PPBC Meeting minutes, 3/14/2019

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

Minutes from last meeting approved

- Unanimous vote to approve from voting members present.

Discussion of Decision Package Proposals (DPP)

Clarification from the Dean: The goal of this review is not to decide what goes forward and what does not, as this will happen next year. The goal here is to provide feedback to authors to help them fine tune the proposals and identify ways to best align with the strategic growth and goals of the college. Proposals need provide strong justification that they address core themes (CSE, WWU mission indicators) effectively. Revised versions due to Brad on Friday, April 5, then Academic Affairs the following Monday, then to UPRC April 10. UPRC will provide feedback to authors as well. Each stage is an opportunity for culling the number of proposals, but strategic culling will certainly occur next year.

Engineering Geology DPP:

This is a great idea that is worth pursuing. The committee was, however, very disappointed in the level of preparation. There are many question marks included in the text, suggesting this may be a draft version. Authors should highlight the actual request in terms of cost, number of positions, etc., ideally in a table format. The proposal also needs an estimated budget in table form. The discussion of how this project will address CSE, WWU core principles is particularly vague and weak. The committee wondered if a Director position actually necessary. If there is an MS program developed (which was unclear in the text), will additional TA positions be required? The committee strongly recommends removing the template text from the proposal as well.

Vehicle Systems Engineering Program DPP

This is a good proposal that seeks to replace and expand the outgoing VRI program. Asks for 3 new TT positions (two faculty, one director), also needs two technicians. Seems to be well-written and a relatively modest cost. The proposed program would add up to 24 students, which is a fairly large amount for Engineering. The proposal could be strengthened by adding specifics to the “Advancing Inclusive Success” section (although details were originally included but stripped from the proposal for brevity). Space for this program already exists, so capital request is minimal, which is a significant positive. This should be highlighted more in the text.

Manufacturing Engineering Expansion MFG E 2020 DPP

This proposal seeks to add and expand the robotics program in the Engineering department. Currently qualified students are being turned away from the program already, and there is >90% hiring rate for graduates. This proposal also does not require new space, and appears to be a “shovel ready” program. These factors should be highlighted more in the text. Otherwise, there were no significant comments to authors for improvement.
AMSEC Engineering of Sustainable Materials

This proposal seeks to create MS (either 2-yr or 4+1) degree in materials science and a plastics concentration in the Engineering Bachelor of Science degree program. Space is a very big issue, so this would need to be tied to a capital request as well. It wasn’t clear to the committee if this link to a capital request should be explicitly stated in this proposal or not. The project would require part of a new (or existing, occupied?) building, and this should be mentioned a bit more (without specifics). The request includes 4 Tenure Track positions in AMSEC (joint with other programs). It might be possible to call these positions as AMSEC faculty to ease the space issue concerns for the home departments, although there is no dedicated space for AMSEC faculty. The GUR aspect of the proposal should be strengthened and better tied into the rest of the proposal, as it seems to come out of nowhere currently. The GUR section is also the weakest explanation of the three main aspects in the proposal. Additionally, EID are ultimately going to be a required element of any DPP, so that should be added. It wasn’t clear how many new TA positions would be needed.

Discussion of Biology and Geology CO-PEP addenda

Biology addendum: The committee suggested that this document should be shorter, or summarized more concisely in order to help the T&P committee. It appears unlikely that this will be possible given the concerns of the Biology faculty.

The committee expressed concern that only one publication during the review period is required for promotion. It was explained that this is largely due to differences in access to research materials and equipment in various sub-disciplines. The committee suggested adding wording that requests evidence for a high quality publication record if it is particularly sparse.

The statement of EID requirements and the associated list (pg. 6) should be revised to allow for new, innovative ways to show commitment to EID efforts that don’t appear on the list.

In the description of teaching and research statements (pg. 3), it is unclear what applicants are being asked to provide. Should there be a general statement of teaching goals, and then a separate statement of teaching development? A suggested change to the wording to “…the statement could include…” would satisfy the intent of the Biology department of allowing this information to be included in a single statement.

The requirement of including graded student work in a candidate’s dossier was also questions. The addendum language should include a requirement that these documents should be anonymized or permission should be obtained from the student.

Geology addendum – Department will delete requirement for 2/3 supermajority. Updated addendum will be emailed to this committee for review. Previous discussion indicated that the Geology addendum would be approved if this language was removed.

adjourned 9:58 am