

## APT Meeting Minutes (2018-2019)

In addition to these meetings, APT also reviewed 4 mandatory and 16 non-mandatory promotion cases.

Also APT organized an information session on Community Engagement and P&T on April 3<sup>rd</sup> and organized a workshop on tenure and promotion on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Additionally, during this year a document was created to outline the responsibilities of the APT Chair. This is presented below.

### APT Chair Task Description

1. As Chair of Faculty Assembly EC Standing Committee, the Chair is a voting member of the EC and is expected to attend and participate in all EC meetings (EC meets 2 times a month). As such the Chair is also eligible for course release (one course) per year.
2. Work with Academic HR in late Summer/Early Fall to determine the number of mandatory and non-mandatory cases and obtain information including composition of their review committees. Review the list and come up with lead reader assignments based on principles of equal workload, no conflict of interest, and disciplinary backgrounds.
3. Organize kick-off meeting in Early Fall and Onboard any new/first-time APT members. Discuss with committee as to any changes in process to be adopted.
4. Schedule all mandatory and non-mandatory promotion review meetings. Take votes and ensure summaries are reviewed and uploaded to private APT shared drive for committee members to review and then to Campus Drive by deadline. Keep track of all APT deadlines and processes and connect with appropriate parties in case of issues.
5. Schedule continuous improvement meeting and get any process improvements voted by EC as necessary and share with Academic HR, Deans and Directors, and Program Administrators.
6. Work with Deans/Directors, Academic HR, EVCAA, EC, and Faculty Councils to “improve” the APT processes. Chair has the opportunity to take initiatives to improve the processes.
7. Organize and moderate workshops both on mechanics and processes of promotion and any special initiatives.
8. Prepare a summary of activities for EC (typically done in late May, sample is available on APT/FA website).
9. If not continuing on APT facilitate a smooth transition to the incoming chair.

## APT Meeting Minutes

October 26, 2018

Attending: Katie Baird, Erin Casey, Yonn Dierwechter, Denise Drevdahl, Anderson Nascimento, Jose Rios, Eugene Sivadas (Chair) and Beverly Berry (FA).

1. Members new to the committee were on-boarded and there was a discussion of the role of the APT Committee and processes (secret ballot, participating remotely, lead reader).
2. Lead reader assignments were made and agreed to by all members. Lead readers lead the discussions and also write the first draft of APT report for cases assigned to them. A sample redacted report shall be provided to the committee members.
3. The committee had a discussion on criterion to be used for early tenure or early promotion cases and what in general we expected to see from those cases. It was decided that each program/school will be requested to reflect on this matter and come up with clearer policies on the same. The key issues discussed were a) what is the bar for early promotion cases; b) colleagues are being asked to make a decision with fewer data points and what would make the case stronger and c) as stated in the T&P guidelines reviewers at various levels should make a case for early promotion. There was some difference in the perspective of committee members on the early promotion issue.
4. The committee also discussed the role of community engagement in the T&P Process (workshops will be scheduled on the same in Winter quarter) and the role of equity and inclusion in T&P cases (it was suggested that the EVCAA could also be contacted on the same).
5. The committee has scheduled a meeting to review the 4 mandatory promotion cases on November 19<sup>th</sup> from 3PM to 4:30 PM (Eugene will follow up with Academic HR on timely access to the files) and tentatively decided to tackle 6 more non-mandatory cases on December 10<sup>th</sup>.
6. The committee members were reminded to keep an eye out for any appointment cases or even "internal job re-classification" cases that would require APT review.

### Post-Script

1. Academic HR will provide access to 4 mandatory cases on November 15<sup>th</sup>.
2. EVCAA Jill Purdy provided the following information on equity and inclusion:

#### **Section 24-32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members**

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. In accord with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

**E.** The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and

international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

Please see <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432> for full context of the above statements. The Provost's office has expressed interest in ensuring that unit-level guidelines for appointment and promotion reflect the intent of the Faculty Code with respect to diversity and equal opportunity.

## APT Continuous Improvement Meeting Minutes

February 22, 2019

**Attending:** Katie Baird, Erin Casey, Mark Pendras, Denise Drevdahl (via zoom), Anderson Nascimento (via zoom), Eugene Sivadas (Chair) and Autumn Diaz (FA).

