

# **Best Practices for Tenure and Promotion Review For UAFT-Represented Faculty University of Alaska Fairbanks**

## **Introduction**

The aim of this document is to provide guidance for faculty who are standing for tenure and/or promotion review, and to faculty serving in the unit-peer and/or university-wide review processes. It is also intended to provide guidance to department chairs, deans, and directors.

This document represents guidance and advice rather than official UAF policy. The standards and procedures mandated for the tenure and/or promotion review processes are described in the following official documents:

- UA Policy and University Regulation
- UAF Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty (the “Blue Book”)
- Approved Unit Criteria, if applicable
- The University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

These documents take precedence over the Best Practices and may be accessed through links on the Provost’s website <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/> and through the Faculty Handbook site <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/general-information-1/faculty-handbook/>.

The best practices described here cover both the period leading up to the recommendation for promotion or tenure and the procedures to be followed during the year in which the promotion and/or tenure file is sent forward. “Candidate” refers to a faculty member who is being, or may in the future be, considered for tenure or promotion.

## **Best Practices for Faculty Undergoing Review**

### **The Probationary Years**

#### *Expectations for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty*

Expectations for tenure and promotion should be discussed informally with the candidate’s mentor(s), department chair, and campus dean/director soon after hire and in the context of annual reviews. General expectations for tenure and promotion regarding teaching, research/scholarly/creative work, and service are contained in the official documents listed above, particularly the *UAF Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*; specific and supplementary expectations are found in approved unit criteria (please note: not all units have specific unit criteria). Some expectations may be stated in quantitative terms (number of books or articles published, juried exhibitions, committee assignments, etc.). Expectations may also be described qualitatively. There are a number of possible combinations of

accomplishments that might be acceptable for tenure and promotion. The sooner a new tenure-track faculty member acquaints him or herself with the expectations of the process, the better the quality of presentation in a file years into the future. It is important to have early and annual discussions with mentor(s), the department chair, the campus dean/director, and the executive dean.

#### *Initial Appointment and Mandatory Tenure Review*

Faculty initially appointed at the rank of assistant professor must be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than during their seventh consecutive year of tenure-track service; i.e., submission at the beginning of the seventh year for an award of tenure at the end of the seventh year. At UAF, the award of tenure and advancement to the associate professor rank are linked and are done concurrently in the vast majority of cases. Faculty who are initially appointed at the rank of associate professor must be reviewed no later than during their fourth consecutive year of service. Faculty initially appointed at the rank of professor must be reviewed no later than during their second consecutive year of service.

Faculty who fail to receive tenure during their mandatory year are given a terminal contract for the following year. Employment in a faculty position may not continue beyond that terminal year.

It is advisable that candidates consult with their campus dean/director and department chair before submitting a tenure and promotion file prior to their mandatory year.

#### *Starting the “Tenure Clock”*

The “tenure clock” is the calculated date of the mandatory year of tenure for all tenure-track faculty. The mandatory date of tenure should be recorded on the faculty member’s annual contract letter. The tenure “clock” starts for a faculty member the first year of hire, usually at the beginning of the fall semester. Faculty who start mid-year (usually later than end of November or more typically some time in the spring semester) may choose when their “clock” begins. Faculty may choose to count the academic year during which they were hired as year one, or they may choose to count the following academic year as year one. This decision must be made at the time of hire, written in the contract letter, and may not be changed.

#### *Extensions of the Probationary Period – Stopping/Resetting the “Tenure Clock”*

Faculty are entitled to take leave for medical or personal reasons. In such cases, the probationary period before mandatory tenure review may be extended. All agreements regarding changes to the probationary period (i.e., temporarily stopping a “tenure clock”) must be documented in writing at the beginning of the leave process and have the approval of the campus dean/director, the executive dean, and the provost. The provost is the final authority.

