I. Approval of meeting minutes of 3.15.13

Motion to approve (M/S – Louderback/Min). Minutes approved with redaction.

Max asked for an added agenda item to discuss meeting schedule.

II. Review of questions to ask programs

Gus expressed that the questions seem reasonable. They are not all applicable to all programs, but are good questions. Steve wants to make sure that we are not locked into a template and limited from asking other questions. We should all know that we should be asking questions that are specific to that program. This document is a great foundation for the group to agree on. Ann Marie shared that these questions are good guiding questions for programs moving forward. Others agreed that these are the types of questions that should be part of program review.

Kaee expressed that in her recent meeting with her assigned program, they asked questions on from the document, but also asked individualized questions and the meeting went well. Gus opined that the questions should be asked in a collegial manner that is meant to advise and inquire respectfully. Leigh shared that she and Patricia sent the questions to DMIS before they
met with them as way of providing them information to prepare for their meeting with them. They tried to approach the process with a respectful demeanor.

Steve expressed concern with a comment that this group should in any way be advocates for programs. He doesn’t want our colleagues to see us as advocates, but rather as resources. These programs already have advocates in their department and division chairs. This is a distinction that we need to be clear about. He expressed that there was a comment in a past meeting that we should be advocates and he missed that reference in past meeting minutes, but feels that we should not consider ourselves such. Max corrected himself and said that perhaps “advocate” is not the right term for us. Rather, we need to be facilitators. Steve responded that we may need to ask programs questions that they may not want to hear. Jim expressed that we can’t lose sight of the fact that we are tasked with revitalization. We can be helpful in identifying resources that are outside the program area that they can access. Jim is hopeful that all the programs can continue and expects to work toward that, fully knowing that there is a possibility that a fiscal emergency may be declared and we may not be able to retain all the programs.

He urges us to stay focused on revitalization. The group expressed that there is acceptance of the list of 12 questions.

III. Discussion of workgroup meetings

Jim reminded the group that we were all tasked with meeting with our group and starting to discuss an action plan. Leigh and Patricia reported out that they sent DMIS (Jean McIntosh and Heidi Diamond) a request to meet to identify weaknesses of the program and to discuss action plan. They proposed a meeting next week on Monday and expect to hear back from them. There was a question about who should be invited to these meetings. Steve expressed that any faculty member in the program should be invited to attend. Jim shared that the faculty in DMIS also have assignments in other areas.

Stephanie expressed that our committee needs to be clear with programs that we have a process that we need to follow and if program members indicate that they are not available to meet in a designated time, that is a choice they are making and they need to understand the seriousness of the process and make accommodations in their schedule to appear at these meetings.

Steve expressed that he initially didn’t have concerns with the scheduling, but after some exchanges with the faculty he is working with, he realized that there need to be some parameters set depending on the program.

Kaee expressed appreciation for Brian actually taking time out of teaching his class to meet with his workgroup. He has been very accommodating.

Jim summarized that there are varying degrees of realization of the seriousness of this process and perhaps some may need a reminder of the seriousness of the process. Patricia asked if Academic Senate is currently debating the timeline. Jim responded that the Senate discussion is about fiscal emergency
and that the action plan needs to be developed immediately and we need to see positive outcomes within the year. Ann Marie asked when the deadline is for the action plan. Steve expects that we will be meeting over the summer with our groups. We should have an action plan in place before summer. We definitely need to have a plan in place before the next scheduling cycle (in Sept for Winter/Spring 14 schedule). This will give us something tangible to provide the Senate in regard to program compliance with the action plan. Lance had indicated that ADC may need to have a report ready for Senate by September. This would include the action plan for each program. This gives us a timeline for this group.

Jim senses that Brian has a real sense of urgency for revitalization. Patricia shared that Brian has been very active in updating his curriculum.

We still need to assign Leila (student committee member) to a group.

Ann Marie and Max met with Architecture. It was a cordial meeting. This was greatly facilitated by Diane’s presence. Ann Marie took notes. She is going to send a brief meeting summary to the workgroup. In the meeting, they expressed the purpose of the workgroup. Diane had shared her experience on PGC. The workgroup talked about the PGC parameters of efficiency, enrollment and program completion. Soroush had brought to the group a document noting data points that were identified as incorrect in a meeting with Inge and were going to be corrected by Inge. Max had told the workgroup that they needed to work with Inge on data correction and not just provide their own assertions about data.

Jim shared that Tom Sanford had expressed concern about data accuracy and so Jim asked Inge to today’s ADC meeting, but she expressed that she needed time to meet with Tom and look at the data and then she could come to ADC to report out.

Ann Marie added that in a discussion about completion, the Architecture program is primarily transfer and students don’t need degrees and certificates. Ann Marie asked the program to find out the number of Architecture program transfer students. Stephanie expressed that we don’t track this data. Ann Marie further said to Soroush in her meeting with him that he needed to examine his degree and certificate and the number of units and the curriculum and determine if this is meeting student needs.

