Additional Instructions for
FARE for Calendar Year 2016 (due Spring 2017), Grade Distributions, and SIE Template

N.B. There are several changes to the pilot version of the FARE that was completed by many of you last year.

Your first step should be to download the blank FARE and save it to an identifiable name such as "Firstname Lastname FARE for Calendar Year 2016."

Your second step should be to fill in your name and year in the document header.

Beyond that: Each section has its own brief instruction. As a general rule, filling out the FARE is intended to be uncomplicated and self-explanatory, but by its nature it can only be so simple, and inevitably some will have questions.

The following FAQs will hopefully answer many of those:

1) **Why do we have to report Teaching, Research, and Service each for three years, and is that always enough (or ever too much)?**

   Each department may set their own number of years. We have set three years as the default based on the following thinking: (a) in many cases one year provides insufficient information to make a "fare" assessment of Teaching, Research, or Service – the data may be skewed due to a particularly (and unusually) good or bad year, or some of the past year may have been a sabbatical or leave; (b) but going back too many years will obscure the relatively recent performance that the annual review addresses.

2) **What is the "Template Summarizing Grade Distributions and Student Instructor Evaluations"**

   Here we punt: This item has its own, separate instruction sheet!

3) **How detailed should I be?**

   Most sections can be addressed using bulleted lists. We are not looking here for narrative discourses on your teaching, research, or service philosophy – those will often be manifest from the details of what you have done. Provide all details that are needed for your chair to make an assessment of your recent performance, and no more. Once again, bulleted lists are often what is called for. If you are unsure, consult with your chair. (Caveat: While some explanation may sometimes be illuminating, long explanatory narratives sometimes come off as excuses for situations where there is nothing to list.)

4) **In the self-assessments, why are the three choices (a) Needs Improvement, (b) Reflects a High Level of Performance, and (c) Superior Performance?**

This language is adapted from our faculty handbook presentation of expectations for what it takes to become an Associate Professor (7.6.2.3). There, it is made clear that in general UAH faculty are expected to maintain at least a “high level of performance” in each of our three areas. We interpret this to mean that is what you are to be striving for on your way to promotion and that is at least the level at which you are expected to continue afterward. For lecturers, we apply these standards to their teaching and service only.

5) I am still not sure how to assess myself on this scale. Can I get more help from the Faculty Handbook or elsewhere?

Naturally this generates a lot of discussion. It is in the authority of the department chair to address specific interpretations, consulting with the dean as appropriate.

Your chairs have had the following general guidance:

(1) We ask chairs to look for performance in Teaching and Research that is appropriate to a university/college with a 3-3 teaching load for most tenure-track and tenured faculty – that is, presumably less than a 2-2 teaching load, but certainly more than those with a 4-4 teaching load.

(2) We inform chairs that the Faculty Handbook addresses this in its own very general terms in sections 7.6.1.1 through 7.6.1.3. Mostly these are guidelines and broad lists of things that can qualify in each area, and intentionally so: expectations vary greatly by discipline. To take two clear examples: (a) you cannot set the same guidelines for artistic output as you can for journal-based scholarship, and (b) in some disciplines, particularly in the sciences, collaboration on research articles is the norm and expectation, and it yields a larger number of publications, on average, than those fields, particularly in the humanities, where solo work is the norm.

(3) We highlight to chairs that one area where the handbook is a bit more specific: In the realm of scholarly publication the handbook states that the fundamental criteria are (1) the ability to publish research in <u>peer-reviewed outlets</u> or peer and/or professional recognition of the faculty member's scholarly and creative work, and (2) the contribution of the faculty member's research to knowledge or the contribution of the faculty member's creative work to the needs of society.

(4) Your chairs have been notified that “departmental norms” or “departmental history” are not supposed to be the primary criteria, though they might be part of the conversation. The problem with “norms” should be apparent: as a criterion, it carries with it the danger of legitimizing sub-par performance in any department where that, for whatever reason, might become the norm.

If you have other questions, please submit them to your chair who may be able to answer the question easily. Your chair will determine whether the question needs to be considered for adding to the FAQs and if so will share with the dean.