College of Science and Engineering Policy, Planning, and Budget Council (PPBC) Minutes

February 29, 2024

Attendees: Dietmar Schwarz (Biology), Jay McCarty (Chemistry), Bob Mitchell (Geology), Amr Radwan (Engineering & Design), Brian Hutchinson (Computer Science), Takele Seda (Physics & Astronomy), Amy Anderson (Mathematics), Tim Kowalczyk (AMSEC), John Hardgrove (AS Senate), Jackie Caplan-Auerbach (Associate Dean), Janelle Leger (Dean)

Absent: SMATE representative (no currently appointed representative)

1. Councilors approved minutes from the February 15 PPBC meeting.
2. Councilors discussed revision to the AMSEC COPEP addendum to address introduction of senior instructor merit review, per the UFWW-WWU CBA, and other minor changes
   1. The addendum describes review procedures for NTT faculty with appointments of “0.5 FTE or greater” and with appointments of “0.5 FTE or less” within AMSEC; for clarity, the case of appointment equal to 0.5 FTE needs to be clarified as one or the other.
   2. Councilors recommended the candidate’s record of service to AMSEC also include service on behalf of AMSEC on college and university committees.
   3. Criteria constituting merit for senior instructor merit reviews were not clearly laid out separately from the regular senior instructor:
      1. The addendum should refer to the new COPEP language for what materials are required in the dossier, plus any materials that AMSEC additional requires.
      2. The addendum should describe the criteria for senior instructor merit based on the
      3. Curriculum development might be appropriate to include in the merit review
   4. Certain changes to the COPEP about the timeline for secondary department review of jointly appointed faculty are not accurately reflected in the AMSEC COPEP addendum and will need to be updated.
   5. The addendum uses “UEP” and “COPEP” at different places in the document. Councilors suggest being consistent with the use of one of these acronyms unless there is an intention behind using one or the other (e.g. review of faculty with a joint appointment and a secondary department outside of CSE).
   6. Addendum language about the “letter of offer” should be replaced with “contract letter” (or “contract”) as stipulated in the revised COPEP description of senior instructor merit review.
3. Councilors discussed revision to the CSCI COPEP addendum to address adjustments to expectations around service for faculty reviews
   1. The revision defines a “quarter-unit” of service and stipulates 18 quarter-units of service as an expectation for tenure and promotion.
   2. Councilors asked about the feasibility of ensuring that tenure-track faculty will have equitable access to the expected number of committee opportunities. Denial of the opportunity, e.g. due to a failure of the department to make space available on suitable committees, should not be held against the candidate. Concerns about the equity of the service assignment process and relative workload of committees were discussed thoroughly.
   3. Quarter-units at other institutions are “counted” in the current language as a protection for faculty recruited from other institutions pre-tenure, but Councilors also noted that assessing a quarter-unit of service at other institutions is potentially fraught.
   4. Councilors raised some concern about how the 18 quarter-unit “normal expectation” would need to be interpreted by the CSE Personnel Committee in cases where department faculty review the service profile favorably despite it arguably not meeting the 18 quarter-unit. Is “normal expectation” equivalent to defining a “standard”?