

**Notes from Faculty Review Committee Meeting with Norton Director  
March 20, 2017**

**Possible Revisions to Review Criteria:**

1. Review (and possibly revise) SC2 criteria as they apply to 100% teaching faculty.
2. Should POPs have a separate APR Committee/review criteria?
  - a. *These two items will require further review and discussion with faculty in light of the new guidelines for POP appointment and promotion.*
  - b. *Angela reported that Nutritional Sciences has a separate POP review committee.*
    - i. *Jana agreed to contact Scott Going (Nut. Sci. dept. head) to get more information about their review process.*
3. Add a TA8 equivalent for non-teaching Extension faculty
  - a. *EA6 will be revised to to say ..."inside and outside the department."*
4. Revise peer review document in light of elimination of comparison group data in TCE reports.
  - a. *Rating scale descriptions will be revised to reflect a criterion-based (rather than a norm-based) evaluation. The "Evaluating TCE Results" document will be attached as an appendix.*
5. Should we incorporate diversity/inclusion into the performance criteria?
  - a. *The committee concluded that this overlaps with other coded categories (e.g., SA9) and therefore doesn't work as its own separate code.*
  - b. *Faculty should be encouraged to add a qualitative comment pertaining to diversity/inclusion in the sections of UA Vitae where these apply (e.g., teaching, service).*
6. Revise performance criteria to clarify that new "program" grants count as RA1.
  - a. *It was agreed that only a wording change is needed to address this issue.*
7. How should media interviews be credited.
  - a. *It was agreed that faculty should code (or describe) where the interview should be credited – i.e., teaching, research, service, outreach/extension.*
8. How to handle publications/book chapters published in a foreign (i.e., non-English) language
  - a. *Foreign language publications should be evaluated in the same way as English-language publications.*
  - b. *All faculty should be encouraged to include information on journal acceptance rates, impact factors, or other information about the rigor of the publication.*

**The APR/peer review process (for discussion with Director)**

9. How can we streamline the peer review process?
  - a. *Recommendation that faculty be asked to provide a summary document highlighting their accomplishments with respect to teaching/research/service/extension.*
  - b. *This could be reported in the "Accomplishments" section of "Major Commitments and Plans" in UA Vitae.*
10. Recommendation for CY 2017 Review: Have faculty code their APRs in UA Vitae. Provide guidelines on where/how to code in UA Vitae.
  - a. *It was recommended that only the core criteria be coded; auxiliary criteria should be presented in a summary way, highlighting the most important accomplishments/activities.*
  - b. *It was agreed that the Faculty Review Committee should provide an orientation/training on completing the APR and provide a model for how faculty should complete their APR document (including the new summary section).*

- c. Angela will prepare a draft revision of the Performance Criteria document (using “track changes”) for circulation and input from the rest of the committee and Jana.*
11. How are the peer review committee’s reviews being used, who sees them, and does the faculty member receive any kind of copy of them?
  12. Can we revisit including (electronically and/or hard copy) the peer review committee’s review during the APR meeting with Director or have the review uploaded on UA Vitae?
    - a. Jana agreed that she would send faculty a draft of her evaluation along with the Faculty Review Committee comments prior to her APR meetings.*
    - b. Both the Director’s final review and the Faculty Review Committee will be posted on UA Vitae.*