

# **Best Practices for Promotion and Tenure**

## **University of Alaska Fairbanks**

### **Introduction**

---

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

While this “Best Practices” document represents the best thinking of quite a few UAF faculty and administrators, its content represents guidance and advice rather than official UAF policy. The standards and procedures mandated for the promotion/tenure processes are described in the following official documents:

- UA Policy and University Regulation
- UAF Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty
- Approved Unit Criteria
- The United Academics – AAUP/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)
- Alaska Community Colleges’ Federation of Teachers Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)
- Regional Review Guidelines for ACCFT Faculty

These documents take precedence over the Best Practices and may be accessed through links on the Provost’s web site <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/> and through the Faculty Handbook site [http://www.uaf.edu/provost/fac\\_handbook/](http://www.uaf.edu/provost/fac_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 in the year when 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 Promotion and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty***

Expectations for tenure and promotion should be discussed informally with the candidate’s mentor(s), department chair, and 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 expectations are found in the approved 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. That is why it is important to have early and annual discussions with mentor(s), the department chair and the dean/director.

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

Faculty appointed at the rank of assistant professor must be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than during the 7<sup>th</sup> consecutive year of service; i.e., submission at the beginning of the seventh year for an award at the end of the seventh year. At UAF the award of tenure and advancement to the associate professor rank are linked and must be done concurrently. Faculty appointed at the rank of associate professor must be reviewed no later than during the 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive year of service. Faculty appointed at the rank of professor must be reviewed no later than during the 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive year of service. It is advisable for the candidate to consult with the dean/director and department chair before sending a file forward prior to the 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 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 they were hired in 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.

### ***Calculating Mandatory Year of Tenure***

If FM was hired.....then this is

AY04-05	year one
AY05-06	year two – professor mandatory year
AY06-07	year three
AY07-08	year four – assistant 4 <sup>th</sup> year review* or associate mandatory year
AY 08-09	year five
AY09-10	year six
AY10-11	year seven – assistant mandatory year

Faculty failing to receive tenure in the mandatory year are given a terminal contract for the following year. Employment in a faculty position may not continue beyond that terminal year. Note: this chart is a sample and the faculty member’s year of hire would be year one.

\* UNAC-represented faculty only; there is no comparable review for ACCFT-represented faculty

### ***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 must be documented in writing at the beginning of the leave process and have the approval of the dean/director and the provost. The provost is the final authority.

## **Types of Review**

---

<b>Type of Review</b>	<b>Applies to</b>
Annual Evaluation	All tenure track faculty
Annual Activities Reporting	All faculty at UAF
4 <sup>th</sup> Year Comprehensive Review	UNAC-represented faculty only
Tenure concurrent with promotion to associate professor	UNAC and ACCFT represented faculty with initial appointment as assistant professor
Tenure only	UNAC and ACCFT represented faculty with initial appointment as associate professor or professor
Promotion only	Any tenure track faculty member or non-tenure track special academic rank faculty
Post-Tenure review	All faculty members with tenure

### ***Feedback During Annual Reviews***

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

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 dean/director. Some differences of opinion among faculty on steps tenure-track faculty should take to make adequate progress towards tenure and promotion are inevitable, but those differences should be clearly resolved in formal feedback from the dean/director 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 9.2.1 in the UNAC CBA and Article 5.4 in the ACCFT CBA.

### ***4<sup>th</sup> Year Comprehensive and Diagnostic review***

For UNAC-represented faculty, the 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> year review file is similar to

that of the promotion-tenure file. However, external review letters are not solicited for the comprehensive and diagnostic review process.

There are some critical points regarding the 4<sup>th</sup> year comprehensive and diagnostic review. Faculty and administration alike should become familiar with the language in the CBA and UAF policies.

- 4<sup>th</sup> year comprehensive and diagnostic reviews are not optional per the UNAC CBA.
- The purpose of the review is to assess progress toward tenure and promotion.
- 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 in the mandatory 7<sup>th</sup> year.
- Faculty may withdraw their candidacy file from consideration at any step in the process prior to review by the chancellor except in the 4<sup>th</sup> year for UNAC-represented faculty.
- For UNAC-represented faculty members: 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.
- For ACCFT-represented faculty members: if the file continues to the chancellor and if the decision of the chancellor is to deny tenure, the faculty member shall be offered a terminal appointment.

