

Guidelines for Faculty Review

Alaska WWAMI School of Medical Education

University of Alaska Anchorage

October 1, 2013

Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria in reviews
August 25, 2014

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Definitions.....	3
III.	General Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.....	4
	(a). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Teaching.....	5
	(b). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Service.....	6
	(c). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Academic Research Activity.....	8
IV.	Evaluation of Academic Research Activity.....	9
V.	Guidelines for Faculty Workload Proposals.....	10

I. Introduction

The Alaska WWAMI School of Medical Education at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty. The WWAMI program is a partnership with the University of Washington School of Medicine, providing medical education to Alaska students. The Alaska WWAMI program also offers some undergraduate and graduate courses, and several of the faculty participate in biomedical research. The information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression towards tenure /tenure/promotion review and by those responsible for assessing review files. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Policies, and the UNAC and UAFT Collective Bargaining Agreements.

II. Definitions

Workloads:

In the specific guidelines which follow, it is presumed that the typical faculty appointment is 'tripartite' with teaching, research and service components; Sections III and IV of this document apply to tripartite faculty. Faculty with 'bipartite' appointments have two workload components, typically teaching and service with no formal or contractual research component. Other allocations of a bipartite workload are possible. Sections III(a) and III(b) apply to bipartite faculty.

An example of a bipartite workload is:

4:0:1 appointment (80% teaching; 00% research; 20% service)

Examples of tripartite workloads are :

3:1:1 appointment (60% teaching; 20% research; 20% service)

2:2:1 appointment (40% teaching; 40% research; 20% service)

1:3:1 appointment (20% teaching; 60% research; 20% service)

Annual Progression towards Tenure Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- a) All untenured faculty undergo an annual review for progression toward tenure prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These annual reviews will be carried out by the college Dean or his/her designee.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty completing three years of academic employment will undergo comprehensive fourth year review at the beginning of their 4th year. During the 4th year review the faculty member will be comprehensively and diagnostically reviewed by the following:

- a) WWAMI Director, at the request of the Dean of the college (UAFT faculty only)
- b) Unit Peer Committee, at the request of the Dean of the college

- c) Dean of the college
- d) University-wide Peer-Review Committee
- e) Provost
- f) Chancellor, at the written request of the faculty member

Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be

The following general guidelines apply to each of the three workload components as indicated. Accomplishments during sabbaticals and/or prior academic appointments (if negotiated at the time of hire and included in the initial Letter of Appointment) should be considered during evaluations of productivity in the three component categories.

III(a). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Teaching

Overview: Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. The WWAMI Director or Unit Peer Committee may request the faculty to compile a teaching dossier including syllabi, quizzes, exams, and other relevant material to include in the review file to establish a basis for evaluating course content and structure. Additional metrics for the **definite promise and achievement** in teaching can include a faculty member's list of courses taught, list of graduate students, syllabi, student evaluations, peer evaluations of classroom teaching (see below), innovative techniques and pedagogies, and common final exam results. In addition, the WWAMI Director (or their designee agreed upon after consultation with the Dean of the college) may, at their discretion, observe faculty teaching for the purpose of direct peer evaluation of appropriate and effective teaching methods, delivery, course content, or other relevant information. The WWAMI Director (or designee) will subsequently provide the faculty member with a written summary of these observations and any recommendations for improvement. The faculty member should then include the WWAMI Director's (or designee's) written summary in the review file (and their response, if any, to this review). Other data, such as student evaluation forms and University of Alaska Anchorage IDEA data, will be included as part of a faculty member's teaching evaluations. Faculty should not include the written student comment sheets in their review files since, a) submitted comments seldom represent all students in one's class, and b) reviewers have no way of knowing whether the comment sheets were screened for content.

Mentoring research: *Mentoring research* is defined as the teaching of research and is properly considered a teaching responsibility. Faculty in the WWAMI School of Medical Education should mentor and involve undergraduate and/or graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists and/or WWAMI Triple I (III) students in their research. Faculty having research workloads should include any combination of undergraduate students, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research programs to produce refereed publications. Measures of successful mentoring include a faculty member's students garnering competitive scholarships and fellowships, completing their degree, completing Honors and graduate theses, publishing in peer-reviewed literature, delivering presentations at regional, national and international conferences, going on to more professional training, and attaining employment within their field. Mentoring will be judged commensurate with a faculty's research workload.

Annual Review of Teaching Prior to Tenure

Comprehensive 4th Year Review:

All faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, undergoing 4th year comprehensive review must meet college requisites for teaching.. Measures for **definite promise and achievement** for teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

Review of Teaching for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be awarded tenure and to be promoted to Associate Professor, faculty should demonstrate significant **accomplishment** in teaching. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon and that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching or research mentoring activities using data available in the review file. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusion.

