

Operational Procedures for the UAF Physics Department Peer Reviews

I. Introduction

These operational procedures apply for review of all academic-rank faculty members tenured or on a tenure track in the UAF Physics Department. The reviews are: fourth-year comprehensive and diagnostic review, reviews for promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. Committee composition is based upon rules and procedures established by the UAF Faculty Senate and the Collective Bargaining Agreement and provided to the department by the Provost's Office at the outset of the review process.

II. Operational Procedures for the Physics Department

1. The Dean's Office provides to the department chair the list of all faculty members in the Physics Department that are up for review.
2. The department chair brings to the faculty the names of all faculty members to be reviewed (candidates) and makes a recommendation for selection of the unit peer review committee chair. The faculty elects the chair and the department chair informs the Dean's Office of the selection. The Provost's Office then organizes training for the committee chair.
3. The department chair brings to the faculty the necessary requirements for composition of the peer review committee and any other requirements. The faculty makes its decisions on this and the overall procedures. These procedures are then submitted to the Provost for approval. [Note; The objective is to have one committee with one chair for all reviews, trying to avoid the necessity of individuals leaving for some reviews. This may not always be possible. jdc 22 sept 2005]

For the AY04-05 review, the faculty consensus is that the operational procedures will be the responsibility of the committee chair, and that the committee at its first meeting will make the decision for reviews open or closed to the public and/or the candidates.

4. The committee chair, with cooperation of the department chair, is formally responsible for the work of the unit peer committee, including:
 - Organize the review meeting or meetings;
 - Make all review files available to the faculty within the department, in a secure environment;
 - Select subcommittee assignments for preparation of draft recommendations to the committee;
 - Organize with the dean for additional members on the committee if the basic composition requirements cannot be met from within the faculty;
 - Lead all discussions and voting in the committee;
 - Lead final preparation of recommendations and substantive rationale for the committee votes; and
 - Deliver review results to the Dean's Office, with a copy to each candidate being reviewed

**Operational Procedures
for the
UAF Physics Department Peer Reviews**

5. The department chair [recommend making this “committee” chair, who will have been trained by the Provost’s Office.] selects (from the pool of eligible faculty members) a subcommittee for each review, where eligibility is determined by the approved composition of the review committee. The committee chair, with the concurrence of the department chair, also selects the subcommittee chairs. [The department chair is expected to be more aware of any conflicting issues that are not common knowledge.] Each subcommittee is responsible for the preparation of draft recommendations based on instructions and guidance provide by the committee chair. The subcommittee chair makes the presentation of recommendations to the full committee. The subcommittee (and its chair) responsible for reviewing the department chair are selected without input from the department chair.
6. If the meeting is open (closed), the public and/or the candidate being reviewed may (not) be present during the discussion, but cannot participate. The meeting is closed for the purpose of voting and drafting of the final report.
7. The review subcommittee and then the full committee must consider in their evaluations the candidate’s contributions to instruction, research, and service in a manner consistent with criteria established by UAF and the college, and with consideration for the established workload agreement. The committee chair is responsible for providing guidance throughout the proceedings.
8. The written substantive rationale for the vote on each category (instruction, research, and service) and overall performance includes the majority recommendation and minority opinion, without individual attribution.
9. All committee members are expected to read each file.
10. No discussion or votes can take place if the minimum requirements for composition of the committee are not met.
11. The votes shall be by paper ballot, without attribution, and the results included in the recommendation to the Dean. The vote shall be yes for approval and no for disapproval, counted and separately verified by two members of the committee. Sealed absentee ballots may be received in advance of the committee vote for reasons of illness, academic or research conflicts (e.g., class or travel), or other reasons deemed reasonable, at the discretion of the committee chair

Approved by unit-peer review committee chair: 13 September 2004
Approved by the Provost: XX September 2004

Note. Minor revisions have been made to the original for the purpose of clarity. Several notes have been added to assist in understanding the intent. Suggestions for recommended corrections are so marked. Not aware that we ever got a formal approval from the provost. jdc, 22 sept 05