## Types of Review

| Type of Review  | Applies to   |
|---|--|
| Annual Evaluation                                       | All faculty at UAF   |
| Annual Activities Reporting                             | All faculty at UAF   |
| Fourth Year Comprehensive Review                        | All represented faculty at UAF in a tenure-track position  |
| Tenure concurrent with promotion to associate professor | All represented faculty at UAF who have initial appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor  |
| Tenure only   | All represented faculty at UAF who have initial appointment as a tenure-track associate professor or professor   |
| Promotion only  | All represented tenured and special academic rank faculty at UAF   |
| Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review                        | UAFT-represented faculty: Every fifth post-tenure year, post-tenure files will be reviewed by the faculty member's campus dean/director, unit peer committee, and executive dean. If requested, the file will also be reviewed by the university-wide committee and the provost. |

### *Feedback During Annual Reviews*

Annual reviews should include written comments on progress towards tenure and promotion, and should identify areas in which performance is good or exemplary as well as problem areas. Campus deans/directors, department chairs, and mentors are encouraged to discuss marginal or inadequate performance and suggest ways for improvement. It is important that feedback is consistent both from year to year, and between the individuals who provide it.

Candidates who believe they are hearing seriously conflicting advice from colleagues, or who see contradictions in evaluations they receive, should ask for a resolution by the campus dean/director. Some differences of opinion among faculty on what adequate progress towards tenure and promotion is are inevitable, but those differences should be clearly resolved in formal feedback from the campus dean/director, along with input from the department chair.

If performance in any area is inadequate, inadequacies should be clearly identified in annual reviews. A decision not to recommend for tenure when annual reviews have been consistently positive is always highly problematic. The process for annual review is outlined in Article 6 of the UAFT CBA.

### *Fourth Year Comprehensive and Diagnostic Review*

The fourth year comprehensive and diagnostic review provides a valuable opportunity for broad-based feedback on progress made towards tenure and promotion. The content and organization of a fourth year review file is similar to that of the tenure and/or promotion comprehensive file.

There are some critical points regarding the fourth year comprehensive and diagnostic review. Faculty and administration alike should become familiar with the language in the CBA and UAF policies.

- Fourth year comprehensive and diagnostic reviews are not optional.
- The purpose of the review is to assess progress toward tenure and promotion.
- Fourth year comprehensive and diagnostic review proceeds only to the level of the provost, unless the candidate specifically requests that the chancellor review the file.
- A unit member who commences a fourth year review may not convert to promotion or tenure review.
- If a candidate chooses to stand for promotion and tenure during the year he or she would normally have participated in a fourth year review, the candidate MAY NOT withdraw the file from consideration at any step in the process.
- If a candidate chooses to stand for promotion and tenure review in what normally would have been a candidate's fourth review year, and the decision of the chancellor is to deny tenure, the candidate may continue to serve as a tenure-track unit member but MAY NOT stand again for promotion/tenure until the mandatory year of review.

### *Tenure Review Prior to the Mandatory Year*

Exceptional accomplishments may provide grounds for a review prior to the mandatory year. It is advisable that faculty and administration become very familiar with CBA and UAF Policy language regarding review prior to the mandatory year.

- Faculty may choose to stand for tenure after at least one year of tenure-track appointment at the university, but must do so prior to, or during, the mandatory seventh year.
- Faculty may withdraw their candidacy file from consideration at any step in the process prior to review by the chancellor, except in the fourth year for UAFT-represented faculty.
- If the file continues to the chancellor and if the decision of the chancellor is to deny tenure, the faculty member may continue to serve as a tenure track faculty member but MAY NOT stand again for tenure prior to the mandatory year of service.

### *Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor*

It is good practice for the faculty member to discuss progress towards promotion from associate professor to professor with the department chair, senior colleagues, and their dean and/or director. A faculty member denied promotion to full professor may not reapply for promotion for at least one year from the date of the chancellor's decision.

## Preparing a File for Review

Instructions for file preparation are located on the Provost's website, <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/>, sorted by review type. When assembling materials for your file, remember that reviewers outside the peer-unit will have many files to review. It is better to provide reprints or clean photocopies of journal articles and chapters in edited books, rather than copies of the entire journal issue or books themselves. For visual materials in the arts, prints and CDs are easier to review. The file should include all accomplishments covering the review period, up to the time the file is submitted for review.

There are a variety of formats and range of content for successful promotion and tenure files. It is very helpful to look at models and is a good idea for faculty members to review available successful tenure and promotion files.