Review of Teaching for Promotion to Professor

For an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate **extensive accomplishment** in teaching. Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is the highest academic rank the University can bestow, so additional material which may lend support to an extensive accomplishment evaluation should be included in the file. Such additional material may include (but should not be limited to): teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty or students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring research by graduate and undergraduate students, and/or other professional recognition of teaching.

member's **definite promise or achievement** in the research component of the workload or to determine progress towards tenure and promotion.

The hallmark for demonstrating research success is peer-reviewed publication of one's research results. Therefore, tripartite faculty are expected to publish in the peer-reviewed literature while at UAA. In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity. However, reviewers should note that such work does not satisfy any requirement to demonstrate *de novo* research activity while at UAA.

Since research faculty are expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis, the WWAMI Director may also request that evidence of these submissions be included in the review file. In reviewing funding activity, external competitive grant proposals that are funded will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, awards of experimental time and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit. Presentations at conferences, participation in scientific discussion panels, and contributions to grant review processes can also be included for review.

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to demonstrate **definite promise and achievement** in research through the documentation in their file. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate **significant accomplishment** in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In those cases where a faculty member changes workload categories, (e.g., changes from **3:1:1** to **2:2:1**) research productivity should be judged on a *pro-rated* basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

For an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate **extensive accomplishment** in research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. Extensive accomplishment will be measured by a continued rate of success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program that includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national labs. Each discipline has

peer-reviewed journals are expected to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory; such publications serve as a representation of the faculty member's ability to design, conduct, and mentor novel research at the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the *authorship standards associated with their particular disciplines*.

The level of research productivity over a particular interval being reviewed for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion will be defined primarily by the number and quality of publications (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.). The expected output will be dictated by the workload agreement assigned to the faculty member as well as the faculty member's rank. The projected output levels defined below represent *minimum* standards for progression towards tenure, and promotion.

Annual Progress towards Tenure Reviews:

To demonstrate **definite promise and achievement** in Academic Research, candidates for progression towards tenure must show evidence that they have begun to develop an independent research program. Such evidence may include, at minimum, the establishment of a functional research laboratory or other research infrastructure (database, etc.), evidence of an effort to obtain internal and/or external funding, and student (graduate and/or undergraduate) participation in the candidate's research program.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review

All faculty members undergoing 4th year comprehensive reviews are expected to demonstrate **growth and achievement** in Academic Research. Measures for growth and achievement can include manuscripts submitted or published, proposals submitted or funded, students (graduate and/or undergraduate) and/or postdoctoral scientists recruited for research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

Research/ Activity Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To demonstrate **significant accomplishment** in Academic Research, the faculty member must give evidence of contributions to the body of knowledge in the candidate's discipline and must demonstrate a continuing program of internal and/or external funding to support graduate students and research activity. Manifestations of scholarship vary in form from one discipline to another, but typically include the following:

1. Defined area of research.
2. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, and supervision of post-doctoral researchers.
3. Service as a member of thesis committees.

and that it is a measure of the candidate's potential to make continuing contributions in basic and/or applied research.

Promotion to Professor

Faculty in all workload categories must demonstrate **continuous** and **extensive accomplishment** in performance in research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA, recognizing that UAA has limited research support and infrastructure.* In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only (Consideration of productivity outside of time at UAA can only be considered if negotiated at the time of hire and included in the initial Letter of Appointment).

The rank of Professor is an indication of the stature of the scientist among his/her peers, so evaluation by researchers external to UAA must be sought, where reviewers should

W

2. Complete the form assigning workload units to each category. The total for the nine month period must equal 30 workload units. The workload assignment defines the 30 units of workload that you are contracted to perform, so please carefully consider your proposal.

The major categories within the annual workload are Teaching, Research and Service which are defined in section 13.1.3 of the UNAC CBA. The “Teaching Activity” category includes classroom and other teaching, as well as advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

TEACHING

Teaching workload credits for tripartite faculty are as follows

For 3:1:1 workload (3 parts teaching, 1 part research, 1 part service): 18 workload credits during the academic year

For 2:2:1 workload: 12 workload credits during the academic year

may be banked against future workloads, but only as long as the student remains enrolled.

Postdoctoral supervision will be credited at 0.25 workload credits per person, per academic year, with a total cap of 2 for each postdoc during the postdoc's tenure at UAA.

Teaching Workload Credit for Undergraduate Student (tud)003>FG,200(48,0441 125mg aTm[Und)S)-

The faculty supervisor should be required to put a substantial amount of effort into the training of each student, meeting weekly for at least an hour with each student and reading all graded material. The instructor of record for a 498 course should receive 1 workload credit per student per semester for up to 3 students per semester. There will be no cap on teaching workload allowance, as long as the activities conform to the above guidelines.
