Time/Location: 9:00 – 10:00 MCPRK 402

Recorder: Gina McCann

Attendees: Hawley, McCann, Armenta, Astroth, Brooke, Butler, Clark, Curran, Frontain, Jacobson, Kim, Knapp, Lotz, Ortega, Padilla, Rice, Romero, Rosen, Speirs, Taylor, Toomey, Wood, Zeiders

Announcements
• 　　　Introduction of RCSC Online Professor of Practice Lisette Rice

Events - Turbeville Speaker Series: Held this Friday in MCPRK 210 to accommodate the FSHD grad student recruits. Next meeting on 3/31 on Inclusive Excellence.

School Updates
FMI Space remains unchanged

Searches
- 　　　TCAI Director: Looking for Associate or Full Professor. The job posting is currently at CALS awaiting approval. TCAI Founder Mike Hall has been added to the Search Committee. Aiming for a month-long posting with review date of 3/17/16.
- 　　　FSHD Asst POP (vice-Kelly): Offer has been made to candidate.
- 　　　FSHD Assoc Professor (vice-Ellis): 4 candidates to be interviewed Feb 20 – March 7
- 　　　RCSC Online POP (2nd hire): Position has been posted with plans to do a focused reach-out for candidates.
- 　　　Staff requests: 1 position each in the Business Center and Student Services has been requested as part of hiring plan.

PFFP Program (not covered)

Faculty Council Report: Discussion included signature requirement of CALS Ethics Statement, lack of communication from CALS to the individual units. Next meeting 3/3/17 to include Mike Staten discussing instructional issues

Service Appointments: 10% Service requirement to be discussed during individual APR meetings

APR Updates: UAVitae all online but Jana will print hard copies as a back-up.

Commitments and Plans—clearly written goals: If you have not already included your commitments and goals. Please contact Leslie to unlock your UAVitae so it can be added prior to your APR meeting with Jana.

Career Conversations: Staff and Appointed Personnel only

Evaluating TCEs: 75% participation expected for reliable data; Bonus points may be given to encourage participation. Suggested – Invite OIE to speak at future Norton Faculty meeting.

Next meeting: Monday, March 6 (to accommodate Spring Break)

Appendix A   *Evaluating TCE Results*[5]

Academic units should have a written policy detailing how TCE results are evaluated for purposes of administrative review. AER recommends a three-part process consisting of 1) evaluating the sample, 2) reviewing results and assigning points according to a rubric, and 3) verifying the results of the review by examining the candidate's narrative and taking into account mitigating factors. Guidelines for reviewing the sample, a generic rubric for examining results, and a sample statement of ratings adjustments are provided below.

1. Evaluate the Sample

Ratings results should be used in summative evaluation only if they are representative. The higher the proportion of respondents to those enrolled, the more reliable the results. In general, sections with a less than 50% response rate should not be used for performance appraisal. The smaller the class, the higher the percentage of responses needed to ensure that the same is representative.

One way to ensure reliability is to assign each section a "sample score" based on the percentage responding, then average the scores for each level of course (lower division, upper division, graduate) to arrive at a sample score. Samples not meeting a specified level should not be considered in summative review. Table 1 below provides suggested sample scores for different enrollment sizes, while Table 2 offers interpretations for averaged sample scorees.

Table 1. SUGGESTED TCE "SAMPLE SCORES"		
0=poor sample 1=marginal, but likely usable 2=probably good sample		
Enrolled	**Response %**	**Section Sample Score**
5-29	Less than 50%*	0
	More than 49%, but less than 80%	1
	More than 79%	2
30-49	Less than 50%*	0
	More than 49%, but less than 75%	1
	More than 74%	2
50 or more	Less than 50%*	0
	More than 49%, but less than 66%	1
	More than 66%	2
* These results are considered unusable because it cannot be determined if the few students who responded were representative of the class as a whole.		

---

[5] An earlier version of this Appendix, entitled "Preparing a Quantitative Summary of TCE Results," was co-written with Jennifer Franklin.

Table 2. Mean Grad and Undergrad Sample Scores	
Values	**Interpretation**
2.0 to 1.5	Good sample across all sections
1.49 to .50	Marginal, but likely usable
.50 to 0	Unusable set of sections; too few respondents for reliable interpretation

Inadequate sample scores may be addressed in the narratives faculty write to accompany the "quantitative summaries" they are expected to provide for administrative reviews. AER recommends that departments exclude from further consideration ratings results where the sample is inadequate (Section Sample Score equals 0; Summary Sample Score is less than .50).

Part 2. Evaluate TCE Results

Department plans for faculty performance appraisal should include an explicit (written) statement of the basis for judging TCE results. Essentially, there are two choices: criterion-based or norm-based. In criterion-based schemes, the performance of individuals is compared with fixed standards (e.g. ratings over 4.5 are deemed "outstanding"). In a strong teaching department, everyone could be deemed outstanding or excellent since individual scores are not affected by the scores of others. In norm-based schemes, the performance of individuals is compared with that of their peers (e.g. the top 10% of ratings are deemed "outstanding"). Norm-based schemes are conceptually similar to grading on the curve in that standards are relative to that of peers rather than absolute.

After determining whether a norm-based and a criterion-based approach is chosen, explicit "decision rules" for interpreting ratings should be developed, as in Table 3 below. Ideally, decision rules should be a matter of department policy. They can include guidelines for incrementing scores under certain conditions (see below).