1. Discussions of what to do about discrepancies between deans/directors summaries of faculty discussion and faculty attendee perspectives regarding cases for promotion and tenure took place. The following improvement was suggested: Deans/directors will inform faculty attendees that a summary of this meeting is available (either on the shared drive or to be dispersed via email). Faculty will have 48 hours to respond with comments or suggestions. APT will update its guidelines to provide clarity on this.
2. Committee discussed a potential process to ensure APT sees the letters from deans/directors to promotion and tenure candidates. Additionally, discussion of faculty writing rebuttal to the summary was discussed. Committee members decided they will reach out to Mike Townsend to see how this is handled in APT at the Seattle and Bothell campuses.
3. Regarding the additional guidelines on “DEI” and “urban-serving”, committee members expressed concerns over how this will affect promotion and tenure cases for those who do not partake in community engaged scholarship. To address concerns and answer questions of campus faculty, APT will hold a forum to discuss what urban serving and community engaged scholarship means and how it counts at UWT.
4. The consensus among APT members present at the discussion was that APT member Associate Professors should recuse themselves from voting on Full Professor Cases that came before them. This can be discussed further with Jose and Anderson who were not present for this portion of the discussion.
5. Discussion of Lecturer promotion temporal factors resulted in the decision that individual units need to discuss these cases and take appropriate action amongst themselves. Committee members recommended that units discuss this issue amongst themselves and APT will also alert Jill Purdy, EVCAA to bring this up with Deans/Directors.
6. Early Tenure Criteria will continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis within individual units.
7. Committee consensus was to ask Yonn Dierwechter to serve as APT Chair for the 2019-2020 Academic Year if he is amenable. Eugene had shared a document that summarized APT Chair responsibilities via an email.

### Supplementary Meeting (March 5, 2019: Attending: Anderson, Denise, Eugene, Katie and Mark)

The meeting focused on what the topics should be for the April 3<sup>rd</sup> session on community engaged research and who should be invited. The committee decided after a detailed discussion that we should invite Provost Richards (or his designee), Chancellors Office (Mark and Jill) and all 7 campus deans/directors.

The topic should be How does CE count it T&P and How Should it Count? The objective of the session is to communicate clearly to the faculty and arrive at as much clarity as possible?

### Questions for the Session?

1. How does Community Engaged Scholarship Count in the T&P process at UW Tacoma. How do the EVCAA/Chancellor and Provost's office evaluate it?
2. Can a program/unit narrowly define the Urban Serving Mission and its applicability to T&P?
3. How does Community Engaged Scholarship go beyond service and how does it mesh with UW Faculty Code?
4. Whose responsibility is it to showcase and account for Community Engaged Work, is it simply for the candidate or do programs have responsibility as well?
5. Why should we align P&T criteria with Urban Serving Mission?
6. How is the quality of CE scholarship evaluated? Is it different from evaluating traditional scholarship?
7. What special burden does this impose on voting faculty, deans, and other administrators.

APT Meeting Minutes April 15, 2019 (Zoom Meeting)

Attending: Denise Drevdahl, Mark Pendras, Jose Rios, Anderson Nascimento, Katie Baird, Eugene Sivadas

Excused: Erin Casey (in class)

The meeting was held to finalize the revised set of guidelines that would be submitted to a vote of the EC.

The items that were previously reviewed were revisited and some modifications were made.

1. It was decided to make modifications to 1d. and 2J. insert "community engagement."
2. In 2 e IV, it was decided that if an external reviewer came from both candidate and school's list, the review committee should justify the selection of that external reviewer.
3. In 2 e VI, a table was added that would provide readers with a clear understanding as to which list an external reviewer would come from.
4. In Section 3, a few items were added to ensure accuracy and clarity in the Dean's summary of voting faculty discussion and faculty right to address any omissions.
5. In Section 6, the practices of the APT were clarified and especially the role of members from the same school as the candidate, role of members (even if from a different school) who had served on the review committee of a candidate, and the role of Associate Professors reviewing full professor cases.
6. In Section 7, a paragraph on Community Engagement was inserted
7. The Campus has an urban serving mission and highly values community engaged scholarship. Units are encouraged to clarify the role of community engaged scholarship in the P&T process. However, there is no expectation or requirement for individual faculty in any unit to engage in community engaged scholarship.
8. It was also decided that the APT Chair would send a letter to unit deans and directors and FC Chairs requesting them to
  - a. The nature of scholarship, impact and scholarly productivity can vary from discipline to discipline. Candidates who do community engaged scholarship have to meet the expectations of their scholarly community. Furthermore, community engagement has to result in scholarship that meets the expectations of their unit for those in the tenure-track. External reviewers play a critical role in assessing the quantity, quality, and impact of such scholarship. Candidates, review committees, and programs must pay attention to the quality, credibility, and expertise of those chosen as external reviewers and ensure that they can speak to the work with authority. A weaker set of external reviewers commenting on non-traditional scholarship may weaken the case.
  - b. Units are encouraged to clarify to the extent possible the various "acceptable" avenues for publishing community engaged scholarship especially if they depart from the traditional outlets of peer reviewed journals and scholarly monographs. It is the responsibility of the unit to identify such venues and also explain how voting faculty and

administrators can assess the rigor and impact of such work when disseminated through these non-traditional avenues.

**Addendum**

There was a question about whether to even include point 7 and whether to take that to the units. This item was put to an e-vote.