



to provide feedback to incorporate into the responses. Once those responses are submitted, the IPC subcommittee does round one of the ratings based on reviews of the submitted documentation and they also have access to the data via the Faculty Hiring Dashboard. There are additionally four impact questions that receive yes or no answers, based on that particular position: justification, compelling evidence, impact on the department, and if



Stated that they do consider that. That is part of the data set that is linked to one of the questions that faculty are asked to respond to. It is up to the faculty putting the request in to put that data in the request. Typically, that is something that is done. The committee also does have access to the dashboard. It is up to the committee member the extent to which they pull from the narrative or pull from the data.

Asked how the criteria is described in terms of what kinds of variables are used in the description.

Shared her screen and stated that faculty hiring is managed in the TracDat system. There are three narrative areas. There are a couple of sections listed such as department characteristics, data and trends provided by institutional research as appropriate, the specific number of a question while responding, the number of full-time faculty members in the department and in the past three academic years, part-time faculty FTE equivalencies in each of the past three academic years, LHE taught by part-time faculty and in each of the last three academic years, percentage of instruction taught by part-time faculty and in each of the past three academic years and then the number of FTEs generated. Those are the data points for the department characteristics that are being asked of the faculty member to discuss and add context to.

Stated that he wants to assume good faith because there were serious holes in some of those departments and lot of practical concerns. Not knowing any of that, he is somewhat concerned that the prioritization seems to reflect the trend in higher education of divesting from social sciences and humanities towards STEM, as if they are opposing priorities. Not knowing any of the background of this, all he can see is the list. He expressed concern about their potential participation in that trend.

The Orange Coast Senate sent Senator Alabi and himself to the plenary. They were able to participate virtually, which reduced the cost to the Senate somewhat. The Senate has one voting delegate and he voted on behalf of the Senate. The list of adopted resolutions is on the statewide academic senate web page. The list shows how the votes went on each of the items. He voted with the majority on every resolution. To see how he voted, look at the endorsed resolutions. They line up with his vote. With respect to the significant amendments, there was one vote on his part that was a variance with the majority. That was on a particular item with respect to an issue of equity concerning STEM. The proposal was to amend it to the acronym STEAM to add the arts. He voted in favor of that amendment, meaning that he voted in favor of changing the term STEM to STEAM on this particular equity issue. That W\*

they can understand how to be paid for that particular modality, any type of modality that is outside of all online or in person. In order to have it apportioned properly, they have to outline the structure of how it is taught. It was a



handbook updates will take from now through the next semester. There is no specific date yet. They are working with the VPI as per schedul

