differential emphases and interests over the course of a faculty member's career

The policies and procedures outlined here guide the evaluation process for all tenure-track and tenured faculty members across the various campuses of UAA, as well as faculty from the Prince William Sound Community College (PWSCC). PWSCC is a separately accredited institution of higher education, with its own representative faculty assembly. However, the shared governance responsibilities related to faculty evaluation are carried out under UAA's major administrative unit (MAU) authority and responsibilities (see BOR P10.02.060010). Moreover, as used in these guidelines "unit" refers to the colleges and schools within UAA (see BOR P10.02.010040).

Comment [MKB1]: Corrections to BOR Policy reference

The examination and evaluation of faculty work must be done within the context of the explicit goals of the institution, as embodied in the mission and strategic plan. The most valuable resource the University has for enacting its mission is the time, talent, and expertise of the faculty. An evaluation system aligned with the mission provides faculty with a clear set of expectations around which they may focus their work and continue their professional development and achievement. In this way, a faculty member may pursue an individualized professional pathway based on his or her unique talents while contributing to the collective achievement of the institutional mission.

The evaluation of faculty members for hiring, progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review should also occur in the context of: established criteria for high-quality work; clearly communicated expectations and responsibilities set forth in a faculty member's initial appointment letter approved by the department chair, dean, campus director or other designated administrator; subsequent modifications made for annual workload agreements; the results of periodic reviews or previous promotion or tenure decisions; and the priorities of the department, unit, college, campus, and University.

² Unit and departmental guidelines must be in agreement with procedures in the governing Collective Bargaining Agreements.

³ A more detailed discussion of the relationship of the FEGs and unit guidelines can be found on page 38ff.

These guidelines and procedures shall be interpreted and implemented within the framework of the UA Board of Regent's Policies (P0.04.04.0104-070), 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).

Comment [MKB2]: CORRECTION to BOR
Policy reference

III. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Overview of Faculty Responsibilities

The central tasks of the University include the promotion of learning and the expansion of knowledge. These tasks place specific responsibilities upon faculty members with respect to their students, their discipline, craft or professional field, the University, and communities. In support of these responsibilities, the University seeks to foster the continued development of faculty in ways that support their effective engagement with students, as well as with a variety of local, state, national and international communities and colleagues.

Faculty have a responsibility to their students, their discipline, craft or professional field, the University and communities to strive for exemplary intellectual, ethical, aesthetic, and creative achievement. Such achievements are the defining qualifications for appointment, tenure, and promotion in the academic ranks. Individuals appointed to the faculty are expected to possess the intellectual and professional integrity associated with the exercise of academic freedom and shared governance; to show respect for the opinions of others; to maintain accepted standards of civility and professionalism; to cooperate effectively with others; and to consider the welfare of the total institution.⁴

One of UAA's strategic priorities is to build a university of first choice distinguished for excellence in teaching and learning and to become a leader in undergraduate and graduate education centered on professional and craft practice, academic research, and creative activity. This requires faculty of the highest caliber who will maintain currency in the developments in their fields--whether disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or interdisciplinary--and remain actively engaged in scholarship throughout their careers.

All faculty members have a responsibility to engage in scholarly work in teaching, academic research, craft or professional practice, or creative activity, and professionally related service activities according to their respective appointments, positions and workload agreements. In this way, faculty members contribute to the knowledge-base in their fields, advance student success, and contribute to the mission of the University in service to society. Each faculty member is also

⁴AAUP, 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments*; *On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation*

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/default.htm>

University of Alaska Anchorage University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines - June 6, 2012

(previously posted as April 2012)

chancellor's designee. A partial year of service that includes at least one semester of full-time faculty service may be counted as a full year of service when it has also been used to determine eligibility for any sabbatical leave upon approval by the chancellor or the chancellor's designee. Periods of officially requested and approved parental, family, or medical leave, whether paid or unpaid, shall be excluded from the determination of the mandatory year for review unless the faculty member requests that such leave be counted toward their time in rank.

