Jim opened the meeting at 10:05 and welcomed Cheryl Hackworth. The committee introduced themselves to Cheryl. Review of agenda. No changes to the agenda.

I. Review ADC minutes for meeting of 2/8/13.

Minutes approved. (MS Juarez/Kambeitz)

II. Report to ADC overview of senate discussion of 2/12/13

Steve reported on the hour and 45 minute discussion on the Academic Directions Committee. There appeared to be a lack of understanding by the Senate as to what the ADC’s purpose was. There were questions about the scope, role as active or passive in program identification/rejuvenation, timeline, administrative role in identifying programs, voting role of PGC member. Senate voted to accept ADC By-Laws. Senate asked ADC to wait for PGC recommendations on programs to forward to ADC. The following day, the PGC recommended 4 programs and this week, they recommended 2 more.

Jim shared that there appear to be divergent views on the Senate regarding ADC. There appeared to be some desire to have close control over ADC. Jim and Steve will be attending Senate meetings to report out on activities. Steve found it puzzling that the creation of the ADC appeared to be an attempt for the Senate to distance themselves from the discontinuance process, but the recent discussion seemed to be an attempt to tightly control the process and these 2 actions are not in agreement. Jim shared that he and Steve will
continue to report back to ADC on Senate communications. Jim offered to send an email report to the ADC on Senate discussions regarding ADC.

III. Report to ADC on PGC recommendations forwarding programs for "rejuvenation" / "evaluation."

Leigh, the PGC representative, reported out on PGC actions. The PGC voted that there would be 3 criteria used to forward programs to ADC: low efficiency, low or declining enrollment, low completion of degrees or certificates. Four programs were approved for forwarding at the 2.13.13 meeting:

1. Park Management
2. DMIS
3. Computer Applications
4. Architecture

The language in the motions made to forward programs evolved from “revitalization” to “rejuvenation”. In the 2.20.13 PGC meeting, the following programs were forwarded:

1. Engineering (checking Engineering TMCs were recommended, specifically)
2. Photography

There was concern expressed about overlapping curriculum in some of these departments and a necessity to have these programs communicate with each other so departments are not competing with students. There is a Photoshop course being offered in 3 departments (CA, Photo, DMIS). There is also a Dreamweaver course being offered in multiple departments. Kae asked whether individual courses are being forwarded for review. Leigh clarified that programs are being forwarded, but that one of the areas of concern in these programs is overlapping curriculum.

Steve shared that Photo and DMIS will be meeting on Monday to discuss overlapping curriculum. There is already some indication that programs are simply trying to protect their turf. Gus shared that at SJSU, the majority of photo courses are upper division. Steve expressed that this is a point well taken and these are the kinds of questions we will be pursuing.

Jim asked how the process of PGC evolved in deciding which programs to forward to ADC. Leigh responded that PGC does have a sense of history of enrollment challenges. There is a wealth of knowledge in the group. Stephanie shared that through the normal enrollment management process, these 6 programs rose to the top in regard to appearing to need further review by ADC. Steve shared that the scrutiny that is being given to programs is much greater than 2 semesters ago. There is a much more rigorous enrollment management process in play now. Classes with low enrollments are being questioned assiduously and plans are being questioned tightly. Stephanie shared that Kuni has now introduced a process whereby the program enrollment plans now must be in alignment with actuals from the past.

Gus and Ann Marie shared that their Division Chair used to hold Department Chairs responsible for entering realistic numbers. Stephanie, Leigh and Steve shared that the new process allowed the PGC to easily identify those programs that are not planning realistically and are struggling with enrollment. Jim shared that the past frustration was that the actuals were never reconciled with the plans and is appreciative that there is now a process to reconcile. Jim also expressed concern with the changing class caps and the arbitrariness of
establishing any class cap. Leigh shared that Kuni has now changed the process such that only the Division Chair can approve any change in class caps. Jim shared that there has been some past concern with data and asked Inge if there is still concern with data. Inge shared that overall the data is clean. There are occasional questions and those questions are addressed on a case-by-case basis. There is not a systemic problem with data. Steve agreed that data issues are addressed immediately and the essence of the data is sound. He anticipates that the data will be challenged by programs, but he is confident that the data is overall reliable.