Max shared that Soroush expressed concern with the data. Max responded that any data concerns need to be specified and addressed directly with Inge. Soroush had shared that he is willing to change the degree and certificate to match the transfer requirements. Soroush had asserted that he has developed curriculum in the past which has not been submitted to the state and he has no control over this. Because Ann Marie and Max are not familiar with these issues, they couldn’t respond at the time.

Gus shared that his program has submitted a Commercial Music certificate to the state and has not yet heard back from the state. Kae shared that she has experience with a program never going forward to the state. Leigh expressed that this is relevant to our role vis a vis the program. If there is an assertion that there is a problem with curriculum submission, isn’t it our role to urge the program to find out what is happening with the curriculum. We cannot take on the role of managing all this minutiae. There is an urgency to this process and we need to be able to move forward. Jim shared that some programs
appear to be hoping that we will remove them from consideration when, in fact, the clock is ticking now and programs need to be working to improve. There appear to be a lot of pointing fingers by some programs and this is not an effective response to this process.

Ann Marie shared that she is hopeful that her group will get to a discussion the potential positive actions that can be undertaken to address success and program health. Patti has shared that we now do a transfer celebration and we ask programs to report who their transfer students are. There is a way to track who a program’s transfer students are. Soroush could be tracking who his transfer students are. He could contact the transfer center to seek data.

Steve recommended that we asked the VPI’s office for a report on the status of particular programs that have been proposed. Stephanie responded that she can get the information if each workgroup will send her the list of the specific degrees or certificates that are under discussion.

Stephanie and Gus shared that the Division Chair has not yet responded to request for schedule information for scheduling a meeting. Tom Sanford has indicated that he has concerns with data. Steve reported that Inge said she could work on the Engineering data questions on Monday. She has also expressed willingness to come to next Friday’s meeting. Steve sent an email last night to Tom recommending that he communicated directly with Stephanie and Gus moving forward.

Diane has been in communication with other workgroups for the Park Management and Architecture meetings. One workgroup requested regular meetings with their programs to ease the issue of scheduling. Patti and Steve sent an email to Park Management indicating that they would be conducting some research on the program and tasked the faculty with looking at labor market and completion data. They didn’t send out the questions, but will do so. Chris had indicated a willingness to come in on Fridays for their meetings in spite of the fact that he is not usually on campus that day.

Patti shared that at the AAS Division meeting yesterday, someone expressed that there was talk about fiscal urgency. Leigh shared that Lance said on Wed at PGC/DCC that there is a possibility that ADC will need to report out to Senate as early as September. Steve expressed that the Senate is having Ed Maduli, Brad Davis, and ACE come in to contribute to the discussion of fiscal emergency.

Kaeo and Jim shared that the Photo meeting went well with Janis Kea and Brian Tramontana. Brian shared that in 2008, he was called into the Office of instruction and told that he was on the “B” list and so since that time, Brian has been actively working on improving the program including writing curriculum and participating in numerous recruitment activities. The workgroup didn’t discuss enrollment and efficiency because Brian had already shared that problems with curriculum submission to the state had resulted in his low enrollment. The workgroup asked Brian what his plan for an ideal program would be. The group is meeting every Friday.

Steve expressed that programs will assert that if they have been asked to cancel their intro class, this has had a negative effect on the rest of their program. Steve wants to caution ADC from accepting this automatically as a rationale for the low enrollment overall for the program. This assertion needs to be approached with a critical ear. Programs may need to look at how they are offering their intro classes.
Perhaps they are offering too many sections of the intro course. This needs to be considered. Programs cannot expect to be allowed to offer numerous intro courses in the hope of capturing students if there is no history of healthy enrollment in that number of sections. Our goal is to set programs on a path to good health. We should not be asking programs for a wish list. We need to be grounded in historical data. Kaee responded that Brian appeared to be responsive to a request to plan responsibly based on maximizing enrollment and efficiency and based on historical data.

Jim shared that photography has gone through a shift from analog to digital. A shift needs to occur in the program to reflect that and the workgroup is working on this. Kaee shared that there is a curriculum overlap with DMIS in regard to Photoshop. Steve responded that we should use Max as a source of information on photo curriculum. He added that there is an overlap on the Photoshop classes in DMIS and Photo. Steve and Heidi have met to discuss. DMIS and Photo will be working together in the scheduling of Photoshop courses moving forward. However, low enrollment cannot be attributed to this overlap or to a single intro course. There has been time to work on these issues. Steve has expressed concerns to the Photo program in the past and not all of them have been addressed.

Max shared that the Photoshop issue is not the problem with the program. He believes that Brian will be coming forward with different solutions to the problems identified. Photo could temporarily agree to not offer that class for a period and put efforts into other areas, Max asserted. The curriculum overlap is not the problem. Steve asked whether questions to Max about Photo should be put forward here or in the workgroup. The committee responded that this discussion should happen in the workgroup arena.

