THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA.

Academic Personnel Policy Committee

Faculty Center
1216 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721-0456
Tel: 520-621-1342
Fax: 520-621-8844
facsen@u.arizona.edu

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE
Faculty Center
1216 E. Mabel St. (PO Box 210456)
621-1342 (Fax: 621-8844)
facultycenter@email.arizona.edu

APPC Annual Report 2014-2015

APPC Members:
Leslie Ritter, Nursing/Neurology (7/14-5/15) **CHAIR**
Alberta Charney, Eller (8/13-5/15)
Trey Cox, ASUA (8/14-5/15)
Roger Dahlgran, Agricultural/Res Economics (6/10-5/15)
Alexander Karaman, GPSC (8/14-5/15)
Moisés Paiewonsky, Music (11/10-5/15)
Brad Story, Speech, Language & Hearing Science (7/10-5/15)
Richard Vaillancourt, Pharmacology (6/14-5/15)
John P. (Pat) Willerton, School of Gov't/Public Policy (6/10-5/15)

Three action items came before the APPC during the 2014-2015 year and are summarized below.

Action item #1: Should the Academic Personnel Policy Committee be the point of contact for academic personnel with questions concerning policy at the University?
Proposed by: Michael Brewer, past APPC chair on behalf of the Faculty Officers
Pros: Members of APPC are willing to field faculty questions regarding policy. All members feel that it is equally important to have all senate committee chairs or members field questions that might be applicable to their committee charge. Members agreed that a statement concerning where to find information and policy might appear in the bylaws before the listing of the individual committees and that the Faculty Governance website could reflect this information more clearly
Cons: All senate committees, not only the APPC, should be the approachable and accessible for questions from faculty.
Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members

Action item #2: Should Teacher-Course Evaluations be accessible to more than the instructor that is being evaluated and how should they be formatted?
Proposed by: Tom Miller, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and the Office of Instruction and Assessment.
Recommendation: The Committee supports the development of departmental questions on the TCE that would be used by all departments/units across campus in the teaching reviews of faculty.
Pros: The committee believes that newly developed campus-wide departmental/unit questions should come from a working committee who are specifically tasked to develop said questions. Members of APPC will/should review the proposed campus-wide departmental/unit questions, specifically because these questions are related to matters of performance review.
Cons: Attention should be paid to the number of questions developed; the Committee recommends that only two questions be considered. Attention should also be paid to having individual faculty provide input as to how the information from the evaluations is used by their departments/units. Finally, it was recognized that department/unit use of the information from these newly-devised questions should necessarily take into account the strengths/weaknesses of the existing TCE (e.g., low participation rate).
Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members.

Action Item #3: **Should Teacher-Course Evaluations policy language be changed to add the sentence, "Departmental reports also include the open-ended responses to TCE surveys."**
Proposed by: Tom Miller, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and the Office of Instruction and Assessment.
Pros: The Committee supports the development of departmental questions for use across campus for all departments that would be used in the teaching review of faculty. It feels that the actual questions should come from a working committee tasked to develop the questions. Members of APPC will look at the proposed changes to TCE questions/process.
Cons: The process defining the use of these open ended questions should be better defined before recommending a policy change to the Faculty Senate.
Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Ritter

Leslie Ritter
Chair, APPC