The Unit Standards Committee (USC)
The objective of the USC is to look at the standards from an outsider’s point of view and from the perspective of a newly hired faculty member (.5 FTE and above). It evaluates the clarity of the Unit Standards in relation to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and makes recommendations based on elements that are unclear or do not reflect changes to the CBA that may have occurred since the Units’ standards were last evaluated.

The USC’s goal is to help Units refine standards that accurately reflect what the Unit values across rank and across the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

The USC reviews the standards to ensure they:
- Are consistent with University Standards (CBA)
- Address the general activities
- Address participation in general education activities
- Address all academic appointments to the unit covered under the CBA
- Specify, where appropriate, special standards and special procedures for the evaluation of individuals on grants, contracts, or other work assignments outside the normal academic activities of the unit, including but not limited to adjunct research faculty
- Guarantee peer review
- Ensure consultation between faculty members and chairpersons or deans before each individual recommendation is made final

The USC’s generalized feedback is summarized below. Please see the standards document for specific revisions.

Several elements of the standard as submitted feel more appropriate for a handbook for student and faculty evaluation committees. Such things as format, elements of the review and other details are not how a faculty member is judged.

The unit has left in a process that we are not convinced aligns with the CBA. A subsection of the School gathers in a meeting that is different from the FEC and applies standards only loosely outlined in this document. We asked that the School remove the 2.11. TEACHING AREA RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY section that allows this group of faculty to dictate performance in certain areas can equal a less-than-normal. We would recommend, instead a peer review of these duties that are included in the FEC evaluation of the service and teaching requirements currently included in 2.11. Obviously, a unit may exceed the CBA, but we are still concerned by this external review process.

More clarity could still be offered faculty members in terms of the unit’s expectations for promotion. While tenure is fairly well outlined, the standard does not offer much new detail beyond the CBA language about what merits promotion to Associate or Full professor.

Once the standards have been revised, please return to:
☐ the Unit Standards Committee, OR ☐ the Office of the Provost