Patti shared that the Photoshop class can fulfill an elective for GE. If it is marketing as a standalone, GE, humanities class (learn to make your photos better), it might attract more students. Right now the perception is that it is for Photo majors.

The CA program was assigned to Thuy and Cheryl. They are not present today to report out progress on the meetings.

Jim asked the DMIS team to work with the CA team to identify any further curriculum overlap.

He summarized that 3 programs have not met and 1 has not yet reported out. He asked the group what kind of schedule we want to set for completing the action plan and for reporting back to this committee. Stephanie proposed that this group consider meeting every other week to allow the groups to meet with their workgroups. Stephanie and Gus will not be here next Friday.

Patricia supported the idea of a blocked time to meet with workgroups.

The committee agreed not to meet next week. The following week is Spring Break. ADC will meet again on April 12th.

Steve expressed that programs should have an action plan in place by Sept 1 in the event that the Senate declares a fiscal emergency and we need to report to the Senate in September. There needs to be a recognition by the programs that they need to responsibly manage their enrollment to meet their efficiency goals. Each of us should make clear to our workgroups that it would be great for us to have an
action plan by the end of spring, but the drop dead date is week before fall 2013 semester. Jim expressed that we should plan to present the action plans to Senate at their first fall 2013 meeting. This will give the Senate a sense of which programs are working cooperatively.

Patti asserted that an action plan should have dates. Could we come up with tentative dates? Perhaps draft action plan due by end of spring semester. These plans need to be owned by the program owner and the program owner needs to understand that they are responsible for implementing the action plan. Steve expressed that, although we need some flexibility, having dates is a good idea and lends some urgency to the process. Others agreed that having dates is a good idea. Max shared that the action plan needs to be realistic. Jim added that some programs have expressed a desire to market their programs, but we have very few marketing dollars and this may be an unrealistic goal for a program if it is reliant on absent resources.

Tentative action plans due: (should include responsible parties, outcomes, due dates) Friday before finals week (May 17th, 2013)

We will present the action plans to the Senate at the first Senate meeting of the fall. Leigh is concerned with a proposal to have programs present their own action plans. This looks too much like the discontinuance process. She expressed confusion about the timeline. What has the Senate communicated about our process? What is the expectation of our report to the Senate in the fall. Jim responded that he believes the Senate will want to hear our progress on revitalization in the fall. Steve shared that all we will have to show in September is a plan and anecdotal evidence as to how the program is responding to the plan. This will be a status report. Steve agrees that we shouldn’t ask programs to go before the Senate in September. It may create a defensiveness.

Leigh asked what this group will do if we are asked to recommend programs to the Senate. Steve responded that we will be looking at the responsiveness of the programs. The programs need to have a year to remediate. If we have colleagues that are digging in their heels and there is a viable plan, we would bring that information to the Senate. We will not have the data on revitalization needed to make recommendations unless the bottom drops out of a program between now and then. Steve doesn’t see this body making that call given the lack of data we will have.

Steve expressed that the historical data on each program will be included in the presentations to the Senate in September. He expressed that he believes the administration wants to discontinue particular programs and he believes Lance would rather that the administration propose these programs for consideration. Jim expressed that this will create an interesting discussion. If the ADC recommends following the action plan and the administration recommends discontinuance, there could be an issue.

Max asked what the Mission process has been. Stephanie responded that Mission has a similar process and that of all the programs they worked with, one program didn’t cooperate and it was forwarded to the Senate and was discontinued.

Stephanie responded to comments about what the agenda of the administration is. She indicated that there is no plan within the administration to discontinue particular programs. However, just as has been
occurring in shared governance groups, there is a recognition that the campus is currently going through a reduction and possible consolidation and there is a recognition by administrators and others that we currently have weak programs that are using much needed resources and not necessarily being highly productive. Steve responded that he appreciated this perspective and understood the difficult position the administration is in in regard to needing to address budget concerns.

Jim asked for clarification on the communication we should have with programs in regard to action plan. We should request the action plan by May 17. The programs can work on it during the summer. We can be available to work with them during the summer. At the end of the summer that programs would write up and forward to this committee.

The committee agreed on this proposal.

Leila asked to be on the Engineering workgroup. She shared that some students have expressed that the Engineering program should not be discontinued. Kae asked if it is possible for Engineering to continue without a degree or certificate. Steve responded that this is one way to improve a program. You offer courses that are needed for transfer.

Stephanie is the contact for TMC questions. TMC completion can be used to count transfers from a particular program.

Patti looked at Park Management courses that are articulated. There are only 2 courses articulated with Humboldt. Programs need to expand their articulated courses.

IV. Meeting schedule

Not meeting next week. Next meeting is April 12.