Minutes Unit Criteria Review Committee - 21 February 2011
Perry Barboza, Karen Jensen, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson

Next Meeting 23 March 2pm.

SFOS Revision

Page 5. Please clarify the intent of the following section. “Additional evidence of teaching ... publications based on student’s thesis or dissertation research” We understand that publication indicates the quality of work in a thesis and therefore reflects the quality of the instructor or mentor. However, the convention for promotion and tenure files is to list a product only once as evidence of either teaching or research. This section of the document would make it possible to use the same set of publications to demonstrate both teaching and research performance by the advisor. It seem more appropriate that publications co-authored with a student should only be counted either as scholarly work or as evidence of teaching but not as both. Student publications that are not coauthored by the advisor/ instructor could be used to demonstrate the quality of instruction in a writing class or the editorial guidance of the advisor. How does the unit want to use student publications to evaluate the faculty - only research, only teaching or both research and teaching simultaneously?

Please remove all comments from the margin.
Please add page numbers for ease of reference.
The final documents are distributed as black and white copies. Please convert the red text to bold or underlined font for clear copies.

Music Criteria
The committee would like to discuss revision of this document at the next meeting. We would appreciate the attendance of a representative from the music department to assist with questions about the criteria.

• The formatting of this document is difficult to follow and is not consistent with those of other units. Please consult the criteria for the Department of Theater that was approved in May 2010 (http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion-tenure/unit-peer-criteria/).

• Page 3. Please distinguish between “local” and “surrounding community”

• Page 3 PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

• This summary is very difficult to follow in this format. Please follow the format used by other units by including the expectations for teaching (B), research (C) and service (D) in the appropriate sections. Define expectations for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and full Professor that are specific to the unit and additional to the
established criteria for UAF. This document will be used to evaluate faculty for tenure and promotion. Criteria for evaluation of non-tenured faculty should be removed from the document to avoid confusion.

- Page 4. Statement of Purpose for the unit should be placed at the beginning of the document before Chapter 1. Please confine comments to the specifics of your department.

- Page 7 and following: Please integrate the description and evaluation of each activity in the existing format for Scholarly Work (7-10) and Service (14-16)

- Page 8. Please remove italics or clarify the need for the different font.

- Page 10: 1. "Achievement in research. 1.c. They must be evaluated by peers ..."

- Page 7. Please clarify the following statement "MAY ALSO BE MEASURED BY WHATEVER METHODS FOR EVALUATION ARE IN PLACE FOR A PARTICULAR EVENT."

- Page 10. A better definition of “knowledgeable persons” as peer reviewers would be helpful.