Easy-to-read review files have these characteristics:

- well-organized with tabs (having followed the directions);
- clearly marked;
- explanations that can be understood by all reviewers, not just those in the candidate's discipline;
- materials that support claims of accomplishment;
- inclusion of examples of abstracts or other written work; and
- self-evaluation narratives that focus on the impact of the candidate's efforts and accomplishments (including explanations of the candidate's role in any collaborative endeavors).

Some common elements in an unsuccessful file are:

- missing materials;
- poor organization (did not follow directions);
- voluminous, with excessive text and/or extraneous supplementary materials that do not pertain to the criteria;
- sparse, with insufficient documentation to support claims of accomplishment and excellence;
- failure to address issues raised in recommendations from earlier stages in the review;
- excessive repetition; and
- self-evaluation narratives that simply summarize activities rather than assess their significance and impact.

## Specific Parts of the File

### *Non-evaluative or Support Letters*

Non-evaluative or support letters may be appropriate to explain aspects of a candidate's work rather than to evaluate it. For example, if a significant number of publications derive from a long-term collaboration with another researcher, it would be useful to include a letter from the collaborator describing the candidate's role in that research program. Such letters are usually requested by the candidate and should be placed separately from letters of evaluation and their

role in the file clearly explained. Do not simply include them without explanation. Only the candidate may place such letters in the file. If not included when the file is first submitted, these letters may be placed in the file during the comment period after any level of review.

*Late or Other Materials for Inclusion in the File*

- Reports on progress for items that are referenced in the file as “in progress,” (e.g. manuscripts, and grant proposals in review). This can be, for example, formal notice of approval or acceptance of a grant proposal. These items may be submitted by the candidate at any time.
- Other materials, such as letters of support, awards, honors or appointments that have occurred since the file was submitted may only be submitted by the candidate at those times in the review schedule when the candidate is explicitly provided an opportunity to respond to recommendations by a committee or individual reviewer.
- In response to comments in any recommendation by a committee or individual reviewer, the candidate may include a variety of materials that support his or her replies to items noted in that recommendation.
- Evaluators’ comments may include relevant documents related to evaluative statements.

**Progression of the File**

Complete information about the process and the schedule is located on the Provost’s website at <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/>. Once your completed file has been submitted to the director or dean’s office, it will progress through a process of successive levels of review.

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| Stage 1  | Candidate submits file to campus dean/director.  |
| Stage 2  | Campus dean/director may add materials from the Academic Review File or the Employee Personnel File to the review file that are relevant to the evaluation, with a copy to the candidate (optional). |
| Stage 3  | Candidate has opportunity to respond to campus dean/director regarding any additional materials added to the review file.  |
| Stage 4  | Campus dean/director writes recommendation and submits file to executive dean.   |
| Stage 5  | Candidate has opportunity to respond to executive dean regarding campus dean’s/director’s recommendation.  |
| Stage 6  | Executive dean send file to unit peer review committee.  |
| Stage 7  | The unit-peer review committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the executive dean.  |
| Stage 8  | Candidate has opportunity to respond to executive dean regarding the unit peer review committee recommendation.  |
| Stage 9  | Executive dean reviews file and submits recommendation to the Office of the Provost.   |
| Stage 10 | Candidate has opportunity to respond to the university-wide review committee regarding the executive dean recommendation.  |
| Stage 11 | University-wide committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the provost.  |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| Stage 12 | Candidate has opportunity to respond to the provost regarding the university-wide committee recommendation.                  |
| Stage 13 | Provost reviews file and makes recommendation to the chancellor.   |
| Stage 14 | Candidate has opportunity to respond to the chancellor regarding the provost's recommendation.                               |
| Stage 15 | Chancellor reviews files (tenure, promotion and those requested fourth year and post-tenure files) and makes final decision. |
| Stage 16 | There is no formal comment period to the Chancellor's decision.  |

*Comments by the Candidate to a Recommendation*

The candidate has an opportunity to respond to the recommendations at each level of review, through the level of the provost. There is a limited window of response time as defined in the tenure and/or promotion review schedule. Minimally, the candidate should sign to acknowledge that he or she has received the recommendation. In addition, these are the only times at which the candidate may supplement materials in the file and/or respond to specific comments in the recommendation

**When the Process is Over**

*The Award of Tenure and Promotion*

The award of tenure and promotion is effective July 1 of the year in which the process was completed. Salary increases due to promotion are applied the first full pay period in July.

