Steve introduced the 2 new members of the body: Leigh Burrill from PGC and Patricia Louderback from PE. The group welcomed them to the committee.

I. Review minutes for meeting of 2/1/13

There was a question about the statement regarding the 4 programs that were mentioned in PGC as needing discussion at Academic Directions. Steve and Leigh clarified that the PGC indicated at their last meeting that they had not taken a formal action to forward names to the ADC and so wanted to revisit the issue. The ADC did not discuss any specific programs last week.

The 2/1/13 minutes were approved as written.

II. Establish a metric / set of criteria for the ADC to evaluate weak programs

Steve has discussed with Frank Kobayashi one possible metric to use to analyze the health of programs in which you look at apportionment of a program and divide it by the ftef and full-time faculty costs associated with a program. This metric does not include the non-personnel costs associated with the program, but it is a way to immediately capture the revenue that is being produced by a particular program. Michael Renzi produced an elaborate document with the costs of each program. Steve has a
copy of this document from October 2011. Michael established a “break-even” point for programs which didn’t take into consideration non-personnel costs.

Jim asserted that we currently don’t always consider the full costs of a program. It is difficult to get at the full costs of a program. Inge clarified that Michael had produced a “cost per FTES” document. Steve asked whether this would be a useful set of data to share. The group said yes and the document was distributed.

Steve asked how many members have been department chairs and know how to read the Cognos reports. Ann Marie, Kaee, Leigh, Jim, and Steve have been department chairs.

5 semesters of Cognos data had been distributed last meeting: Spring 11-Spring 13. Steve asked the group how they would like to proceed in reviewing these Cognos reports. Jim expressed that there are some programs that don’t have a lot of program completers, but their courses are part of other department certificate and program completion. Stephanie expressed that the Core-Electives document captures this information. We can share that document at the next meeting.

Jim asserted that it appears that we will be called to forward names of programs to the Senate in November. What he reviewed is whether a program has languished for a while and if the program has been non-responsive to suggestions for improvement. We currently have programs that are less that 400 efficiency. We need to establish some criteria for analysis and prioritize programs that need our attention.

There are programs that have been at low efficiency over multiple semesters. Stephanie handed out a rough data key to assist the members in understanding what efficiency numbers mean in relation to enrollment. For example, a program with a 400 efficiency has about 22 students in a 3 unit lecture class on average.

Steve expressed that we will need some data points to identify programs and perhaps another set may be needed to revitalize programs. Ann Marie asserted that we should also consider that some skills need lower enrollment classes to teach that skill. Steve shared that there is currently an analysis underway to determine which classes have regulatory requirements for low ratio and other classes that have self-imposed limits on enrollment the rationale for which has not been determined. The District Enrollment Management Committee is addressing this issue and has identified the specific classes that have been identified as “exempt” and being allowed to be low-efficiency. Ann Marie asserted that there are pedagogical reasons that some classes need to be low-enrolled. Stephanie expressed concern that the rationale of “pedagogy” is being used for a justification for all lower enrollments without clear definition of that rationale. A simple analysis of the enrollments standards between 2 colleges, such as Child Development at Mission and Foothill classes, shows that similar programs at different colleges have different class sizes. Kaee asked whether the programs were teaching the same material. Stephanie responded that she hadn’t done a critical analysis, but found it interesting that there may be some questions in how class caps are set.
One member expressed that she has noticed that different faculty teaching the same class will set different class caps and this seems unfair. Another member shared that there can be a class cap for some disciplines in which there is a large workload for correcting student work. Another issue brought up is that facilities sometimes limits enrollment.

These facility constraints do need to be taken into consideration. The Fox computer classrooms are limited to 32. The question was raised as to whether there is any facility rationale for why a program might have an average of less than 25 students. It was asserted that we will be looking at a multitude of factors affecting programs. We need to look at data, but also other factors involved.

One member shared that there may be reasons of concern to look at, such as a faculty member continuing to offer a class that is under-enrolled every semester. If there is a major course that is offered every semester that is not filled, we need to look at curriculum, staffing, scheduling, and many other factors that might lead to this.

A member asked whether we should identify those factors ahead of time. The group determined that those could be raised on a case-by-case basis.

We have some criteria on the table thus far:

1. # of degrees/certificates completed
2. Efficiency
3. Cost of program

Others to consider: length of time it takes to complete a program – perhaps some programs take too long to complete for a community college.

A member asserted that we should disseminate the list of criteria to programs because many have not considered these criteria. Another member expressed that most programs are aware of their efficiency, approximate number of completers and approximate cost of program. There may be other factors that are generated by programs and this committee to consider.

Should we be considering transfer rates for programs? This data is difficult to get. This is why Inge’s support will be important. She will be able to identify which data points she can provide. Inge shared that most of the data we are discussing is shared in program review. Jim shared that having gone through the Court Reporting program discontinuance process, the data was in question. We need to use recognizable data sources that are available to all.

Ann Marie shared that some programs don’t give certificates or degrees. How do we measure those programs? Jim responded that we should be looking at multiple factors and use the criteria just as a starting point. Kae asked whether there is a plan to get the program specific transfer data. Stephanie responded that the TMCs will allow us to collect data on this.
What about Basic Skills? Stephanie responded that persistence data would be pertinent. Steve added that Basic Skills is part of the 3 primary missions of the state system. What if the data demonstrated low performance? Would we discontinue a basic skills program? Our discussion now is just to identify how to identify programs in question. Also, we are looking at data over time – a pattern. Should we be looking at comparative data with other colleges? That would be appropriate for a second level review of the program. We could look at other area programs and labor market data. We should also look at competition within our own college – multiple departments offering the same classes. That kind of situation will be looked at by Curriculum Committee moving forward when new courses are proposed. The PGC discussed that ADC should be reviewing this.

