Room 1901 – President's Conference Room
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

1	Review charge, role, membership, and products.	Discussion
2	Review 2017 Governance Survey.	Discussion
3	Review recommendations for IP&B from PaRC/PRC.	Discussion

Andrew LaManque, Adrienne Hypolite, Bret Watson, Craig Gawlick,

) & /

Andrew noted that PaRC has directed this taskforce to consider the items approved in a
June 19, 2017

already requested a report on this but it should be discussed elsewhere as it is not within the scope of this committee's work.

There was further discussion on 'top 5 items' on the 2017 Governance Survey. Highlights of the discussion:
- There was a discussion about campus understanding of how the OPC process works. This includes the process for feedback. When a department puts in a request they should know when they will hear whether it will be funded and on what basis that decision was made. It was agreed that there was a need to increase transparency in this area and this was also mentioned on the governance survey. While PaRC did not include a review of the OPC process and timelines in its charge to IPB this year it was agreed that the OPC timeline is related to the PRC timeline and thus it made sense to talk about the two together later in the summer. OPC will also be working this coming year to examine their processes and make recommendations for change to PaRC.

Andrew reviewed the Theater and Math department programs reviews, along with PRC's feedback (which were included as attachments) so that the committee could get a sense of what they looked like. Theater received a red rating because of enrollment issues and Math received a green. There was discussion at PaRC about why Math received a green even though the student course success rates, especially for some subpopulations, are near or below the institutional standard. Paul from PRC noted that Math had addressed the issue in the program review and had outlined a number of interventions to improve student success.

The discussion then moved on the best way to impact change – how do we best support the department in their efforts to increase success rates. What are the institutional responsibilities? How often do we look back to see if what has been tried has worked? While PRC does look back at the previous comprehensive program review this is not systematic – perhaps a review of the metrics and goals from the previous program review should be included more formally in the comprehensive program review?

The group then began reviewing the proposal from the Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) to change the program review template, including the addition of an "Appendix" of best practices for creating a welcoming classroom environment. The group talked about the level of data provided and the need for additional coaching of departments on interpreting the data.

Only the first couple items of the SEW proposal were reviewed so the group agreed to continue the discussion of the proposal at the next meeting.

)

Andrew reviewed the data presented to PaRC last fall to support the faculty prioritization proposal. The data included trend information on student success and enrollment as well as a summary sheet on the trends using pluses and minuses as well as notes for those departments that had requested a faculty position. IPB reviewed the list of faculty prioritization positions from last year.

Discussion highlights:
- Current process has used many of the same data elements / criteria that are now incorporated in the out-of-cycle hiring prioritizations process.

- The process entails looking at program reviews for full-time faculty requests for this year. The number of new hires is based on direction from the district on the allowance of new hires (vacant and growth positions). Reminder that the list of position requests does not go to Operations Planning Committee (OPC). Instead, the deans and VPs review the list for ranking, and their prioritized list comes to PaRC along with relevant data and comments regarding how the prioritizations were made.

- There is no set formula was used for faculty hiring prioritizations so that the college has flexibility to adapt to changing needs. Departments do a good job of providing a rationale to argue for their needs.

- Even though last year was a year of transition in the Office of Instruction, the prioritization list was discussed multiple times by the Instructional Deans. A position in Graphic Design was ranked low and a new Library position received a high ranking. It did turn out that most positions ended up being replacement positions but that was after an examination and discussion of college needs.

    It was agreed last year to continue the practice that searches that were unsuccessful in