**PPBC Meeting minutes, 4/18/2019**

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

**Minutes from last meeting approved**

* Unanimous vote to approve from voting members present.

**Notes**

On May 9, Kendra Sharp (Professor of Humanitarian Engineering from Oregon State University) will be visiting to discuss EID policies and procedures at OSU. The OSU CO-PEP-equivalent has been a model for the CSE EID discussion and documentation. PPBC will meet with Dr. Sharp on an off week from 8:30-9:00 with her. Format of meeting is TBD.

**Process of moratorium**

4/18/19

There was good feedback from department faculty that was based on original document. Revised document sent to Deb Donovan by Ben earlier this week that addressed many of these concerns and the PPBC discussion of two weeks ago.

It was pointed out that this document needs to balance two needs: be able to provide actionable metrics to put a program into moratorium as well as protect programs from being put into moratorium without consensus.

The ACC handbook has very little guidance on this, as ACC’s role is not to determine program quality. The limited ACC guidelines have no role for the college in this process, and this document will designate CSE as the appropriate curricular organization through which these decisions must be routed.

There were several questions about who should be allowed input on the decision. Are students and staff included in the voting “unit”? No, because faculty must have control over curricular decisions and students in general do not have the large-scale vision required for such a decision. Only tenure and tenure-track faculty should be eligible to vote. Should student input be required? How would this be verified? How should student, staff and other input be included in decisions, given that they are not voting members?

Other questions arose about the discussion and voting procedure. What is voting procedure? Simple majority has been used in the past, but it was agreed that a supermajority of non-abstaining members is a good idea.

If there are two sides that are trying to retain a program or put into moratorium, there should be some way for both sides to present evidence and arguments. This could provide an opportunity for student feedback. The current document requires a discussion meeting only if a faculty member requests it. Anonymous voting should occur (with records kept as per Open Meetings Act). There should also be communication with and/or feedback from internal and external programs directly affected.

By the end, Ben suggested the following two-level process, both beginning with the same information and feedback process:

* The chair of the affected department will notify all affected groups (faculty, staff, students, other departments and external organizations that would be directly affected) about the proposal to put the program into moratorium and justification for this proposal. All of the recipients of this information will have 10 business days for response. All non-voting people (students, NTT, staff, other departments, and external agencies) will communicate to voting faculty (tenured and tenure-track).
* If there is no request for discussion resulting from this feedback, then the moratorium decision will be considered unanimous and consensus procedures will be followed. Consensus procedures will include modification of the program status through curriculog.
* If a discussion meeting is requested, then stage II procedures will be followed until a consensus is reached. Discussion meeting(s) will be held that will allow proponents and opponents of the moratorium decision to state their arguments. An anonymous vote will be held and records of the vote will be kept (as per Open Meetings Act). A supermajority (66%, rounded down) of non-abstaining voting members will be required. Once a supermajority is reached, the consensus procedures will be followed.

Ben will revise the existing document and distribute it to PPBC members for dissemination to faculty for comments.

There is no immediate rush on this, and we’re making good headway.

**Budgetary advice from PPBC to Dean**

**4/18/19**

Concern has been expressed about the role of PPBC in determining or providing recommendations for CSE budgets. Apparently, last year CSE was given money to increase student access, yet PPBC was only made aware of this through word of mouth and only after the allocation of tenure-track positions had already occurred. Similarly, three diversity hires (Physics, Geophysics, and Biology) were allocated last year without input or communication with PPBC (this funding came from the Provost, but allocation was conducted through the College). Should PPBC have played a role in how those position were allocated? Most of these types of decisions occur in the summer when PPBC is not in session, but this timeline can be changed. At a minimum, PPBC should have been informed of the decisions. The current charge of the PPBC includes “Advises the Dean on budgetary matters, including allocation of faculty hires,” and this has not been the case in these hires. Overall, the PPBC role in providing budgetary advice to the Dean has been rather distant.

Given the current positive relationship with the Dean, now is the best time to outline the role, authority and jurisdiction of PPBC. An annual meeting with Tonya (CSE fiscal officer) should be held to inform us and request advice on budgetary matters. Should this happen in the spring or fall? Let’s ask Tonya, but spring would be best so we can be proactive about decisions rather than reactive about decisions that have already been made.

Additionally, PPBC would like to receive information about budgetary matters that have passed through this committee to evaluate how our recommendations have been addressed. The DAC committee often has a strong informational component, much of which would be relevant to PPBC. Should the chair of PPBC also be a member of DAC? Or should DAC provide PPBC with meeting minutes as a communication tool? It was suggested that attending meetings in person would be more beneficial than relying on meeting minutes. This would be a lot of work for the PPBC chair, but perhaps attendance at the meeting would be optional based on the posted agenda. Regarding communication of results of PPBC recommendations, it was suggested that PPBC be cc’d on any notification of budgetary awards and procedures (proposals, hires, decision packages, etc.) that were considered by this committee.

Moving forward: Meet with Tonya to get info from last year, then meet to discuss what we think our charge should be.

* PPBC charge should be re-evaluated without the consideration of Tonya’s report
* Need to include language in copep (?) to require feedback from groups that PPBC has advised. Deb will look through the CO-PEP to see where this language should be inserted.
* Ben or Deb will look into what it would take to get a member of PPBC on DAC.
* PPBC will revisit this after Tonya’s report next week and discuss.

Meeting adjourned 9:26 am