At the time of hire, a faculty member may negotiate up to three (3) years of service from a prior institution be counted toward their faculty service at the University. New faculty hires should be notified of this possibility by their hiring unit administrator. Any prior years of service which are subsequently granted should be documented in the faculty member's initial letter of appointment.

Denial of Tenure

Faculty who are not awarded tenure by the end of their mandatory year of review shall be offered a terminal appointment for one additional year of service. If a faculty member chooses to stand for tenure prior to the mandatory year and the Chancellor's decision is to deny tenure, the faculty member may continue as a tenure-track faculty member, but may not stand again for tenure prior to the mandatory year.

VI. EVALUATION PROCESS AND REVIEW CYCLE

Introduction

The decision to grant tenure and/or promote a faculty member shall be based on the performance of the work that the faculty member has been employed to do, his or her performance with respect to unit and University expectations for high-quality scholarly accomplishments in accordance with faculty rank, and the broader responsibilities expected of all members of the faculty academic community (see Section III: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities). Although the review for promotion and tenure might happen simultaneously, the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank are two separate actions.¹⁹

Types of Evaluation

Annual Progression towards Tenure Review. In an academic year or work year in which a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not scheduled for comprehensive fourth year, tenure, or promotion review, the faculty member shall receive a Progression towards Tenure Review. The faculty member shall submit an Abbreviated File (see following section). The evaluation will be completed by the Dean or Director, or designee, of the faculty member's unit, ~~or and~~ in the case of community campus faculty members by the Campus Director or President, or designee. In those units that have developed procedures for the inclusion of peer review in this process, such

Comment [MKB3]: CORRECTION. The process on page 28 lists review by **both** Campus Director and Dean, as well as department chair or unit director.

¹⁹ Note that while these are two separate decisions, 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.

action shall occur before the evaluation by the unit administrator. The annual review should evaluate and provide feedback on the faculty member's performance with respect to his or her progress in scholarly accomplishments toward promotion and/or tenure expectations.

Comprehensive Fourth Year Review. During the fourth year of a tenure-track appointment a faculty member will undergo a comprehensive and diagnostic review by peer review committees and administrators, and the Provost. The faculty member may also request that the review proceed to the Chancellor. The purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion, and to notify him or her of any gaps or areas that need to be strengthened, as well as areas of strength to be sustained and enhanced. Once the faculty member begins the comprehensive review process, he or she may not request that it be converted to a tenure or promotion review. The faculty member is required to submit a Full File for this review (see following section).

Tenure Review. Tenure review is conducted to determine whether a tenure-track faculty member's work has demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment, faculty rank, and position. The deciding factor in tenure decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have contributed in sufficiently significant ways to the University mission, so as to merit the right to continuous employment at the institution. The faculty member is required to submit a Full File for this review. The Chancellor makes the final decision on tenure, giving due consideration to the recommendations of the peer review committees and appropriate administrators.

Promotion Review. Tenure-track and tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member's scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate's last comprehensive review, or tenure or promotion decision. The deciding factor in promotion decisions is whether the faculty member's scholarly achievements have met the established unit and University criteria so as to merit appointment at a higher academic rank. For this review, the faculty member will be required to submit a Full File.

Post-tenure Review. Tenured faculty will be reviewed every three years. The post-tenure review process should review and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, and provide formative feedback to faculty to assist their continued development, and production of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. Every three years, the Dean or designee, or in the case of a community campus faculty member the Campus Director or President, or designee, will complete the review and provide written feedback. The tenured department chair may provide

Comment [MKB4]: CORRECTION. This wording would allow tenure and promotion files to contain as little as one year's material, if the faculty member filed in a year immediately following a comprehensive review (4th year pre-tenure, or 6th year post tenure).

This deletion maintains the status quo, i.e., 1) tenure and promotion files should include material since hire in tenure-track position, and 2) promotion after tenure file should include material since last promotion.

review at the request of the dean, director or designee. The faculty member will submit an Abbreviated File for this review.

Comment [MKB5]: CORRECTION: Tenured department chair may provide review at the request of the dean, director, or designee, per page 28.