*Full Credit*

Each year the university publishes the photographs, names, and ranks of the newly tenured and promoted faculty in a full page advertisement in the *Fairbanks Daily News-Miner*. You will be asked to provide a photo for this purpose or arrange to have a photograph taken by UAF's photographer, if you wish to have your photograph included in the ad.

*Storage and Access to Files*

Once the promotion and tenure process has been completed, files are stored in the following manner:

- Files are kept in the Office of the Provost until just before the next round of files is due to the Provost's Office. Sample files are also available for review by contacting the Academic and Faculty Services Manager in the Provost's Office.
- Files from the previous year are archived the following fall. Parts of the files are boxed and sent to the Library Archives. The files, with copies of the archived materials, are returned to the campus dean/director or executive dean. Faculty may access the archived portions of their files with the permission of the chancellor or provost. If you wish to receive your file back sooner, please contact the Academic and Faculty Services Manager.

## **Best Practices for Faculty Participating on a Review Committee**

### **Introduction to Units and Procedures**

Departmental tenure and promotion procedures vary according to custom and local preference. In some departments, all tenured faculty of a unit are participating members of the unit-peer committee. In others, a committee is appointed to review the candidate's file, then report to the whole faculty before the vote is taken. And in others, where departments are small and do not have enough tenured faculty, a "unit" may be created by combining two or more departments. The procedures that are adopted by the unit must be described in a written document and explained to all tenure-track faculty when they are hired. These written procedures must be on file in the dean's office of the unit and the Provost's Office, and are posted to: <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion-tenure/unit-peer-criteria/>.

Senior faculty in the unit should mentor newer faculty to provide information and advice concerning the unit-peer committee. This should be addressed in the written procedures, which should also include a discussion of: a) eligibility for membership on the unit-peer committee and voting eligibility; b) open or closed meetings, and rules concerning open meetings; c) operating procedures; d) voting in relation to membership on both the unit-peer and university-wide committees; and e) how to create a unit-peer committee if there are not enough eligible faculty in a department. Faculty who serve on a university-wide committee may either vote on that level **or** at the peer-unit level. They should be apprised of this early on so they can choose.

### **How the Unit is Defined**

The executive dean, in consultation with the faculty, determines the definition of a unit. A unit may be defined as an academic discipline or a department or cluster as determined by the executive dean. An academic department does not necessarily have to function as the peer unit for promotion and tenure. Especially in the case in which there are few tenured faculty or full professors in a department, a unit for the purposes of promotion and tenure review can be composed of two or more departments. If there are not enough tenured faculty within a unit to comprise a committee as defined below, then a new unit needs to be established. Practice at UAF has been to augment an existing unit with the necessary faculty from similar or comparable disciplines.

### **Composition of the Unit-Peer Review Committee**

The unit-peer review committee must include all tenured faculty members from the discipline in which the candidate is being evaluated. For the purposes of identifying the members of a unit-peer review committee, the dean and relevant faculty must agree upon a working definition of "discipline." The unit-peer review committee shall be composed of at least five (5) tenured faculty at the same or higher rank as the unit member being reviewed, with at least three (3) at the rank of full professor (UAF Regulations Chapter IV.5.b.) . In addition, unit-peer committees reviewing represented faculty must comply with the provision of the relevant CBA.

### **Chair of the Unit-Peer Review Committee**

The chair of the unit-peer review committee is chosen by the committee members. The chair is responsible for convening the review meetings, developing written operating procedures or overseeing revision of the procedures, overseeing the writing of the recommendation letters, and other matters related to the promotion/tenure review process.

In the event that the chair has submitted a file for promotion or post-tenure review, the chair must recuse himself/herself from action regarding his or her file, and the committee will choose an acting chair who will administer the process for that file.

In the event that the chair participates in sabbatical or other type of leave during the same year he or she was selected to act as the committee chair, that person should decline the duties as unit-peer chair and a new chair selected. The faculty member may participate as a member of the committee.

The chair or the designee of the chair is responsible for presenting the candidates' files to the university-wide review committee.

