

Program Viability Committee Summary

February 18, 2021, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – Zoom

Members present: Garrett Rieck (Noncredit Faculty), Christopher Boltz (Theatre/CTE Rep), Lisa Hooper (Curriculum), Nicole Faudree (Business/COCFA Rep), Jason Burgdorfer (MSHP), Jesse Vera (Adjunct Counselor & AMSA Faculty Co-Advisor) & Erik Altenbernd (Humanities), Albert Loiaza (Counseling)

Guests: Harriet Happel (CE Dean), Marilyn Jimenez (Academic Senate Administrative Assistant), Kathy Bakhit (Dean, HPPS), Dr. Omar Torres (CIO, Instruction) & Rebecca Eikey (MSHP)

I. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 10:07am
2. Approval of 11/19/20 meeting minutes:
 - Motion to approve the minutes by Lisa Hooper, seconded by Chris Boltz. Unanimous. Approved.
3. Approval of the Agenda:
 - Motion to approve the agenda by Nicole Faudree, seconded by Albert Loiaza. Unanimous. Approved.

II. Action Items

1. Review Program Viability Forms: Program Modification, Initiation, and Revitalization
 - Program Justification Form: In addition to the two forms mentioned in this action item there is also a *Program Justification Form*. This form was created by both Garrett Rieck and Harriet Happel. This form requires a labor market report from the Centers of Excellence that Harriet then collects. Is it necessary to instead make this form as broad as possible as a faculty members may not get to the step of proposing a new program?
 - Program Discontinuance: Most of the questions are focused on how to continue or create program on existing forms but not many are about program discontinuance. If a program is cancelled how can students be supported? What will be the financial and academic implications for students? What will be the course substitution which will allow students to complete the degree? Perhaps these types of questions should be added to the form? This may require a separate form as there are usually only 1% of program that are discontinued.
 - Program Initiation and Modification: There was some discussion over how to make the forms more clear in terms of which form faculty should be using. The forms also have similar questions. It is preferred that the presenter enter information regarding how they think the curriculum should look like. However, many times faculty may not know. There was a question regarding ADT's and if information regarding CID's associated with the curriculum be included in the form? The form does ask if the degree is an AA/AS or AA-T/AS-T. There was a clarification that when there is already an ADT it is a re-packing of the existing curriculum. If the department is in support of this and there is no need for new curriculum and there are no new resource demands then this program does not need to come through Program Viability.
 1. Section 1: If a program is coming through that is not a CE program then the form may be confusing. Is there a need to have both forms?
 - a. CE Program Proposals: If someone is proposing a CE program then there is a need for LMD and Advisory Board Minutes.

- b. Non-CE Program Proposals: For non-CE program there may be a need to Institutional Research reports, similar program from other schools, CSU model Curriculum etc.
- 2. This can still be one form. There is some concern with faculty who have not gone through this process and with the time it may take faculty to collect evidence to support their proposed program. Depending on the program proposal it may require a faculty member to come through Program Viability several times.
- 3. It was clarified that both CE and Academic program are academic and to instead refer to the programs as CE and Non-CE programs. The following suggestion were made in regards to updating the forms:
 - a. Suggestion 1: Should there be a cover page which outlines a timeline, with check boxes, so people understand that it will require some time to prepare. This could help avoid a lot of time wasted with follow up. There have been some proposal which are very thorough and others are missing information.
 - b. Suggestion 2: It is recommended to not have general questions. Could there be an appendix where someone could enter the data or evidence for a CTE track or an Academic track program. This would allow for one form with appendixes.
 - c. Suggestion 3: It is recommended to outline in the form what a CE program needs vs a Non-CE program in list format. Could there be links to other required forms such as IR, or Centers of Excellence?
 - d. Suggestion 4: There many repetitive questions and there was a suggestion to eliminate duplicative questions on the forms. Should the questions from the Program Justification form be moved to the Program Initiation and Modification form?
 - e. Suggestion 5: Create a flow chart for a program approval process to provide for faculty which outlines all the steps. This can be send out via email.
 - f. Suggestion 6: To review past program proposal forms to see how they were completed.
- Center of Excellence (COE) Report Process:
 - 1. When a Centers of Excellence report is required Harriet will need to file a letter of intent with the Consortium which then allows the Centers of Excellence to prepare the LMI data.
 - 2. COC is in district 5 of LA County but LMI data comes from the region. This region include the North all the way to San Luis Obispo. There are times when Harriet will send the report back and request that data from northern and central LA County be included. Other times there are already existing stock reports which can be used.
 - 3. The region is requesting data which demonstrates that there is an undersupply in employment for a particular program.
 - 4. Once there is approval a program moves to Level 2 where specifics are inputted in regards to curriculum, advisory board minutes, other sources and data which demonstrates support. Then it will move to a recommendation report, CTE Deans will vote to either recommend or not. Prior to COVID-19 colleges were not concerned with having similar programs as many felt students would not travel to other locations. However, now all courses are online. There were some revision to

the Medical Transcriptions. There was a Dean from Ventura who voted against it as there was concern with having a similar program. However, all 7 Deans from other colleges can vote against it but it has no binding as this is required from the Chancellors office.

5. LMI from Advisory Boards will not be accepted. In regards to the Centers of Excellence there is only 1 person for 5 colleges. It imperative that only request be put forth that are necessary as there is a Letter of Intent required first. IT is important to what is being asked aligns well with the current resources and strategic goals.
 6. It is important to clarify for faculty that if they do not have the evidence they should not submit a proposal.
- [BP 4021 Program Viability Policy](#): There are sections in this policy that state that it may be required to include in proposals both qualitative and quantitative data. What is the purpose of the form? Who is the audience of the form? Is the form for the faculty proposers or for the committee? Is this for the region to have the data? Will the information on the form be used at the beginning, prior to LMI or at the end of a proposal? What are the stages and how are we helping to guide faculty? If there is one form which that create more confusion?
 - What percentage of program proposal have gone through the Centers of Excellence and are CE programs? There have only been 2 general education program which have come through Program Viability. It is estimated that over 50% - 60% of the CE programs have gone through the Centers of Excellence. Non-credit program proposal do not need a Centers of Excellence report but this may change in the future. Updates will now require for non-credit programs. SWF can help support non-credit. Should the form be designed for the 80% of the programs coming through or for the 20% of programs?
 - It was emphasized that there is now major de-emphasis on GE and BA programs and now more emphasis on technical CE certificates which can stack to a degree. It is important to be responsive to this as everyone comes out of the pandemic.
 - It is recommend that faculty have a larger discussion regarding their proposal and go through Program Viability rather than presenting 2 courses at a time to the Curriculum Committee. This is of concern and it is not clear how to have more faculty present to Program Viability. The process can overwhelm some and discourage from going through Program Viability. There are benefit with going through Program Viability as more resources can be shared and provided for programs.
 - Can an Administrator Initiate a program? According to the policy program can be initiation by the CIO, School Dean, Department Chair or an Academic Program Director. An administrator can initiate a revitalization. If an administrator has the support of faulty to do a program proposal then this is acceptable. There will need to be 3-5 faculty in support of this program or a faculty champion identified, as only faculty write curriculum. An administrator can initiate a program discontinuance as long as this is done with the support of faculty. There is also concern with a programs being proposed by an administrator and no faculty member has been hired. Once a faculty member is hired they may spend 1-2 years writing curriculum.
 - It is suggested to have all committee members review the forms on the CANVAS shells and add in their notes, comments and feedback. Garrett will work on the forms and the forms will return at the last meeting agenda of PV of the semester.

III. Adjournment: 11:24 am