Stephanie urged the committee, if they are challenged with questions about data integrity, to respond by asking for the specific data point that is being questioned and commit to looking into any data questions that are being raised. The committee members shouldn’t accept a wholesale attack on the data as a defense from programs under scrutiny. Cheryl shared that the Senate had grappled with whether degree and certificate completion should be a measure of program health. Stephanie responded that Ed Code language sets out 3 criteria to determine CTE program health: labor market data demonstrate demand; nonduplication of other area training programs; program effectiveness as measured by employment and program completion data.

Cheryl asked for clarification on the terms “rejuvenation” and “evaluation” and why one term was used over another by PGC. Leigh shared that “evaluation” implied a somewhat passive process, where “rejuvenation” implied that there would be an active intervention in moving the program to a healthier state. Steve shared that he originally felt that “evaluation” was meant to determine the overall health of a program, but now feels the term “rejuvenation” allows for a positive approach to helping programs succeed. Jim shared that he feels we are here to help programs, support them. Steve expressed that, that being said, there may be a need to move some programs to a place that is not in their current form. We are not here to provide unlimited tutelage. At some point, we may need to re-envision what the program is. Max expressed that there is already some concern by faculty that this group is just a “discontinuance” committee, but he has tried to reassure them that the committee is committed to supporting programs to the degree possible.

Stephanie shared that this group is carrying out the will of the public as charged through Ed Code that all programs we offer have a demonstrated student need. Cheryl shared that it is important this group follows the Senate’s mandate regarding the discontinuance process.

Jim asked that we move to evaluation of data. Inge distributed an analysis of the 6 programs in question. Jim asked for clarification of the recent meeting in which Vice President Hay met with the Park Management faculty along with Dean Kobayashi and Division Chair Diane Hurd. Stephanie shared that there are some compliance issues in regard to the way some of their courses are being offered and scheduled. The course outline stipulates the total hours that students can/must be required to attend. There was a discrepancy between what was listed on the outline and how the class was being scheduled and Kuni brought this to the attention of the faculty and informed them of what the requirements were for offering. She informed Jim and Steve of this meeting to reassure them that her meeting was not superseding the work of the ADC.

Inge explained her document which is a summary for each of the 6 programs in regard to the following data points for Fall 2008 – Fall 2012:

1. Duplicated Enrollment
2. Unduplicated Headcount (number of individual students taking classes)
3. FTES Plan
4. FTES Actuals
5. Efficiency Plan
6. Efficiency Actuals
7. Program Completions

Jim shared some data questions for Spring 2011 from the Cognos report that was sent out by Stephanie. Inge noted them and will look into these data points. Steve recommended that we save the data specific questions for the next meeting or share them with Inge directly. Inge shared that there are occasionally anomalies and she would like to know about them. Kaee Min also wanted to know about the discrepancies in the Spring 11 summary Cognos – difference between bold number and non-bold number.

Stephanie explained the meaning of each of the data points provided. Jim asked for Inge to look into the Fall 2012 drop in enrollment from Spring 2012. Ann Marie asked when the repeatability regulations were implemented on campus. Stephanie responded it was Fall 12. Inge shared that tuition went up in Fall 2012 also, to $46/unit. Kaee also brought up that hba was removed from courses this year.

Jim asked committee members to review the data on this document and forward any questions to Inge. Cheryl asked whether we could get comparative data for the entire college. Stephanie handed out the Program Completion document. She also expressed that the college efficiency is 570. Stephanie will send the Core/Electives analysis document. Jim added that we should be looking at the difference between actual and plan. This is an indication of poor planning and inappropriate use of resources. Kaee would like to see the college average for FTES and efficiency. Inge shared that 570 is the average efficiency and that the college has historically made the efficiency or been close. Cheryl asked what has happened in the past when programs have not met their goal. Stephanie responded that there have not been consequences in the past for those programs that did not meet their goal, but those programs are now under great scrutiny by the PGC and some have been forwarded to the ADC.