### **Unit-Peer Operating Procedures**

Each unit-peer review committee is responsible for developing written operating procedures in advance of any review of files. A copy of these procedures shall be submitted to the provost prior to review of any files (UAF Regulations Chapter IV.5.b). They should also be on file at the respective dean's office for that college or school. These procedures may be revised annually. Revisions should be submitted to the Office of the Provost and the respective dean's office. The operating procedures may include, but not be limited to: an outline of specific chair duties; procedures of maintenance of the files and methods for access to review the files; criteria that will be used in the review; and general instruction about meetings and dates, voting, and the writing of recommendations.

Be sure to keep track of attendance at meetings and document who voted.

### **The University-Wide Review Committee**

The executive dean forwards a list of UAFT-represented faculty who are eligible and able to sit on the university-wide committee that will review UAFT-represented faculty. The provost appoints five of them to the university-wide committee and selects two UNAC-represented faculty to bring the committee membership to seven. Committee members serve a one-year term.

The UAFT university-wide tenure and promotion review committee is also responsible for annually reviewing nominations for emeritus status and forwarding a recommendation to the provost.

The provost selects two UNAC-represented faculty to serve on the university-wide committee that will review UAFT tenure-promotion files. Committee members serve a one-year term.

### **Chair of the University-Wide Review Committee**

The chair of each university-wide review committee is chosen by the committee members annually. The chair is responsible for convening the review meetings, the oversight of the revision of the operating procedures, oversight of the writing of the recommendation letters, and other matters related to the promotion/tenure review process. In the case of the university-wide committee for UAFT tenure and promotion, it is also the chair's responsibility to conduct the review of nominations for emeritus status of retired faculty.

### **University-Wide Committee Operating Procedures**

Operating procedures for each university-wide review committee are kept on file with the Office of the Provost. These may be revised annually. The Academic and Faculty Services Manager provides clerical support for these review committees.

### **Review Meeting Conduct in General**

#### *Open or Closed Meetings*

Faculty evaluation committees are exempt from the state open meetings act, so open meetings are not required. Committees may declare all meetings closed without exception, or, committees may declare all meetings are closed unless the candidate requests an open meeting. In the case of the latter, if the candidate requests an open meeting, that request will be honored. Neither the candidate, nor friends, family, or members of the community may attend a closed meeting. The candidate, friends, and members of the community may attend an open meeting, but they are there to listen and may not contribute to the discussion unless requested to do so. Even at open meetings, the committee's final discussion and vote must happen in executive session, and all non-committee members will be asked to leave.

#### *Meeting Notice*

Notice of open meetings is a good practice. The unit is responsible for identifying reasonable places and methods for notice and the notice should provide reasonable advance warning of the meeting (several days, at least).

#### *Media Use for Meetings*

Unit-peer and university-wide review committee meetings are conducted face-to-face, with audio and/or video conferencing used in support for members unable to attend in person.

#### *Discussion of the File*

Formal discussion of a candidate's file must take place in a meeting setting appropriate to the importance of the event. In the cases where spouses, domestic partners, or other family members hold positions in the same department, they cannot participate in formal discussions or decisions about the other's tenure or promotion. However, this does not preclude their presence at an open meeting.

### *Union Representation and Committee Composition*

Committees reviewing UAFT-represented faculty may have non UAFT-represented members. It is the practice that the provost will appoint two UNAC university-wide promotion and tenure committee members to also serve on the UAFT university-wide promotion and tenure committee.

### *Presenters of the File*

A faculty member may present the candidate's file to the unit-peer committee. The chair (or designee) of the unit-peer committee will present the file to the university-wide committee. The presenter's role is to discuss the points of the file in light of the unit's recommendation and to answer any questions the members of the university-wide committee may have.

### *Emeriti, Adjunct or Retired Faculty Involvement in Meetings*

Adjunct faculty, emeriti faculty, or retired faculty who return to the workplace are not eligible to participate in or vote on any promotion or tenure cases. Tenure is the status of holding a faculty appointment on a continuing basis following evaluation and award with an appointment of 51% full time or greater and is considered to be ended upon retirement or termination. (UAF Policy Chapter II; UAFT Article 5.1.2; BOR Policy 04.04.04)

### **Voting on a File**

Practices may vary from unit to unit, but generally, faculty must be present to vote and must have participated in the process by either reading the file, discussing the file at the meeting, or both. The vote of the unit-peer review committee shall be closed to the public and the candidate, regardless as to whether the review meeting was open or closed. Votes/ballots do not need to be secret at this level. However, votes should be recorded in the recommendation without individual attribution.