#### ***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 dean or director.

## **Preparing a file for review**

---

Instructions for file preparation are located on the Provost's Web site <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/>. In assembling materials for the file, remember that readers 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 than slides.

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 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 reviewers, not just those in the candidate's discipline;
- materials that support claims of accomplishment;
- inclusion of examples of abstracts or other written work;
- 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;
- self-evaluation narratives that simply summarize activities rather than assess their significance and impact.

## **Specific Parts of the file**

---

### ***External Review Letters***

For UNAC-represented faculty only. The function of the external letters is to assist promotion and tenure review committees in making a judgment about the strength of the file. External review letters shall be requested for tenure and/or promotion files and are not requested for 4<sup>th</sup> year comprehensive review or post-tenure review files.

If faculty are requested by the dean to select reviewers, it is good practice for faculty to select persons with a national or international reputation who can speak to their file. It is generally considered better not to ask relatives, close friends, your major professor, or anyone else who might not be objective in the review process. It is not necessary for the candidate and the reviewer to be completely unknown to one another. In addition to the two names the faculty member provides, the dean or director may select up to two additional reviewers. The dean or director will contact external reviewers on your behalf. Letters are not confidential.

Faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion generally make the best external reviewers. In some cases, however, reviewers in non-academic positions may be better placed to evaluate the significance of a candidate's work, in which case it is particularly important to establish their credentials in the file.

Deans are responsible for sending materials to the reviewers. These materials typically include the candidate's CV and perhaps a sampling of publications or other evidence of professional accomplishments. While only the CV is required, most outside reviewers appreciate some extra materials, (particularly copies of key publications) and some idea of the candidate's workload responsibilities.

When applied research is part of the file for tenure and/or promotion, the file is supported through evidence of the impact of the research, whether local, regional, or national. Depending on the nature of the applied research, this evidence may include letters from people able to assess its impact.

### ***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 at 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.
- No other types of materials may be added.

## **Progression of the File**

Complete information about the process and the schedule is located on the Provost's Web site <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. [Paul questioned whether or not we needed this section but I think we do.]

	<b>ACCFT Files</b>	<b>UNAC Files</b>
Stage 1	Candidate submits file to campus director.	Candidate submits to dean/director CV and list of 2 external reviewers (p-t candidates only).
Stage 2	Director writes recommendation and submits file to executive dean.	Dean/director distributes CV to 2-4 external reviewers.
Stage 3	Candidate has opportunity to respond to executive dean regarding director's comments.	Candidate submits file to dean/director.
Stage 4	Dean sends file to unit-peer review committee.	Dean/director passes file to department chair if desired.
Stage 5	The unit-peer review committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the executive dean.	Department chair responds.
Stage 6	Candidate has opportunity to respond to the executive dean regarding unit-peer committee comments.	Candidate has opportunity to respond regarding department chair comments.
Stage 7	Executive Dean reviews file and submits to the Office of the Provost	The unit-peer review committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the dean.
Stage 8	Candidate has opportunity to respond to university-wide committee regarding the dean's comments.	Candidate has opportunity to respond to dean/director regarding the unit-peer review committee recommendation
Stage 9	University-wide review committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the provost.	Dean/director reviews file and submits recommendation to the Office of the Provost.
Stage 10	Candidate has opportunity to respond to provost regarding the	Candidate has opportunity to respond to the university-wide review

	university-wide committee's comments	committee regarding the dean/director comments
Stage 11	Provost review files and submits recommendation to the chancellor.	University-wide committee reviews file and submits recommendation to the provost.
Stage 12	Candidate has opportunity to respond to the chancellor regarding the provost's comments	Candidate has opportunity to respond to the provost regarding the university-wide committee's comments.
Stage 13	Chancellor reviews files and makes final decision	Provost reviews file and makes recommendation to the chancellor.
Stage 14	There is no formal comment period to the chancellor's decision.	Candidate has opportunity to respond to the chancellor regarding the provost's comments
Stage 15	n/a	Chancellor reviews files (promotion, tenure and those requested 4 <sup>th</sup> -year and post-tenure files) and makes final decision.
Stage 16	n/a	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 promotion-tenure 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.

***Bragging Rights***

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.

