1. **Update from PGC/DCC (added to the agenda)**

Committee discussed formally accepting the recommendation of the PGC to consider the following programs for revitalization:

1. Park Management
2. Computer Applications
3. DMIS
4. Architecture
5. Photo
6. Engineering

They agreed to consider the whole meeting a discussion of this item and vote at the end of the meeting. The question about when the one year begins for revitalization. The group decided that it start when the ADC accepts the program for revitalization.

The PGC/DCC discussed that By-Laws section 1A include reference to ADC reviewing new programs.

1) **Review for approval minutes of 2/22 meeting.**
   
   This was postponed until next meeting.

2) **Review Core-Electives Document**
3) Review draft of questions to be asked of referred programs

Stephanie distributed a list of 38 draft questions this group could ask programs who are coming before the committee. Perhaps we could send the list to the programs to provide responses to either in person or in writing. Perhaps we could post the questions or responses. Perhaps we could break the questions into categories. Perhaps we could select fewer questions for the first intake session and then other questions for the workgroup period. Some of these questions are part of the program review form.

Perhaps we should identify the program problems first and then select specific questions that are pertinent to that. Questions 1-6 and 37 and 38 could be used for intake. The other questions are more detailed and could be part of the workgroup work. Perhaps a program cost question should be part of the intake process? Asking all 38 questions at the beginning might create a sense of inquisition that we don’t want to create.

Perhaps the secondary list of question could be provided at the beginning to request that they be considered guidance for the kinds of things we are looking for in their more general questions responses. Stephanie recommended that the questions be compared to the list of 11 criteria from the Program Discontinuance policy to ensure they are included in the question themes. Those 11 criteria are:

1. Projected enrollment
2. Persistence of students in program
3. Enrollment trends over 5 years
4. Frequency of course section offerings
5. Term to term Persistence
6. Retention/success compared to college avg
7. Efficiency
8. Number of graduates from program
9. Diversity of students in program
10. Affordability
11. Degree/certificate completion

We only capture persistence data for basic skills programs. We currently don’t have this data for other programs. Persistence captures how many students return for the next level of a sequenced program. We may need to ask Senate for clarification of some of these criteria, for example, persistence in number 2 and number 5 listed above. Do we have the college average for term to term persistence? We don’t need to ask questions about every single criterion mentioned above, but should consider the list above as a guide post for how to evaluate programs.

Leigh Burrill volunteered to organize the list of questions into categories and separate them into first intake and follow up work group questions. Leigh asked for input on the following:
• Projected demand in the future

Inge shared that we have software to provide current and projected labor market data. Kaee requested that for any CTE related questions, she be consulted. The specific list of questions for each program will not be developed by Leigh. These will be developed in a different way, perhaps by the workgroups. Jim expressed that the first step after we accept a program for revitalization, we need to provide questions to the program and then invite them in to respond to the questions. Perhaps we need one more week to work on the questions. Perhaps we accept the programs today and then inform them that they have been formally accepted and send them the 11 criteria from the Senate policy. Perhaps we can also send them the data Inge has put together for each program. This would provide them information to begin thinking about responses to the information. We could inform them that we will forward them a list of specific questions in the following week. Perhaps we inform them that, of the 11 criteria, we have data for the following criteria and are sharing with them.

Leigh recommends that we bring each program in for 15 minutes and indicate that the areas for consideration by the Senate are as follows (include 11 criteria). If we accept these programs for revitalization, the email might read:

*The ADC has identified the xxx program as needing revitalization on March 1st, 2013 and this process requires official notification. Please consider this correspondence your official notification.*

*The criteria for analysis per the Academic Senate are attached here. Also attached here are program-specific data and a copy of the ADC By-Laws.*

*Representatives from the ADC will work with your specific program on the criteria applicable to your program. We invite you to come at 10:15 on March 8th for 15 minutes to share your views in a statement and tell us how the ADC can be of assistance to your program.*

*From the Academic Directions Committee*

*(include Inge’s data sets, By-Laws and 11 criteria)*

This language approved by the committee.

We need to also send a hard copy letter along with the email.

Steve requested that we move forward with looking at the data for each program.

3) **Review Pat Fenton / Jim Henderson program cost tool**

Inge sent out the data last night. Not all members had a chance to print it out. Jim shared that the total programs costs compared to total FTES generated can be analyzed to see whether a program is cost neutral, revenue generating to support other important operational areas of the college or costing the college money to offer.
Cost can help us look at whether the program is carrying their own weight in the college. This would be just one factor in looking at a program along with many other factors including FTES, efficiency, program completers, scheduling practices, etc...

Jim’s cost information should supersede the cost information provided on the Spring 13 Cognos document distributed at last week’s meeting. The document from Pat Fenton does not account for actual costs of associate faculty so we should use Jim’s document as the data for the program cost. We will use this as one tool in reviewing programs.

4) Discuss data-driven possible program prioritization

Jim asked Inge whether the Fall 12 data is correct because there is a huge drop-off in enrollment in multiple programs in this semester. Inge took the questions from Kae, Gus and others regarding the data and put together a document demonstrating that the drop-off occurred college-wide. It is believed that this is due to the increased tuition from $36-$46/unit, repeatability limitations enforced, workload reduction. There was a drop of 20% in enrollment. The drop in enrollment statewide has been about 6% from 11-12 to 12-13.

Thuy shared that the reason DMIS spiked in program completions in Spring 2012 was that the program faculty contacted past students and asked them to file petitions for degrees and certificates and apparently that occurred. Some of these completions were by students who completed courses a number of years ago.

Inge shared a “Program Review Enrollment Summary Report” for all programs. There was a question about the Engineering efficiency in Spring 12, but Inge’s research found no errors/issues. The data is correct. The efficiency for cross-listed classes may not be calculated correctly for that semester because the cross-listed courses are not accurately accounted for; however, these per-class efficiencies are not part of the department level calculations. She recommends that the SOC or Thuy double check the loads.

In regard to students who complete a program but don’t need the certificate or degree, the question is why we are offering the certificate or degree and whether we need to revise our curriculum or move programs to Community Ed.

Leigh asked whether there is a CTE equivalent for the TMCs that could incentivize completion by students. Stephanie responded that unless employers require completion of a degree/certificate, there is no other way for us to incentivize completion and these programs in which students state they don’t need the degree/certificate, we need to examine why we are offering the program in the credit side of the house rather than Community Ed.

Inge asked the group not to use the Summary Cognos Reports that were distributed a few weeks ago as they are not as accurate as the Detail Cognos Reports. Kae asked if we can set a benchmark report for Cognos so the programs and we are using the same reports. Inge responded that we as a group should agree that our data is the benchmark and then provide them with the detail reports.
6) Develop plan and schedule for inviting program leaders to meet with ADC

Leigh made a motion to accept the 6 programs for revitalization. (Burrill/Kambeitz, S/M). 5 of the 6 programs were consistently under their plan in FTES and efficiency. Jim asserted that engineering appeared to be more accurate in their planning. Inge clarified that Engineering has not met their plan for the past 4 semesters. Spring efficiency for Engineering was 567 which seems healthy. AAS programs typically have one semester at a higher efficiency than another, so averages are important for AAS. Leigh cautioned the group against spending too much time rehashing the data review that has been discussed at PGC. Vote was 6 Yes, 1 abstention. The motion passes.

The Committee Chairs will send out the official messages to the programs.

Emails should go to Division Chairs and Program Leads.

   Stephanie will send emails to each of the Program Leads notifying them they will be called in March 8th. Stephanie will print out letters for Jim and Steve to sign next week and send to programs.