A faculty member serving on a university-wide committee and the unit-peer review committee may participate in the review of a unit-peer faculty member's file at both levels of review, but he or she shall vote at only one level (UAF Regulation Chapter IV.5.b).

A faculty member with a joint appointment is reviewed in the college or school in which their tenure resides. Jointly-appointed faculty may participate and vote in two separate committees in two separate units.

If there is an abstention, it is recommended that the reason for abstention be stated, e.g., that the abstainer voted at another level or was ill.

### **Ratings, Recommendations and Signatures**

#### *Rating for Promotion to Professor*

The rating standard for promotion to the rank of professor for UAFT-represented faculty is "successful," meaning "resulted in a positive outcome," according to the standards the candidate must demonstrate for each part of their workload in their tenure and/or promotion review file.

### *Rating for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure*

The rating standard for recommendation of promotion to the rank of associate professor and/or the award of tenure only when a majority of the committee rates the faculty member's tripartite (or bipartite) areas of activity as 'good' or better (ratings, in order of improved performance, being 'unsatisfactory,' 'satisfactory,' 'good,' 'very good,' and 'excellent)."

### *Recommendations*

Once the meetings have concluded, the unit-peer and university-wide review committees shall each prepare a single written recommendation for each candidate under review that includes substantive rationale that is in conformance with the provisions of UAF Faculty Policy (see especially Chapter IV.D.) and Regulation (see especially Chapter IV.B.5.b.). The vote, without attribution, shall be recorded in the recommendation. The dean and/or director and the provost will also prepare recommendations at their level of review.

### *Minority or Dissenting Opinions*

Opinions that differ from the majority opinion of a promotion and tenure committee are to be incorporated into the committee's recommendation. This is to be done without attribution.

### *Committee Signatures*

Normally all active (participating) members of the unit-peer or university-wide review committee should sign the recommendation, signifying that it accurately reflects the final vote and the substantive issues. If obtaining individual signatures is impractical, the chair may sign for the committee and indicate which members of the committee participated in the deliberations and vote. The recommendation should include the names of all the committee members, and specifically note the committee chair.

## **Best Practices for Documenting Teaching, Research and Service**

A full description of the criteria for teaching, research/creative/scholarly, and service activity can be found in the *UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty, revised May 6, 2002*.

### **Best Practices in Teaching**

Faculty are reminded that a file should reflect and refer to unit criteria, where applicable. A teaching portfolio, prepared by the candidate and updated from year to year, is the best way to document teaching accomplishments in the descriptive part of this section. Discussion of student evaluations should include information about the choice of student evaluation forms for particular classes, the context in which the individual's ratings should be viewed (e.g. student evaluation rating of other sections of the course(s)), and information on trends, if any, in the candidate's own ratings. Be sure to explicitly address any concerns that were raised in previous annual or comprehensive reviews. When discussing student evaluations, remember that those reading the file will include individuals outside of the candidate's department and discipline area,

so it is helpful to describe the courses taught (e.g. large lecture course, small seminar, part of an especially demanding sequence in the major, lab, studio, etc.) rather than simply referring to them by course number.

Candidates for promotion to professor may have collected student evaluations over many years, so a discussion of student evaluations in terms of changing curricula and course assignments may be helpful.

In addition to numerical ratings, it is helpful to provide verbatim examples of students' written comments in the evaluative sections, selected to show the range of student opinion. All faculty receive both positive and negative comments so provide a context to help readers interpret them. For example:

“of 47 student comments on this course over three semesters, 33 were generally positive and 9 were negative; the remainder were neutral. Positive comments included: [example]. Negative comments included: [examples]. Negative comments mainly concerned large amounts of required reading, which we do not consider inappropriate in an upper-level literature course.”

