

Summary of PCRRC process to move SPIA to CLAS.

Posted by Brian Robinson (co-chair PCRRC) and Michael Petersen (chair PCRRC),
April 27, 2013.

Phase 2.

The presenters of the SPIA proposal were informed that the process needed to go through the PCRRC on Feb. 6, 2013 and pre-proposal was submitted on March 7, 2013. The pre-proposal was complete.

Phase 3.

Before the pre-proposal was moved to a final proposal, John Mahon communicated strong dissatisfaction with the plan. A meeting was scheduled for April 12, with John and the deans, directors, and chairs of the SPIA proposal. The meeting was scheduled prior to submission of the final proposal to help resolve issues. It was well attended except that John could not make it and instead sent an email with his list of concerns on the day of the meeting. The full list was read and addressed point by point. John's letter and a summary of responses with the pre-proposal were posted on the PCRRC web page. The pre-proposal went to a full proposal, essentially as resubmission of the pre-proposal with proper cover letter as agreed upon at the meeting of April 12.

After the lengthy meeting of August 12 we did not propose to repeat the meeting in 10 days (as required for a public hearing), but rather that with proper posting it could be presented at the Senate Meeting of May 1. This was intended as a means to allow the proposal to be considered this year. John's comments were intended to stop the proposed move of SPIA altogether, with no suggestions for improving it, and given that during the meeting of April 12, the benefits of the plan were enumerated, we chose to move if forward. There has been a great deal of information exchange in the mean time with much of it posted on the PCRRC web page. At this point there has not been additional support to stop the SPIA proposal, beyond John's continued effort, but the issue has been raised as to whether PCRRC procedures have been adequately followed. This accompanied letters of support for the SPIA proposal from administrators of SPIA and CLASS and additional polling of SPIA cooperating faculty from both sides of the argument.

We want to make it clear that we are seeking an expedited Phase 3, lacking a formal public hearing (which requires ten days notice) but with extensive communication at the committee meeting of April 12 and posting of pertinent materials for discussion before the May 1 Senate meeting. We consider that John's comments have been fully presented, as part of the proper procedures of the PCRRC. We seek to expedite the process so that it will not be delayed until the next year, but with no intent to limit the already extensive communication.

We add that part of the problem stems from ambiguities in the PCRRC manual with regard to the decision to move a pre-proposal to a full proposal, resulting in uncertainty and delays on the part of administrators and the PCRRC. This is a problem we intend to address in the following year, but it is also one of the reasons that we do not want to unnecessarily delay current proposals.