Ann Marie asked what we can expect of programs to increase enrollment. Gus responded that he does all of his own marketing. He spends every Friday at local high schools, he holds recruitments, he interacts with parents, students. This requires work on the part of faculty to be visible to the community. Cheryl added that in Biology, the enrollment fluctuates, but the faculty are dedicated and create flyers, visit other classes, create displays and this outreach works. She has increased her enrollment in some classes by 50% through these efforts. Kaee shared that her program does the same. They put on fashion shows, sponsor them, puts flyers in fabric shows, do a lot of outreach. Max shared that the college has an advertising budget, but he is not sure how effective it is. We have the ability to advertise our programs, but it is difficult to get on the home page. Jim shared that whatever action plan is implemented needs to be funded. Leila shared that she is only here at WVC because of recruitment. She is from Kentucky. She believes we need to fund recruitment. She also believes that some teachers may not be advertising their classes.

Stephanie shared that every faculty member is paid for 78 hours of institutional work each semester. We need to hold faculty responsible for fulfilling this work and they need to take responsibility for conducting recruitment for their programs. Leila shared that she observes that many faculty appear to do little outside of teaching and even then, they may not be doing a great job at teaching. This is something that is not going to draw students in.
Jim asked if we are okay with going back and reviewing the data and forwarding questions to Inge. Any questions to Inge will be by midnight Tuesday. Questions should be copied to everybody.

Leigh asked if we have a timeline. When will we approach programs? Will we have task forces? Steve expressed this is the next agenda item. Jim indicated that there will be a task force per the By-Laws.

IV. Discuss process of committee division of labor in program revitalization

Jim shared that perhaps 2 weeks down the road, we will be working with programs. How do we want to do that? Steve shared that we want to give each of 6 programs due diligence. We have to find a way to prioritize and identify the higher priorities in regard to remediation. We need to do a full review and then invite the program faculty in to explain how they view the difficulty that got them to this place. We shouldn’t establish a set criteria that applies to each program. We should begin with the 3 criteria that PGC has set. We should do our review/research before we meet with the faculty so the session is not fact-finding, but rather a forum for the program faculty to share their information. We need to look at timeline because it might be foolish to go after all six at once.

Jim expressed that we need to take action to accept the forwarding of the 6 programs. We need to independently evaluate each program and determine if they warrant review. PGC has reviewed this data closely and Steve trusts the wisdom of that group. This group should look at the data also and prioritize those programs for review. Next week we will take official action on accepting or not accepting the referral from PGC.

Steve suggested the process of:

1. Reviewing the data for each of the programs
2. Inviting the program faculty in one at a time, in priority order (as determined by the group)
3. Task force work – development of an action plan

Creating this process would add transparency to our process. Gus asked how we will prioritize the programs. Steve responded that the data will reveal who needs to be reviewed first. Leila asked whether we should use program completion to identify the health of the program. Leigh shared that other criteria should be reviewed: efficiency, enrollment, cost. Engineering doesn’t have a high completion rate, but they are partly a transfer program. The Senate has asked us to adhere to the 11 criteria established by the Program Discontinuance Policy. Leigh cautioned against prioritizing the programs as it could be perceived badly and be divisive across campus. She suggests that we try to simply ensure we address each program this semester. Perhaps we need to have all the programs in over 2 Fridays.

Jim suggests that after the faculty visit, we allow about 2 weeks to create a revitalization plan. Steve expressed that he still feels internal prioritizing will be important to the process in regard to fairness to the program. Leigh opined that we have enough members to divide the work between our 12 members and conduct this process simultaneously for each program. The schedules need to be finalized by the end of March, so we do have some urgency in our timeline. There was discussion as to whether the program visits should be 15 minutes, 30 minutes, one hour? Gus shared that he could share his program’s challenges in less than 15 minutes.
Inge and Stephanie shared the following documents:

1. Spring 2012 Cognos, after Census
2. Spring 2013 Cognos, late start removed, cost per program – pay attention to the FTES revenue generated, not the cost of program – see next item
3. Full Cost of Programs for 6 programs from Pat Fenton – Pat has indicated that there may even be further program expenses beyond what was shared in this document, but this is a baseline.

Next meeting we will:

1. try to reach a decision as to which programs to work with
2. discuss possible prioritization of programs
3. discuss plan for bringing faculty in for visits

Stephanie will bring a list of draft questions for programs and will send out the Core-Electives document.

Meeting adjourned at 12:07.