The assessment of teaching is not limited to student ratings. UAF requires two of three types of teaching evaluation: student evaluation ratings, peer observations, and course syllabi. Other evidence of teaching quality is also helpful to reviewers. Discussion of syllabi and class assignments, assessment of pedagogical innovations, and descriptions of contributions to curriculum development may all be included. In addition to classroom teaching, it is important to include a description and evaluation of activities such as advising, thesis and dissertation supervision, and work with students in research, studio, clinical, or internship settings.

Since reviewers expect candidates to present themselves in the best light, the presentation of uniformly positive student comments raises obvious questions in their minds. Therefore, if only a sample of student comments is included, it is important to explain how it was selected and why it is representative.

### **Best Practices in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**

The narrative portion of the file should provide reviewers with a summative statement of the candidate's program of research or creative activity. Strong narratives typically demonstrate the coherent themes in the candidate's work and effectively explain and contextualize accomplishments and contributions. If the candidate's profile might be considered atypical, it is especially important to provide a context for understanding the contributions. The narrative should be written in terms that are understandable to a general academic audience, not just to specialists in the field. The readers of the file will not all be from the candidate's own research specialty, or even from the same discipline. Unnecessary jargon should be avoided and necessary technical terminology explained clearly. The evaluative part of this section should include an explanation of practices and conventions of publishing or exhibiting in the discipline that may not be clear to outsiders. For example, multi-authored papers and collaborative research projects

are common in the sciences but relatively rare in the humanities. Single-authored books may be more common in the humanities and some social sciences. Information on the following points is very helpful:

- The prestige and selectivity of the venues in which the candidate has published, performed, or exhibited. (In the case of journal publications, editors may be able to provide information on the percentage of submissions accepted for publication.)
- Explanation of standard methods of review in the field. For example, newspaper (or other) articles about a work or person in the sciences are not considered to be relevant evaluations, but they may be valid indicators of artistic reputation of a work or product for those in the arts.
- The availability of external research grants in the candidate's specialty and the competitiveness of the agencies from which funding has been received. Lack of external funding in the arts and humanities is the rule rather than the exception and usually does not require special comment. The reverse is true in the natural sciences and in some of the social sciences.
- Whether contributions to edited volumes, Festschriften, special issues of journals, and similar works have been subject to peer review.
- Distinctions between conference presentations or exhibitions that are or are not reviewed (juried) for scientific merit, and those subject to some other form of selection. Since the criteria for acceptance of conference presentations and exhibitions vary widely, some explanation of the selection criteria for these types of peer-reviewed works is quite useful for reviewers.
- Contributions made by the candidate to books or articles with multiple authors, especially when these comprise a large fraction of the total work submitted.

Works "in press" or "accepted for publication" may be referenced in the file and should be accompanied by a letter from the editor or publisher confirming their acceptance.

Reference in the file to manuscripts or grant proposals submitted but not yet reviewed should be included if the department or discipline considers this an appropriate measure of research/scholarly/creative activity. Because of the long delays often associated with the publication of scholarly books, it may be wise to submit an unpublished manuscript or excerpt in the file if this is only available evidence for research/scholarly/creative activity. Where possible include reviews of the manuscript by experts from outside the University. The same may be true for other works (such as films) that require an especially long time to complete.

The variety of scholarly publication and presentation formats and venues is increasing; for example, posters and Web publications are becoming increasingly common. Whatever the form or outlet for the candidate's scholarly/creative work, it is critical to describe the process of professional review that has resulted in its acceptance for dissemination, display, or performance.

### **Best Practices in Service**

Faculty are encouraged to maintain documentation of their service contributions. The annual activities report asks candidates to separate service components into the three categories of public, professional and university service. The description of those categories is found in UAF Regulations Chapter III. It is not unusual for activities to overlap categories or be difficult to define. If in doubt, faculty should consult with their mentor or department chair for the best placements of each activity into a single service category. Service activities outside the university should be explained and assessed – the significance of serving on grant review panels or exhibition juries will not be obvious to every reader. It is quite appropriate to request letters commenting on the candidate's external service, especially if this has been significant – for example from an officer of a professional society, a journal editor, or an officer of a funding agency. Of particular importance is the presentation of evidence on the impact of service activities.

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to have provided substantial service to the university as well as to the department, college/school and profession. As with other expectations for promotion and tenure, specific unit criteria may specify other requirements.