

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

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 ...
- 1.c.1. and 1.c.2. Music criteria ..” Please combine the criteria into one statement. Use 1.c.i. to avoid confusion with the main category.
- 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.