

*Alaska Center for Energy and Power Unit Criteria
Approved May 3,*

*Alaska Center for Energy and Power Unit Criteria
Approved May 3, 2021 at Faculty Senate Meeting #256.*

Chapter III: Faculty Evaluation

A. Purpose

Excerpted from the "University Policies and Procedures (The Faculty Blue Book)" Chapter III A.

It is the policy of the university to evaluate faculty on the basis of the criteria identified below. Evaluations shall appraise the extent to which each faculty member has met the performance assignment, the extent to which the faculty member's professional growth and development have proceeded, and the prospects for the faculty member's continued professional growth and development. Evaluations shall also identify changes, if any, in emphasis required for promotion, tenure and continued professional growth and may result in the initiation of processes to improve performance.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined below will be defined by demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; and/or 2) achievement in research, scholarly and creative activity; and/or 3) effectiveness of service.

B. Types of Evaluation for Different Faculty

See "University Policies and Procedures (The Faculty Blue Book)" Chapter III B for the description of the types of evaluation for different faculty.

C. Evaluation Process for Retention, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

Excerpted from the "University Policies and Procedures (The Faculty Blue Book)" Chapter III C.

1. General Evaluation Criteria

Evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member's professional obligation, as specified in the workload agreements:

mastery of subject matter;
effectiveness in teaching;
achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity;
effectiveness of public service;
effectiveness of university service;
demonstration of professional development; and
quality of total contribution to the university.

In addition, departments or disciplines may elaborate in writing, with Faculty Senate approval, on these or other criteria which take into account the distinctive nature of the discipline on special univer2p4 113.s a

D. Criteria for Instruction

This section does not apply to bipartite research faculty with bipartite workloads. For a bipartite research faculty with a bipartite workload, any training, education and workforce development activities are described under the criteria for research, scholarly and creative activity. However, bipartite faculty may temporarily accept a tripartite function, i.e. the faculty is formally teaching a class, and if so, a tripartite function should be considered during promotion review if the research faculty member has an assigned teaching workload. The tripartite evaluation should be part of the review in the same proportion as it is to the whole workload for the entire review period.

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, and curriculum development.

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of effectiveness in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers:

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are supportive of student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;
- f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery, instructional design, and materials;
- g. regularly expend effort towards future oriented educational development;
- h. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.
- i. ***Successful mentoring/teaching of interns, undergraduate and graduate students including but not limited to; formal and informal advising, laboratory training, participation in field work, undergraduate completion of research projects (e.g. URSA, capstone projects etc.), student/intern publications, conference papers, and posters stemming from PI/co-PI research, curriculum***

*Alaska Center for Energy and Power Unit Criteria
Approved May 3, 2021 at Faculty Senate Meeting #*

publications, where applicable. Publication in conference proceedings constitute supplementary evidence that the research program is of high quality. It is essential for the faculty member to clarify in their narrative their, and their co-author's(s') role and creative contributions in multiple-authored publications. This philosophy of explaining the faculty role and contributions also applies to collaborative proposals.

III. Research professor: must have sustained a consistent, productive, independent and/or collaborative research program(s) since advancement to research associate professor. A research program should have produced quality research products that make significant impact to the field and to have earned the faculty member national and/or international stature in the area of research. This could be documented through:

- *Service in a leadership role in project and program execution, for example in internal project teams, complex multi-disciplinary and/or multi-agency or multi-institution projects*
- *Quality publications in rigorous peer-reviewed journal articles, conference publications and other forms of literature such as monographs, books, reviews, agency and customer reports, models, maps, and novel interpretative materials. For example, evidence of quality publications may include:*

*The number of citations past publications have received
The quality of the journals such as their "impact factor"
External reviews stating the papers made major contributions
Invited talks and book chapters
Professional awards*

Service in a leadership role in project and program execution, for example in internal project teams, complex multi-disciplinary and/or multi-agency or multi-institution projects

Impacts may include setting new research directions, developing new techniques or tools to be used by others, increasing the capacity or efficiency of programs or organizations to perform their mission or conduct business, and influencing organizational policy outcomes.

The faculty member should have attained a national and/or international reputation which may be demonstrated by:

A high number of professional article external citations;

and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. Consulting.
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.
- l. Active engagement in public communication of discipline-

and diagnostic review, and post-tenure review. Discipline based unit criteria should be fully aligned with the university-wide evaluation criteria in order to reflect the specific nature of individual disciplines.

Unit criteria when developed by the faculty and approved by the Faculty Senate, must be used in the review processes by all levels of review. Their use is NOT optional. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate for promotion, tenure, 4th year comprehensive and diagnostic review, and post-tenure review to include these approved unit criteria and all their workloads in the application file.