Should we also be looking at student success data? Kaee shared that some labor market data is not specific enough for some programs, such as fashion design. Student success data is tricky to look at. This can lead to a complex discussion related to academic freedom and other issues. Sometimes students are enrolling in classes for reasons not tied to education, such as insurance, probation, financial aid. This complicates the discussion. And there are so many students who are so underprepared who enter our classes. Multiple factors shape student outcomes. Perhaps we should leave the door open to have this discussion later on.

Can we look at the first layer of data first? There is one program that currently has low efficiency that used to have high efficiency. Students in that program are now going straight to the CSU to study in this area. This would be an area where we could look at the pattern and discuss and later drill down to the multiple factors. The high unit programs are causing some students to want to go straight to the CSUs to get their degree rather than taking a high unit certificate. Perhaps something has happened that has led the completion rate to drop. We would need to know the particulars. Perhaps those programs could be revitalized and assisted. Career programs are hugely affected by external factors. There is a constant shift in the enrollment for various career programs.

Should we be looking at Student Success Act factors to consider? This is the new reality. The public is no longer inclined to provide funds to higher education without rationale. Those career programs need to demonstrate need. We need to ensure that we all represent the whole college and not our specific divisions. While long institutional memory is helpful, we need to be able to document any claims about the past with data.

There is a sense that community colleges are now moving back to being “junior” colleges aimed at transfer. If we are going to start with the 3 criteria: efficiency, cost, degree/cert completers, we will need more data later. Can we get the Core-Electives document as additional data?

Jim offered to work with Pat Fenton on getting the total cost of programs. Steve and Jim will work with Pat and bring back information.

The group agreed on the following criteria as a first tier of reviewing programs:
1. # of degrees/certificate completions

2. Efficiency

3. Cost of program

Steve believes it is important to notify faculty in any affected programs as soon as possible out of fairness to the programs. This first layer of analysis/identification would be followed by a second layer of analysis. Frank’s idea of the rough idea of cost v. apportionment is a good metric to use. The group reviewed a document created by Michael Renzi on cost of program per FTES. It was noted that the Journalism and Drafting programs were discontinued.

There was a discussion as to whether this group should be considering whether anyone would lose their job in the process of our consideration of their programs. We can generally discuss possible outcomes of any potential discontinuance; however, we will not be using these considerations as criteria for reviewing programs. The members of this committee can be assisted in working with faculty who may have questions about possible outcomes. Faculty who have general questions about workplace issues should approach their union. It is not for this body to address workplace/union issues.

Are we moving toward discontinuance or revitalization? We need to look at both. Because of the budget realities, we have gotten informal direction that we need to be looking at both possible discontinuance and revitalization. There have been some programs that have been historically underperforming.

Both the Senate President and College President have indicated that there is an urgency to reviewing these programs. How are we proceeding with the programs in question? Are we working toward revitalization? How much time will that take? We will be looking at data now. We are working on a parallel track – looking at both programs that have languished and recommending their discontinuance and looking at programs that we determine should be revitalized. There was an expression of what was heard from a Senator and that the focus should be on revitalization. Perhaps we are getting caught up in semantics. The Senate President has said on multiple occasions in PGC that ADC needs to identify programs for possible discontinuance. We are being asked to identify multiple programs for consideration.

Ann Marie read language from the Academic Senate regarding “fiscal urgency” in the program discontinuance process. The Senate has not yet addressed this issue. The group was reminded that this group was created to revitalize programs in the best of circumstances. However, we are in a specific fiscal state and because of that, we are being asked to conduct the review for possible discontinuance. This is a balancing act.

III. Discuss w/Inge Bond the kind of data available for evaluating the health of programs

Inge and others confirmed that the 3 criteria data is available.
One member expressed that, if the Senate approves our by-laws, at our next meeting he recommended that we identify 4 programs for consideration. The group was reminded that anybody can refer a program to the ADC for consideration. We should move as quickly as possible to inform programs that they are under consideration. Is there any way to get 2010 data? Inge shared that for Fall 2011 and prior, there was a 1.5% margin of error for efficiency data given a change in how we coded classes. The group will continue to consider this data with that small margin of error in mind.

Steve made a motion to identify 4 programs next meeting using the criteria established today. (M/S Steve/Gus). Question: is the next meeting to identify the 4 programs or to wait for others to bring programs forward? One member is uncomfortable being the identifier. Isn’t PGC going to be the nominator? Steve reminded the group that anybody can bring forward a program for consideration with a rationale. Why wouldn’t this body identify the programs? Leigh expressed that she will ask Kuni to agendize on PGC a consideration of programs to forward to ADC. The process would be more powerful if the ADC, as a group, would use data to identify programs.

Is it the responsibility of the members of this committee to communicate with their Divisions about the workings of this committee? The minutes go out college-wide. Faculty should take the responsibility to read the minutes.

One member suggested that we look at our Cognos reports for the current and the last 4 semesters and identify programs that are below 375 efficiency. We will send out Census Sp13. Stephanie and Inge will work together to get a clean Sp13 document perhaps by next Thursday. Stephanie will send out the digital copies of the Cognos reports for the current and last 4 semesters.

Steve made a motion to look at all programs with 400 efficiency and under for next meeting. (MS Steve/Gus). Approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00.