Minutes Unit Criteria Review Committee - 23 March 2011
Perry Barboza, Karen Jensen, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson, Mark Hermann

Next Meeting 27 April 2pm.

Music Criteria
The committee discussed revisions of the document with Eduard Zilberkant and Vincent Cee. We suggested that the department should follow the template approved by the Office of the Provost and recently apprived criteria from Theater.

SFOS Criteria
The committee approved the revised criteria
The following minor errors were noted.
Page 4 Typo - Additional evidence of effecting teaching
Page 4. Redundant sentence (already stated in general criteria): “Quality of classroom teaching is indicated by peer evaluation ... “
We are attempting to standardize the formats of the approved criteria. Please replace the underlined text with ALL CAPS. Underlined text may be easily unformatted and thus confused with teh general criteria.

Art Criteria
This criteria should be revised to follow the template approved by the Provost. All changes from the general criteria in the template should be in ALL CAPS. Many items unique to Art are not differentiated from the template while changes to text in the template have not been marked or differentiated.

-page 1 "Purview" - indicates the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for review procedures - should be Provost
-page 4 - 4.e - This is a different wording for something that already exists in the template (B1g)
-page 5 - e. Creation of public art commissions commissioned - delete "commissions"
-page 8 - a. Please specify "Considerations" of stature. What are the considerations or criteria?

Is there a difference in expectations for assistant, associate and full? This is spelled out in service, for curators, but not for research or teaching.