Every sixth year, the faculty member will submit an Abbreviated File and undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review by peer review committees, unit administrators, and the Provost. The peer review committees and administrators shall make an evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly achievements over the preceding six years in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, in accordance with the unit and University expectations for his or her rank in place at the time of the last promotion decision. The committee shall comment on specific strengths and/or weaknesses in performance. The review may proceed to the Chancellor at the request of the faculty member.

For UNAC-represented faculty members, at any time prior to a scheduled evaluation, the dean or director of the faculty member's unit, or the campus director or president of the faculty member's community campus may initiate the post-tenure review process. In addition, a post-tenure review shall be conducted upon the request of the unit member.

For UAFT-represented faculty members, non-scheduled evaluations may only be initiated for just cause and pursuant to the applicable article dealing with disciplinary investigations of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UAFT and the University of Alaska. Provided that the non-scheduled evaluation meets these criteria, the initiator will provide the same timely notice as required for scheduled evaluations. While the primary purpose of post-tenure review is to provide formative feedback, any disciplinary action taken by the University on the basis of post-tenure review shall be taken in accordance with the applicable article of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UAFT and the University of Alaska. In addition, a post-tenure review shall be conducted upon the request of the unit member.

Distinguished Professor Review. A department may initiate the recommendation for the appointment of a faculty member as a University Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, or Distinguished Service Professor. Such nominations consist of a letter in support of this recommendation, which may be accompanied by other letters written by faculty members and civic leaders. The letters of support should include evidence relative to the specific appointment area of teaching, research, service or all of these in the case of the rank of University Professor. Nominations are directed to the nominee's Dean or Director, or Campus Director or President, who forwards them to the Provost with his or her recommendation. The Provost refers nominations to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee for their recommendation. The Provost then forwards nominations and recommendations to the Chancellor, who will make the final decision regarding recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Professor Emeritus Review. Upon retirement, a faculty member may be nominated by peers or unit administrators for appointment to the rank of Emeritus or Emerita Professor. The nominating body

will submit a dossier²⁰ that will be reviewed by peer review committees, unit administrators, the Provost and the Chancellor. The dossier shall provide evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievements across the course of his or her career. Reviewers determine whether the candidate has achieved a sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishments that has contributed to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

Review Cycle

Except in the case of a mandatory review, the candidate has the responsibility of notifying the unit Dean or Director, or Campus Director or President, of his or her intent to stand for promotion and/or tenure.

A candidate requesting review for tenure may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of service in the tenure-track position, or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year the candidate requests consideration.

A candidate requesting review for promotion may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of service at his or her current tenured or tenure-track faculty rank or after the last comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is most recent, or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year the candidate requests consideration.

If a candidate requests or is required to undergo simultaneous consideration for tenure and promotion, the candidate must select a single set of criteria.

A candidate undergoing a mandatory comprehensive post-tenure review may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate's first academic year of service after his or her last ~~major full~~ review (i.e. tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review), or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year of the required post-tenure review.

The candidate must notify the unit Dean or Director, or Campus Director or President, of his or her decision regarding the selection of evaluation criteria.

a. ~~Comprehensive Fourth Year, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Post-Tenure Reviews~~

Comment [MKB6]: CORRECTION: grandfathering language on page 1 refers to a "major" review, not a "full" review

Comment [MKB7]: CORRECTION: Comprehensive PTR listed in error here. Per the current UNAC CBA 9.2.4, comprehensive PTR does not require a Full File.

²⁰ The contents of the dossier are not prescribed and are left to the discretion of the nominating body. However, the materials assembled in the dossier should provide sufficient evidence for the reviewers to determine the merit of the nomination.

