Policy Council Meeting Minutes
February 19, 2013
12:30 p.m., EBA 342

(Bold means Present; *Asterisk/Italicized means arranged a proxy*)
2/3 of elected members required for quorum

Jose Luis Alvarado (Dean's Office)	**Frank Harris (ARPE)**
Marian Aste (Lecturer Rep.)	**Audrey Hokoda (CFD)**
Elsa Billings, (PLC)	**Johnson John (SPED)**
Marcie Bober-Michel (LDT), Secretary	**Joe Johnson (Dean's Office)**
Nola Butler-Byrd (CSP)	**Patricia Lozada-Santone (Student Rep.)**
Luke Duesbery (STE), Co-Chair	**Randy Philipp (STE), Executive Member**
Nancy Frey (EDL)	**Brent Taylor (CSP), Co-Chair**
Jackie Fuller (Staff Rep.)	

Quorum was reached.

1.0   Approval of Agenda

2.0   Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 18, 2013

3.0   Old Business
Discussion/update about the state of RAT in the COE.

The PC chair yielded the floor to Dean Johnson to initiate the discussion regarding RAT policy adoption.

Joe: Dean Johnson noted that the College did not have funds to award RAT to every faculty, it would be ideal but not fiscally feasible. Our proposed policy does not look like policy from any other college, however, this allows us to try something that we may be able to implement and refine in subsequent years. He is asking that PC adopt a policy that can be implemented.

Joe: We might benefit from having a coherent policy across the college, he is not suggesting or adverse to there being some amounts of input and discretion from departments, he leaves that to the wisdom of PC members. Simple direct answer is that yes, we should be aiming towards a college policy. It may be that as we think about how this policy interfaces with a move towards department-based budgets next year, that will need to think about that some more. So, the dean acknowledges that we have different wheels spinning at the same time and that may be a bit awkward but he is suggesting that we have a policy that gives us a framework college-wide, we can figure out how to adjust department-based budgeting to adjust for that. Departments where there are a number of people earning RAT, should not be penalized for that.

Randy: one of the post placed that RAT is placing it within the context of RTP, is this body currently taking on RTP as well as RAT?

Joe: Long term, we should be thinking about the big picture...because what happens with RAT, should connect to RTP. If we are telling people that they are doing the right thing with regards to RAT, there should be some level of internal consistency with RTP messages. So, big picture, long term, its silly to ignore how these pieces connect. But, right now, the dean is saying that we need to act in a way that moves us off the dime now...I guess what he's really asking is an approach where he is asking PC to go with "Ready, Fire, Aim." He thinks that this group took this charge seriously, but quite frankly too much to ask for this short period of time. We are in this place that if we don't act, we don't give any faculty an opportunity to earn RAT for next year. He is asking that we adopt a policy as a pilot with the expectation that this will be looked at carefully and it will be adapted and modified for the following year...ultimately having a better policy.

Joe: intention to bring this at Spring assembly was not to keep folks from getting RAT, the goal was to give more people RAT. As of this time, it would be really hard to implement current policy for the Fall. His main concern is that PC adopt a policy now that will enable us to provide faculty RAT for next year. Hope is to maximize faculty engagement in research activities.

John Johnson: SPED is not wedded to the proposal that was submitted on behalf of the department. He would like to see the current proposed policy that includes a system that provides priorities. We need to move forward.

Frank: Strategic plan should be guiding what the funding priorities will be.

Randy: The Dean has several times highlighted the importance as to how we contextualize this going forward. This may be more important than the pilot policy itself.

Nancy: if we agree to vote in support of the proposed policy, then, maybe this group can develop some talking points about what it is that we're supporting.

John: The idea that this will be evolving and changing to support a culture of research and scholarship. If we can get that, ok, this is movement forward...it is not the end, but a step in the right direction. As resources become more available, maybe we can do more. That's the context that the SPED department was most concerned about.

Brent: let's focus the conversation on the actual document.

Randy: Let's put up the document so that everyone can see.

...conversation continued, minor changes were made and ultimately PC approved proposed policy.

Discussion ensued that focused on crafting the accompanying message on the ballot. Luke Duesbery will send draft ballot to PC members and once feedback is received, voting should be initiated within a week...or so.

4.0   New Business
No new business brought forward.

6.0   University Committee Reports
No Committee Reports presented at this meeting

7.0   Adjournment