Minutes from ATP meeting, March 5, 2010

Attendance: Zoe, Steve, Denise, Emily
Bob (excused absence)

Item	Discussion	Action
Comparing Checklists/Language re: Tenure and Promotion on VCAA, Human Resources, Faculty Code and By-law pages, and program checklists/pages	To ensure things are uniform, there should be (1) a checklist for the committee chairs; (2) a sample letter to be sent to external reviewers for the committee chairs; (3) a checklist of for the candidate at each program. All agree that by-laws need be changed: By-laws currently state that the annual review from directors is optional – should have annual/goal setting review letter and any responses. Any part of official review should be included in formal files. This includes 3rd year reappointment and all T & P cases. Clarify VCAA's checklist --- items culled together through the years by various Chancellors. Compared language on all three pages. Noted that the HR page doesn't address annual reviews. Should make it clear that the inclusion of annual reviews is mandatory. Should also make it clear that a letter from the director and the candidate's response should be included in the file. Discussed the importance of standardizing the language (i.e., "self-assessment - CV, narrative, etc."), so all units, directors and candidates are clear on what must placed in	Steve has all three pages (i.e. VCAA checklist, Human Resources webpage, and Faculty Code/By-laws pages); will make sure that the items required and descriptions of items required on the VCAA's checklist and HR page is consistent and in compliance with the Faculty Code and By-laws. Zoe will draft language for the EC so the EC can act quickly

	file. After VCAA checklist is re-arranged, should be something Beth should sign off on if that's what she wants. ATP's job is to make sure that this list is in compliance with Faculty Code and Bylaws (on-line at VCAA's home page + HR + Faculty Assembly Website + UW Seattle's website)	
Program Director - role in T&P process	Discussion about the role of the program directors in the T&P process - particularly at the point of voting for candidate's tenure and/or promotion. Decided that it is best that (1) program director either vote w/ faculty, NOT write the separate letter, and let the faculty letter stand for the unit itself. (2) OR - program director writes his/her own letter, NOT summarize the faculty vote (see #3 below), and CANNOT participate in the vote (3) perhaps - we should have someone independent (i.e. not the program director) write the summary of the discussion (*detailed* minutes) and have the faculty vote on that letter.	Questions as to whether the Faculty Code specifically states that the program director must write a separate letter. Should go to the EC about this issue to make sure that expectations are standardized and the T&P process is as fair as possible. ----- go to EC and talk about this. Director's letter is separate. Faculty Code -- go to EC? Or perhaps just go to the department and bring it up.....
Teaching assessment	Discussed different ways various programs handle peer reviews for teaching. Discussed that any changes to peer reviews for teaching must be handled at the program level. BUT, noted that, while the methods and content of peer evaluations may vary across programs, the Faculty Code clearly states that files must	Faculty ATP members should remind directors/deans that faculty members are to have separate, peer evaluations letters in their files, All of us must talk with our program directors about being in compliance with the Faculty Code. Also, we should remind our directors that the HR states that every faculty

	contain separate, annual evaluations adequately describing the teaching effectiveness of faculty. Specifically, the HR page clearly states that the letter must have an adequate analysis of any data (i.e., numbers) and cannot be written in too general terms (i.e., "the candidate is a good teacher.")	member has a separate, annual peer evaluation which adequately describes the teaching effectiveness of faculty member
Immediate EC concerns	We are out of compliance. The By-laws clearly state that we must have 7 members on ATP. This must be addressed immediately. Discussed need for good distribution of associate and full professors on committee. Discussed necessity of having more than 7 members on the committee (would require by-laws change), which would help especially in very busy years. Discussed need to increase the term from 2 to 3 years to, at best, keep organizational memory.	Ask EC to: 1) Comply with the by-laws and fill the two positions immediately. 2) Address the need for and fill the positions that show an even distribution of Full and Associate Professors 3) Address committee's request that the ATP committee have more than 7 members. 4) Change term from 2 to 3 years.