Table 3. SECTION TCE SCORING CRITERIA (criterion-based*)		
Suggested Criteria:	**Finding**	**TCE Points**
Most ratings** between 4.5 and 5.0	Exceeds unit criterion (outstanding)	5
Most ratings between 4.0 and 4.5	Meets or exceeds unit criterion (excellent)	4
Most ratings between 3.5 and 4.0	Meets unit criterion (good)	3
Most ratings between 3.0 and 3.5 of scale	Meets unit criterion , but some improvement is desirable (needs improvement)	2
Most ratings below 3.0	Does not meet unit criterion and substantial improvement is required (unacceptable)	1
Ratings problematical due to high CIs, insufficient participation, etc.		***
* In some departments, norm-based systems are inappropriate because there is too little difference between the bottom and the top. In general, norm-based systems work best when there is a wide range of variation in results.		
**not including text/readings and course difficulty items		
***these may be either excluded or decided on by the group of evaluators		

Part 3. Adjust Results

Relying only on decision rules may lead to unfair judgments. For example, a large required upper division course may receive relatively low ratings compared to ALL upper division courses, but normal or even high ratings compared to other LARGE upper division courses. Because size is not taken into account in the comparison groups used in Overall Effectiveness Graphics, a person teaching large courses could be at a disadvantage if numbers alone are considered. Low ratings may also occur because an instructor is experimenting with a new approach and runs into unexpected problems, or due to factors the instructor cannot control. Faculty should detail special circumstances in a narrative that accompanies their presentation of quantitative results.

AER recommends that units explicitly describe how they will treat special circumstances. Ratings can be adjusted by assigning "bonus values" or increments. Table 4 offers an example of a statement of rating adjustments.

Table 4. Sample Ratings Adjustments	
Circumstance	**Increment***
New Course Increment: for courses being taught for the first time	+.5
Innovation Increment: for courses in which new instructional methods valued by the unit or college are being introduced	+.5
Challenge Increment: for classes rated significantly higher in difficulty than the comparison group **and** which have high ratings (This provides incentive for **not** inflating grades.)	+.25
Special Circumstances Increment: for courses where circumstances beyond an instructor's control led to lower ratings than would have been otherwise merited (based on instructor's usual ratings), e.g. • inadequate instructional facilities or resources • an unusually large number of unprepared or poorly qualified students were enrolled in the course • a personal circumstance in the instructor's life (e.g. illness or a death in the family)	 + .2 + .2 + .5

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 15, 2017

TO: Dean Shane Burgess
FROM: College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Unit Heads & Faculty Council
RE: Position statement on the Faculty Council's recommendation for service
            commitment

The CALS Unit Heads support the recommendations by the Faculty Council regarding applying a general service commitment to all CALS faculty (see attached). There was not consensus within the Unit Heads about how much the FTE should be. Several methods were discussed and two stood out as the dominant/preferred ones:
1. A unilateral 10% service for all CALS faculty (T/CS/PoPs).
2. Through discussions between the Unit Head and faculty member, a range of 5% to 10% service will be assigned.

Eight (8) Unit Heads voted for method 1 because it was the simplest method and CALS faculty have been working under a unilateral zero percent thus far. Two (2) Unit Heads voted for method 2 because it allowed the maximum flexibility for both the Unit Heads and faculty. The Faculty Council accepted the original Unit Heads' proposal of a 10% across-the-board service appointment.

In both cases, the following are recommended:
1. The 10% appointment or range of 5% to 10% is for *standard service to the University (unit, college, university) and professional discipline*. For any special project or activity, it is expected that the faculty member's service will be increased above the 10% or assigned service appointment to reflect the additional, often temporary, but time-consuming service.
2. The reduction in teaching, research, and/or Extension to accommodate this new service appointment will be addressed in conversations between faculty and their unit heads.
3. We revisit this decision in one year to determine what is working and what isn't.

CALS Unit Heads:
Jon Chorover
Kitt Farrell-Poe
Scott Going
Jana Hawley
Stuart Marsh
Karen Schumaker
Bruce Tabashnik
Gary Thompson
Bobby Torres
Andre Wright

CALS Faculty Council:

Roger Dahlgren
Nancy Driscoll
Charles Gerba
Melanie Hingle
Matthew Mars
Edward Martin
Jean McLain
Marc Orbach
Ravi Palanivelu
Sadhana Ravishankar

Steven Smith
Robert Steidl
Patricia Stock
Jennifer Teske
Gayatri Vedantam
Richard Wood
Muluneh Yitayew

The TT and CT faculty recommend that a general service commitment for a 1 FTE faculty member in CALS be 10% FTE or less and could involve the activities listed below:

1. Institutional service

- Serving as member of, or chairing, Unit, College, or University committees or in the Faculty Senate or in other faculty governance roles.
- Recruiting faculty, staff, or students.
- Mentoring faculty or staff.
- Responding to information requests from University administrators.
- Serving as a sponsor or advisor for student activities or groups.
- Organizing or participating in presentations, workshops, or short courses for non-student groups associated with the University.

2. Professional service

- Serving on committees and organizing conferences, workshops, short courses, or retreats for professional organizations or government agencies.
- Completing peer review of manuscripts or proposals.
- Serving on editorial boards, or program panels or reviews.
- Mentoring professional colleagues.

3. Public service

- Organizing or participating in public presentations, workshops, or short courses.[1,2]
- Advising and educating in response to requests from the public.
- Serving on committees or boards of civic organizations.[2]
- Advising or evaluating programs and policies of civic organizations.[1,2]

[1] For faculty without formal Cooperative Extension appointments.
[2] In areas related to the disciplinary focus of University appointment.

Service may not include diagnostic, clinical, administrative or special projects service, which must be separately recognized under teaching and/or research and/or extension as described (http://cals.arizona.edu/about/workplace/faculty-workload).