University Committee Year-end Report

Committee: Unit Standards (USC)

Number of meetings: 9
Committee members: 8

Schools (four)
Donna McCrea, Mansfield Library
Lee Banville, Journalism (Chair Elect)
Kimberly James, Music (Chair)
Tim Manuel, Accounting & Finance

Humanities (Two)
^Katie Kane, English
Ona Renner-Fahey, MCLL

Sciences (Two)
^Nathan McCrady, Physics
Dan Reisenfeld, Physics

Social Sciences (two)

^ term ends this AY

Topics addressed (Action Items)

- Received our charge from Associate Provost Nathan Lindsay, Fall 2014
- Typically spent 1.5 meetings (3 hours) in full-committee review of each Unit’s standards; this was preceded by two primary reviewers and the USC Chair reviewing and marking up the submitted documents
- The USC also compiled a list of recurrent issues we faced this year when reviewing standards (see Actions Taken)
- The USC Chair regularly sought advice or input from the Provost’s Office, the UFA, and previous chairs of the committee

Actions Taken (resolutions, proposals, and recommendations):

- The current prescribed timeline (FS procedure 501.10) is difficult to follow:
  - Many Unit Standards are transmitted to the committee after the November 30 deadline
  - The Unit Standards Committee does not have ample time to conduct the 1-3 collective hours of individual review plus the typical 3 hours of review done by the committee and have edited & depersonalized comments back to the Units by Feb 15
The USC recommends working with the Provost’s Office and the UFA to come up with a more manageable timeline for all parties concerned.

The USC Chair and Associate Provost Lindsay discussed the possibility of having standards submitted from departments to the deans by the end of the AY; the deans would have the summer to review the standards; standards could be transmitted to the USC early in the following AY with a more meaningful process completed during that AY.

The USC determines the review schedule based on the USC meeting schedule and based on the availability of the primary & secondary reviewers to conduct the review; a 40 day response time (or by Feb 15) does not facilitate the process.

- The role of the USC could be more clearly described; this might protect the USC from push-back and also help Units understand that our intent is to help them comply with the CBA and guide all faculty members that are part of the bargaining unit through actionable review processes.

- Common, recurrent recommendations for this year’s Unit Standards addressed:
  - Transparency with regard to what a faculty member needs to do to distinguish him/herself in Teaching, Research, Service
  - Consistent CBA referencing throughout the document
  - Quantification and qualification of normal, above-normal, and outstanding evidence
  - Unit Standards must address General Education teaching (many did not)
  - The creation or revision of Unit Standards should be faculty-driven; the evaluation process is faculty-driven
  - The UFA, Provost’s Office, and USC view the use of standardized templates differently – we have generally suggested that units say that faculty members “may” use them, not “must”
  - Appendices and footnotes should be avoided – all pertinent info belongs in the body of the Unit Standards
  - All criteria for evaluation must be in the Unit Standards
  - Some Units express that there is a tangible difference between promotion to Associate and the awarding of Tenure; it is often unclear how a faculty member would secure numerous additional achievements in the span of potentially one AY; additionally some faculty members elect to apply for promotion and tenure together
  - Similarly, some Units struggle to outline how faculty members can be successful in their applications for Full Professor; some Units were not aware that Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor would be governed by new Unit Standards (not the ones under which they were hired)
  - Process issues – they can be succinct but must accurately mirror the CBA
  - Units should be aware that when the CBA changes, Unit Standards will likely have to be edited to comply with the newest version of the CBA
  - Units should keep in mind that the goal is to make sure that new faculty members to the Unit will know how to be successful in the evaluation process; additionally, since merit awards are competitive within unit and across campus, criteria for establishing a record of above-normal or outstanding activity in teaching, research and creative activity, and service should be provided
  - All evaluators in the process (except the SEC), evaluate the faculty based on the Unit Standards, not criteria that is not articulated in Unit Standards
Please describe your experience on the committee (What information would you share with a faculty member who is considering service on this committee?)

Members of the Unit Standards Committee come to thoroughly understand the CBA and how their own Unit's Standards relate to the CBA. This is a great committee for understanding how other Units operate, what other Units value, and how faculty contribute to high caliber teaching, research & creative activity, and service at the University of Montana (and beyond). The work is intense, but the committee members enjoy working together and helping Units achieve transparency and compliance. Committee members also enjoy the collaboration between individual Units, the Provost’s Office, the UFA, and the Faculty Senate.

Submitted by:

Kimberly G James, DM
Associate Professor
Chair, Unit Standards Committee

4/30/15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Standards under Review</th>
<th>USC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Art</td>
<td>reviewed; meeting with Unit scheduled for 5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>not received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of HHP</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies Program</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of MCLL</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Chemistry &amp; Biochem</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Pharmacy Practice</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of History</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Library</td>
<td>reviewing 5/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>