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

**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.

**Revised CO-PEP addenda**

**Biology**

Ben and Deb revised based on feedback from PPBC and the department. The “one publication” criterion will remain, but will have the caveat that there must be substantial supporting evidence showing progress/achievement in research. The amount of additional evidence necessary will vary depending on amount of peer reviewed material presented. The addendum is still very long, but this is because there is a lot of repetition for each major section for ease of use. Unanimously approved.

**Geology**

The paragraph describing the requirements of a supermajority vote for matters of T&P/PTR and references to it has been removed. The date of last edit has been updated. Unanimously approved.

**Process of moratorium**

A degree program has recently been put into moratorium, and the process showed that we need established procedures. The CBA has language about closing programs, but not about moratoriums. This lies in the college’s purview and, as a matter of curriculum, is the responsibility of the PPBC to establish these procedures. The procedures need to meet state and university policies. An initial document has been drafted for review by PPBC. This could be modified include procedures related to placing an entire program into moratorium or other sub-units.

There was a request for a definition of terms, specifically “moratorium” (hiatus on admitting students, not closing or cancelling the program) and “program” (“degree program;” e.g., BA in Chemistry, Statistics, etc.) These terms should be defined in the document to avoid confusion.

The decision to place a program into moratorium is currently based on departmental voting procedures (either described in the College CO-PEP or in a departmental addendum). There was substantial concern that, if votes are based on a simple majority, small programs could be at high risk. Voting procedure should be clarified, and it was recommended that these types of voting procedures be included in each departmental addendum.

There was a request for the addition of a representative list of viable reasons for moratorium. Past experience has shown, however, that the reasons for putting programs into moratorium are highly variable and difficult to predict, so creating a representative list of specific reasons may not be feasible. Relatedly, it was suggested that there should be some requirement to communicate why the program is being put in moratorium. The proposed language includes that the chair of the affected department will notify affected parties (presumably faculty, students, staff, and other departments affected by the program) at least two weeks prior to the vote.

There was a suggestion that external input should be sought. This should include a requirement of input from staff and students, as well as affected programs (collegial consent). Some of this input could be from the public (alumni). The current document indicates that the meetings should be open to the public for comment (which is consistent with public access regulations).

In the event the proposed program extends beyond CSE, then this document would not apply and the University policy would be used.

This document should be ready to be implemented by Spring quarter, 2020.

It was decided that PPBC members should bring this discussion to their departments and solicit feedback. Meanwhile, the Associate Dean will edit the current draft based on this discussion.

**Budgetary advice from PPBC to Dean**

A suggestion was made to look at the charge of PPBC and make sure it still accurately depicts the role of this committee. Strategic planning and budgetary advice are part of the charge, and proposal review is part of budgetary advice. Because the language in the committee charge is not explicitly consistent with existing duties, language of the charge should be edited to clarify that we don’t have authority over specific faculty hires. Currently we can recommend hiring priorities based on strategic goals of the college. It was suggested that we revisit the entire charge, especially #4 (budgetary advice) to be consistent with the Dean’s planning and strategic plans and programmatic needs flowchart (“Process timeline for Planning – CSE”).

During the discussion about PPBC's role in advising the dean on budgetary matters (relating to PPBC Charge item #4), two council members were under the impression that last year, rather than disbursing funds tied a specific proposal, the Provost distributed a pot of money to the Deans who were free to allocate the funds how they saw fit, including for faculty hires.  The Dean said no, this was not the case, and that funds received were linked to specific funding requests that PPBC had already reviewed.

Andy Klein will write an initial draft of revised language.

**Update on building**

The Pre-Health building is in the early stages of design and has not yet been funded. Currently, however, $60M for construction is in both the House and Senate budgets. Scouting of locations for the building (south end of play field behind Biology) is underway. Much of the play field will become a parking lot to accommodate the new dorm in the upper 14G parking lot. Concern was expressed about the air intake for Chemistry building if a parking lot is used – lots of exhaust that will get distributed throughout the building.

Meeting adjourned 9:48 am