PPBC Meeting minutes, 2/28/2019

Present: Deb Donovan (chair), John Gilbertson, Steve McDowell, Takele Seda, Andy Klein, James Hearne, Lynn Pillitteri, Pete Stelling (scribe), Brad Johnson (Dean), Ben Miner (Assoc. Dean), Nina Tran (AS senator).

Minutes from last meeting approved

- Unanimous vote to approve from voting members present.

Discussion of CO-PEP addenda

Discussion of biology addendum regarding the number of course evaluations required. Are evals required for all instances of each course, or just representative evaluations for each course? Recommendation to include definition at top of CO-PEP of “course” vs. “class”. Further suggestion to make all evaluations from each class required during the review period. Need to clarify review forms to define what “review period” means.

SALG evaluations (online Student Assessment of Learning Goals) – A question arose regarding the inclusion of these forms and if they are an acceptable substitute for standard WWU paper evaluations. Faculty senate has indicated in the past that these are acceptable. The process for including these results in a dossier wasn’t clarified.

Personnel committee feedback (Lynn Pillitteri)

Some teaching or research statements are as long as 15 pages. These documents should have page limits, preferably 6-8 pages with an 8 pg. maximum and no minimum for any single document. Additional guidelines for these documents may be necessary as well, such as suggestions to include a summary of practices, with only a small amount of detail about specific activities, etc. Considerations should be made for statements that contain figures and/or tables.

For research, the DOI number or equivalent should be included for all items published in the review period for all items that have them. These should be in the CV, and may not be necessary in the reflection statement.

There was discussion about how to provide evidence that conference proceedings were actually presented, and what the relative merit of conference proceedings are for individual disciplines. The committee suggests that departments should include explanatory text in addenda to identify these guidelines.

What is the role of P&T committee to determine candidate promotion or rejection, as opposed to evaluating the process that the departments conducted in their assessment of the candidate? It was suggested that the T&P committee’s role is to serve as part of the checks and balances of the process. The committee shouldn’t be evaluating the validity of the candidate’s research, for example, but they should review the letters from faculty and compare them to the candidate’s dossier and look for inequities or mis-representation, and making sure that the faculty were evaluating a candidate’s performance against a standard.
The T&P committee recommends that the departmental addenda should be as specific as possible. For example, “...these items could include the following four items...” What does “could” mean in this case? Are all four required? Two of the four? Just one of the four? Would zero be satisfactory?

**Suspended operations issues**

Campus closure during the recent snow days disproportionately and unfairly affected classified staff. In their CBA, it states that during times of suspended operations classified staff are not allowed to come to work, nor telework, unless they are considered essential personnel. Classified staff are able to make up missed work time with after-hours work, but they are not allowed to be paid in advance for that work. In order to receive a consistent paycheck, classified staff must convert vacation days (or sick leave if they have >176 hours of accrued sick time). With the reduced work hours, classified staff lost as much as 41% of their pay during the last pay period. Discussion about how to determine which personnel are considered essential, and what can be done to rectify this issue. No conclusion was reached.

adjourned 9:35 am