PPBC meeting 05/26/22: Minutes

**In attendance:**

PPBC Chair: David Rider

PPBC Department Representatives present: Amy Anderson, Ying Bao, Andrew Boudreaux, Qiang Hao, Brian Hutchinson, Bob Mitchell, Amr Radwan, Dietmar Schwarz

AS Senate Representatives: Miriam Gold, Justin McGlone,

College Representatives: Brad Johnson, Jackie Caplan-Auerbach

Discussion Topics

1. Minutes from 05/12/22
	* Unanimously approved with minor changes
2. Chemistry COPEP Addendum
	* The council looked at an updated draft of the chemistry department’s COPEP addendum and a document that explained how the updates addressed feedback from PPBC. All of PPBC’s feedback had been addressed, except for a comment that the addendum could be more clear about procedures for individuals with 50/50 appointments between chemistry and other administrative units. The chemistry department had pushed back on this, noting that this topic should be addressed in the main body of the COPEP document.
	* It was generally agreed that the chemistry department was correct and that it is the main body of the COPEP where policies about tenure and promotion of individuals with 50/50 appointments could be made more clear.
	* The PPBC voted unanimously to approve the chemistry department’s COPEP addendum.
* Course Modality.
	+ Jackie briefed the committee. ACC wants *colleges* to come up with standards about when courses can be approved for alternate modalities. The CSE curriculum committee is reluctant to impose college-wide standards and prefers to allow the various departments wide leeway in deciding what their standards will be. The CSE curriculum committee has approved a draft version of a policy document and a rubric that would be used to evaluate whether a course modality change would be approved. The plan is to add a form to curriculog to allow course proposals and/or modality change proposals to address the standards.
	+ Issue with standards varying by department: One department’s decisions affect other departments. This is particularly an issue with prerequisite classes.
		- To address this issue it will be critical that departments be mindful that collegial communications are part of the process for making course changes.
	+ Accreditation: At a university-level, to maintain Western’s accreditation, we need programs to be at least 50% face-to-face. There will be a need to make sure that every graduating student has had at least 50% of their courses in person. Also, we need to make sure that specific departments (e.g. Engineering) are able to maintain accreditation under the new policies.
	+ Assessment: As part of the draft CSE standards document, in the preamble, one of the points mentions assessment.
		- The intention was for outcomes assessment for online vs face-to-face versions of the course. This could be incorporated into each department’s annual outcome assessment protocols.
		- Outcomes for online versions of classes should be made relative to historical outcomes, with the awareness that an initial dip in outcomes is to be expected for the first few quarters when faculty are adjusting the class to its online form.
		- Note that courses offered in different modalities may be difficult to compare directly. Online vs face-to-face classes may have different strengths that will be difficult to compare directly. Also, now that students are self-selecting what modality of class to take, classes with different modalities may well be serving groups of students. Differences in outcomes due to different modes of instruction will be difficult to disentangle from differences in the populations served by the two types of courses.
	+ Implementation: There was a question as to the feasibility of a department having a policy that says something of the form, “Students earning this major may take at most one of the core courses in the major online and are allowed at most two of the electives to be online.” Since course modality is a course attribute that could be tracked, it seems as if a program like degreeworks could accommodate this sort of policy.
	+ Timeline: Modality policies needs to be finalized this quarter, and PPBC only has one more meeting. Jackie will construct an email to be sent to David to be sent to the committee for dissemination.
1. College representatives for RSP RCA committees
	* PPBC received 11 applications for a total of 6 committee vacancies for CSE members. In addition, there are 3 at-large positions on the RCA council for which PPBC can make recommendations.
	* Using an algorithm designed to prioritize respecting applicant preferences, spreading the positions between the various departments, and putting more experienced people on the RCA council, David Rider presented a proposal for which applicant might be placed on each of the grant-related committees (Undergraduate RCA Grants Committee, Graduate RCA Grants Committee, Faculty Summer Research Grants Committee, Faculty Summer Teaching Committee, Small Grants Committee). PPBC approved these recommendations.
	* PPBC voted on which applicant should be appointed to the RCA Council. The applicant with the most votes was approved for the appointment.
	* With time running out, each voting member of PPBC sent an ordered list of their preferences for the three at-large positions on the RCA council. Results will be presented at the next PPBC meeting.