PPBC Meeting minutes, 2/14/2019

Present: Deb Donovan (chair), John Gilbertson, Steve McDowell, Takele Seda, Andy Klein, Pete Stelling (scribe), Brad Johnson (Dean), Ben Miner (Assoc. Dean)

Also in attendance was the EID group: Robyn Dahl, Kevin Covey, Jose Serrano-Moreno, Kelly Yakuda (AS senator), Nina Tran (AS senator).

Minutes from last meeting approved
- Unanimous vote to approve from voting members present.

Comments about Internal Budget Proposal process
- In response to an email by Andy Klein, Brad explained the timing of PPBC review of internal budget proposals. This year was the first year of this process, and the timeline was compressed. The goal is that next year PPBC will be familiar enough with the process that it will be more streamlined and there will be more time for PPBC to provide feedback. It is important that PPBC members be familiar with budget proposal form their own department to help facilitate the discussion.
- Through email discussion and a memo to Brad, PPBC conveyed that all internal budget proposals should go forward, with two identified as “urgent” (SMATE and Introductory Math) and all others identified as “important.” This discussion included the feedback from AS senators Tran and Yakuda.

Discussion of EID in the CO-PEP
- The Equity, Inclusivity and Diversity (EID) committee has been investigating ways in which faculty can try to increase their efforts to support EID that would be presented in their dossier. Their work was largely based on adapting the documents obtained from Oregon State University to fit WWU CSE. The EID committee presented a 1 ½ page document including a table of suggested ways to increase EID and ways to measure the effect of these efforts. Several questions were raised, including:
  o How should the EID document fit into the CO-PEP?
  o How do we determine “satisfactory performance”? The CO-PEP states that faculty must address EID in at least one of the three portions of their dossier.
  o If faculty don’t currently study diversity in their research, how can this be included? One suggestion was to promote a diverse research group, perhaps by advertising for student positions in targeted venues
  o Questions about assessing classroom climate. Nina Tran suggested having other faculty host office hours for a separate class to preserve anonymity. Others suggested adding a diversity/climate question on student evaluations. Another suggestion was to establish anonymous email system for students to submit comments to instructors.
- Where do we go from here?
  o PPBC will review the document from the EID and determine what we do in our classes that are on this list
  o EID will add feedback to the existing list
Both committees will meet again in the near future to compare documents. The goal will be to create a final list that will be posted on the CO-PEP website, as well as send the final document to all faculty as a list of suggested (not required) activities and assessments.

**Departmental CO-PEP addenda**

**Geology**

- Current addendum includes a 2/3 supermajority for all votes to recommend or deny tenure. This is potentially in violation of the CBA. Stelling will confer with the Geology department and the Union to clarify. All other aspects of the Geology addendum are acceptable.

**Engineering**

- Engineering addendum has been extensively revised. Two aspects were discussed. The first regarded the description of teaching as the primary mechanism through which engineers are developed. The concern is that the term “primary” establishes a priority for this aspect of the job over research and service, and this could be in violation of the CBA.

- The process of evaluating faculty who conduct research outside the expertise of the evaluator has been changed. The current language states that non-experts do not have to submit a review of research outside their expertise. The concern is that this could allow evaluators to skip out on part of the review process.

Both addenda will be discussed further by email prior to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 10:01 am