Candidates will submit their Full File to the office of the Dean, Campus Director or President in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs.²¹

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Campus Director or President (for community campus faculty only)
- b) School or unit director or department chair
- c) Unit peer review committee(s) in accordance with the unit guidelines
- d) Dean
- e) University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
- f) Provost
- g) Chancellor (except in the case of ~~6-Year Post-Tenure~~ 4th Year Comprehensive review, which will proceed to this level of review only at the request of the faculty member)

Comment [MKB8]: CORRECTION: Error including PTR6, see note above. 4th Year Comprehensive may proceed to the Chancellor at the request of the faculty member, per UNAC CBA 9.2.1.

b. Annual Progression Towards Tenure Review

Candidates will submit their Abbreviated File to the office of the Dean, Campus Director or President in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs.²¹

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Campus Director or President (for community campus faculty only)
- ~~a)b) Unit peer review committee(s) in accordance with unit guidelines~~
- b)c) School or unit director or department chair if requested by the dean, director, or designee.
- c) Dean

Comment [MKB9]: CORRECTION: This level was omitted in error. See page 24.

c. Third year and Sixth year Post-Tenure Review

Candidates will submit their Abbreviated File to the office of the Dean, Campus Director or President in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs.²¹

The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

- a) Third year review: Campus Director or President, for community campus faculty; the dean, or the respective administrator's designee. The faculty member's tenured department chair may provide a review at the request of the dean, director or designee.
- b) Sixth Year Comprehensive Review: Campus Director or President, for community campus faculty; unit peer review committee(s) in accordance with the unit guidelines; dean, or the respective administrator's designee; University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee; Provost; and, at the request of the faculty member, the Chancellor. The faculty member's

²¹ The calendar will be established in conformity with the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreements between the UAFT and the University of Alaska and between the UNAC and the University of Alaska. University of Alaska Anchorage University-wide Faculty Evaluation Guidelines - June 6, 2012 (previously posted as April 2012)

Full and Abbreviated Files²²

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, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review shall prepare a complete Full File that describes and documents their scholarly achievements in each of the three components of faculty responsibilities, teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, appropriate to their position and appointment. Faculty members scheduled for annual progression towards tenure or post-tenure review shall prepare an Abbreviated File.

Comment [MKB10]: CORRECTION: Included in error – PTR6 is not a Full File, see page 28.

Reviewers at any level of the review process may verify evidence in the file. If reviewers find a discrepancy in the file, this will be documented in the recommendation.

At the time of their response to a review, the candidate may submit additional evidence or documentation that was not available at the time of submission if it is related to scholarly accomplishments previously included and documented in the Full or Abbreviated File.

It is strongly encouraged that files be submitted in digital or electronic format.²³

a. Full File

The Full File showcases a faculty member's scholarly achievements and provides evidence supporting scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service. The file makes faculty work visible by creating a coherent narrative for reflecting upon, documenting, and assessing one's scholarly achievements in each of these areas. However, in evaluating a faculty member's scholarly achievements, it is more important to focus on the criteria of quality and significance than on categorizing the work or achievement.

Candidates undergoing comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review shall prepare a Full File that highlights a selective sample of their scholarly work, with narrative sections that provide context and continuity for the selected materials. The file has three sections and shall include:

Comment [MKB11]: CORRECTION: Included in error, see page 28.

1. A Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documentation in each section;

²² The concept and description of the Full File and its development has been adopted with significant modifications from the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the California State University-Monterey Bay.

²³ The University is likewise strongly encouraged to develop an appropriate system for consistently creating and managing electronic files.

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. Annual Activity Reports for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators; and
- f. Copies of findings and recommendations from the most recent annual progression towards tenure, comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review(s), whichever are applicable.

3. Section II: Self evaluation; and

4. Section III: File sections that describe and document high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility of teaching, academic 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 service if candidate has been in faculty rank less than 6 years), and;
 - ii. a selected example of syllabi from each of the courses he or she has taught. In the case of community campus faculty, or others, who have taught more than eight (8) different and separate courses during the review period, selected representational examples should be included to reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas.
- b. Documentation 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 and/or, 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.

b. Abbreviated File

Tenure-track faculty scheduled for annual progression towards tenure and tenured faculty scheduled for post-tenure review shall prepare an Abbreviated File. The Abbreviated File shall contain:

1. Curriculum Vitae;

Comment [MKB12]: CORRECTION. See page 25. This wording would allow tenure and promotion files to contain as little as one year's material, if the faculty member filed in a year immediately following a comprehensive review (4th year pre-tenure, or 6th year post tenure).

