Jim opened the meeting given that there was a quorum. We will be meeting every Friday except for the President’s weekend holiday Friday.

I. Review and approval of 1/23/13 meeting minutes

Motion to approve (M/S: Crumley, Yukawa). Approved.

II. Development of Academic Directions Committee By-Laws

There was a question about the draft language regarding fiscal emergency in Article I. There was a recommendation to go through the rest of the document and then come back to that language in Article I to reconsider. There was a concern expressed that the By Laws not be directed just at discontinuance, but also aimed at revitalization.

Article II – membership – there was a recommendation to add a rep from the PGC. There needs to be a place for programs to express concerns regarding their special circumstances in regard to their program. The PGC rep would be able to hear this information and bring it back to PGC. The PGC, as it stands, is not meant to vet all special concerns from departments regarding their enrollment. There was a reminder that PGC is essentially a faculty body.

Currently, Steve is representing Social Sciences and could also serve as the rep for PGC. When he leaves, there should be a rep from PGC. There was agreement that the group needs education from the PGC. There was discussion regarding whether the PGC rep should be a voting member. There was concern
that, if the PGC member is the DC from a Division in which an affected program is being examined, this person would have a vote in the matter and this might not be beneficial to the overall vote of the group. There may be some bias. There is concern that the PGC rep would be representing and voting on behalf of both PGC and their division and thus giving that division 2 votes.

The group was reminded that reps can separate their division of origin from their voting practice. It was expressed that the PGC rep could bring the expertise without having a vote. Mission College has a rep from the Division Chair Council, but not PGC. There was disagreement as to whether a PGC member should have a vote. There was motion to add PGC rep with full voting rights (M/S Juarez/Kambeitz). There was concern that a PGC member from a particular division would be doubling the representation of that division. There was a reminder that all members should be representing not just their division, but also the best interests of the College. Any member whose program is under scrutiny would need to recuse themselves. There was a reminder that any vote from this committee will be based on data and then moves as a recommendation to the Academic Senate.

Motion to add PGC rep with full voting rights approved (Approve/Against/Abstention: 7/0/1)

The role of the administrator on the committee will be discussed in the next agenda item. There was a concern expressed that anyone can identify a program for discontinuance. Once that process starts, it was asserted that the process should be owned by faculty. Having an administrator with a vote in the process changes the dynamic of that process. It was recommended to remove the administrator from the process. Recent developments regarding the contract in what is seen as an attack on the PGC have led some to want to see a separation of powers between administrators and faculty. Some administrators come and go, but faculty stay. We want people in the process to have a vested interest in the outcome of decisions. It was asserted that there have been some past decisions on program discontinuance made by administrators that have not necessarily served the college well.

If there is an administrative vote, there may be a view that the outcome is tainted. There was a reminder that asking faculty to make hard decisions about other programs can be extremely difficult, especially in the face of a faculty member from a troubled program who may be a beloved colleague pleading for their program. It was expressed that this week’s PGC meeting demonstrated that faculty do reverse hard decisions when they are pressured by the pleas of other faculty. It was expressed that an administrative vote can assist in making difficult decisions. Another expressed that the members of this committee are ready and willing to be autonomous and make the difficult decisions that need to be made on behalf of the college.

There was a recommendation to have an administrator present, but not give them a vote. This might be beneficial to those faculty with programs under scrutiny. They would be working with a faculty committee. There was an expression of concern that there is a history of faculty having difficulty making hard decisions. This group should be cognizant of that and be willing to make the very difficult decisions that need to be made. None of the members of this group were elected by their division and so do not need to feel they are beholden to their division to protect it. The members of this group are representing the best interests of the college.
There was a discussion about how Division Chairs are having difficulty making decisions on class cancellations and this indicates how difficult it is for faculty to make those difficult decisions. It was asserted that this is specific to class cancellations and not relevant necessarily to all hard faculty decisions. We have not cultivated a culture that trains students to register early.

At Mission, there were 2 programs in revitalization. One made the requested changes and the other didn’t. Because we are not making decisions about discontinuance, there isn’t a danger of being influenced by special pleading, it was expressed.

Amendments – there was discussion as to whether the By-Laws require language as to how the by-laws are amended and when. Do we need specific language regarding timing and process for amending the by-laws? Perhaps we need to allow ourselves the ability to amend the by-laws mid-year if needed.

(M/S – Kambeitz/Crumley) Motion to approve drafted By-Laws. Approved.

III. Discussion of role of administrative designee on Academic Directions Committee

This item was discussed in the previous agenda item.

IV. Development of criteria for review of programs in need of remediation/revitalization given current legislative/fiscal circumstances

There was a request to invite Inge Bond to the next meeting to discuss criteria and data needs.

V. Consideration of proposals of programs for remediation/revitalization

Steve shared that in the last PGC meeting, 4 programs were mentioned as needing discussion at Academic Directions. The ADC wanted to know the names of the 4 programs. The rationale was a history of underperformance. Division chairs mentioned repeated underperformance concerns. Jim expressed that we need to ensure we are using good data. Steve expressed that any programs that might be discussed should know sooner rather than later. Jim recommended inviting the new PGC member to the next meeting to discuss the criteria for recommendation for revitalization.

There was discussion as to what the expectation is for those who are recommending programs for review. Do they need to have a list of data that justifies the recommendation? Can they simply express brief rationale? The PGC meeting minutes will demonstrate what the concerns were with various programs in the PGC meeting.

If there is to be a PGC member, and if Steve fills that role and the Social Science Division member, he is willing to have just one vote. Others felt there should be 2 people filling these roles. Steve will communicate with PGC and his division regarding the need for another member.

Agenda for next time should include a review of the PGC recommendations.
Meeting adjourned at 12:05

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Kashima