***Storage and access to files***

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

- 4<sup>th</sup> year comprehensive review files and post-tenure review files are returned to the college/school and are kept in the dean's office as part of the academic record of faculty.
- Files of candidates undergoing promotion and/or tenure review are kept in the Office of the Provost until just before the next round of files is due to the Provost's Office. The previous year's files are kept on hand in the Provost's Office to allow faculty to view examples. However, a file is available for viewing only if its owner has signed a release form, authorizing other faculty to view his or her file. This is done on a voluntary basis. When the Office of the Provost is ready to receive files in the current promotion-tenure round, the previous year's files are then boxed and sent to Library Archives. Faculty may access these files with the permission of the Chancellor or Provost. Copies of successful files are also available for review in the Office of Faculty Development.
- Files of candidates participating in review for promotion who were not successful are returned to the college/school dean's office.

## **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/UnitPeerCriteria/UnitPeerCriteria.html>.

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, that 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 aren’t 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 dean/director, 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 dean/director. An academic department does not necessarily have to function as the peer unit for promotion and tenure. Especially in the case where 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.

It should be noted that the term “unit” is used in two ways in the UNAC CBA. 1) “unit” means the entire group of UNAC-represented faculty members (i.e., bargaining unit); and 2) “unit” means department/cluster/unit, i.e. an academic organization (or combination of organizations). For ACCFT faculty “unit” is comprised of all tenured faculty.

#### **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 at least annually. It is preferable to make this selection during the spring semester. 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 in 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 candidate’s file 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 and will be posted to the Provost’s web site. 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**

---

Members of the university-wide committees reviewing UNAC-represented faculty are elected by peers through a Faculty Senate process and appointed by the provost to one of three committees with seven members each: promotion and tenure review, 4<sup>th</sup> year

comprehensive and diagnostic review and comprehensive post-tenure review. Committee members serve a two-year term.

The selection process for the university-wide committee reviewing ACCFT-represented faculty is a bit different. The CRA executive dean forwards the provost a list of ACCFT-represented faculty eligible and able to sit on the committee. The provost appoints five of them to the university-wide committee and selects two UNAC-represented faculty from the other promotion and tenure review committee to bring the committee membership to seven. Committee members serve a one-year term.

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

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

---

The chair of the university-wide review committee is chosen by the committee members annually. The chair is responsible for convening the review meetings, overseeing revision of the operating procedures, overseeing the writing of the recommendation letters and other matters related to the promotion/tenure review process as well as conducting 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.

#### ***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/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 can not 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***

It should be noted that committees for UNAC-represented faculty must be comprised entirely of UNAC-represented faculty. Committees reviewing ACCFT-represented faculty may have non ACCFT-represented members.

### ***Role of the Department Chair in Meetings***

If requested by the dean/director to provide an independent, formal evaluation of the candidate's file, the department chair may participate in the discussion of the candidate's file but may not vote. If no such request was made of the department chair, the department chair may participate in the meetings as a voting member of the 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 answer any questions 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; UNAC Article 9.1.2; BOR Policy 04.04.04) In addition, the UNAC CBA stipulates that only bargaining unit members may serve on peer review committees for candidates represented by UNAC.

### ***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 a) reading the file, b) 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. Votes/ballots do not need to be secret. However, votes should be recorded in the recommendation without individual attribution.

A faculty member serving on a university-wide peer 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. 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 UNAC-represented faculty should be uniformly applied within UAF at the unit-peer level as well as the university-wide level. UAF Policy states that “A promotion/tenure committee (unit or university-wide) shall recommend promotion to the rank of professor only if a majority of the committee rates the faculty member’s tripartite (or bipartite) areas of activity as “very good” or “excellent” (ratings, in order of improved performance, being “unsatisfactory”, “satisfactory,” “good,” “very good,” and “excellent”).” (UAF Policy Chapter IV.D.3.) The rating standard for promotion to the rank of professor for ACCFT-represented faculty is “successful,” meaning “resulted in a positive outcome,” according to the standards the candidate must demonstrate in the tenure/promotion file for each part of the workload.

### ***Recommendations***

Once the meetings have concluded, the unit-peer and university-wide review committees shall prepare a single written recommendation, and 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/director, committee and the provost will also prepare a recommendation at their level of review.

### ***Minority or Dissenting Opinions***

Opinions that differ from the majority opinion of a promotion and tenure committee are generally incorporated into the committee’s recommendation. This should 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.

## **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 Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty, 2002* for UNAC-represented Faculty and the *UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty, 1997* and *Regional Review Guidelines* for ACCFT-represented faculty.

### **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 IAS forms for particular classes, the context in which the individual's ratings should be viewed (e.g. IAS 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: IAS 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 for 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.