These deletions maintains the status quo, i.e., 1) tenure and promotion files should include material since hire in tenure-track position, and 2) promotion after tenure file should include material since last promotion.

2. Self-evaluation;
3. Annual Activity Report(s) for the past year or since last review, whichever is applicable, signed by the candidate and the appropriate designated administrators;
4. Optional selected documentation to support the self-evaluation.

Candidates may wish to review these guidelines before preparing their file sections. In addition, prior to their first review, candidates shall attend a training session, offered annually, on how to document their scholarly work, and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of evidence being presented. Candidates are also required to attend a training session prior to subsequent reviews if there have been substantial changes to the faculty evaluation policies and procedures.

c. Descriptions of Full File Elements

Table of Contents and Introductory Materials

The first section of the Full File shall include a Table of Contents of all materials in the file, followed by introductory documents (see previous description) that provide the context for the subsequent descriptions and evidence of scholarly achievements.

Self Evaluation

The Full File shall include an Integrative Narrative, of no more than five pages, that synthesizes and interconnects the candidate's scholarly achievements within the context of her or his professional goals and aspirations as outlined in the relevant scholarly agenda(s), and the actual designated responsibilities outlined in the relevant workloads and activity reports for the period under review. Furthermore, the Integrative Narrative should draw together the sections of the file and tie the faculty member's scholarship and scholarly achievements during this period to the Department, Unit, and University mission and goals. The candidate should discuss achievements outside of the period of review only for the explicit purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. Such discussion should be brief. The narrative should emphasize collaborative, interdisciplinary, engaged or integrative activities when these have been a part of the faculty member's scholarship. It shall also provide an opportunity to reflect on one's professional growth, and accomplishments in accordance with unit and University criteria of high-quality and significant scholarly work * for tenure and promotion, as well as the criteria of the appropriate faculty rank that is the focus of the review

File Sections

The Full File shall include sections describing and documenting selected scholarly achievements in each of the areas of faculty responsibilities of teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to the candidate's position, appointment,

and workloads during the period under review. A candidate whose workload agreements during the review period did not include one of the areas of faculty responsibilities (teaching, academic research or creative activity, or service) may nevertheless include a section with documentation regarding scholarly achievements in that area.

Evidence shall consist of carefully selected examples of the candidate's most accomplished scholarly work, not an exhaustive compilation of materials. Nevertheless, the selections must be sufficient to make it possible to document a consistent pattern of quality scholarly achievement over time. Documentation within each of the file sections shall focus on the quality and significance¹⁵ of the scholarly activity using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials. It shall focus on documenting the scholarly activities and accomplishments of the individual faculty member rather than on documenting the generalized results of a project or a program. Similarly, in documenting collaborative scholarly work, the faculty member shall focus on his or her personal role and contributions to the collaborative process and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to highlight scholarly activities which represent integrative, interdisciplinary, collaborative, or engaged work, as well as those activities that make significant contributions to the attainment of department, unit/campus, or University missions or goals.

d. Descriptions of Abbreviated File Elements

Comment [MKB13]: CORRECTION: Word omitted in error

Self-Evaluation

The Abbreviated File shall include a self-evaluation, of a recommended length of three pages, that synthesizes the candidate's scholarly achievements and contributions in each area of responsibility, in accordance with their workload agreements during the period of review. The self-evaluation shall also summarize progress toward tenure or promotion, where applicable, as well as progress in any areas identified from previous recommendations as needing improvement.

Optional Selected Documentation

The faculty member may, at his or her discretion, opt to include selected evidence to support the self-evaluation. Selected documentation should be kept to a minimum and focus on providing supporting evidence of scholarly accomplishments only in those cases where the curriculum vitae and/or the Annual Activity Reports cannot fully reflect the quality or significance of the scholarly work.

Review and Approval of Changes to University-wide Guidelines

Any faculty member, administrator, academic unit, administrative unit, or faculty union may propose changes to these guidelines using the following process.