

Program Viability Committee Summary

September 25, 2025, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – Zoom

| Voting Committee Members: | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Lisa Hooper | Committee Chair | X | Kathrina Almero-Fabros | Transfer Discipline Rep./At-Large Member | A |
| Erika Torgeson | Enrollment Services/Counseling | A | VACANT | ASG Student Rep. | A |
| Jason Burgdorfer | MSE, COCFA President | X | | | |
| Jaya George | Health Professions | A | Administrator Voting Members | | |
| Jennifer Paris | CTE Rep/ECE Rep/SBS | X | Dr. Thea Alvarado | Interim Asst. Superintendent/CIO | X |
| Jesse Vera | Enrollment Services /Counseling | X | Erin Tague | Assist. Superintendent/VP of Facilities | X |
| Karl Striepe | SBS/Transfer Discipline Faculty | X | Jason Hinkle | Associate, VP, Business Services | X |
| Ruth Rassool | Humanities (Adjunct)/AFT Designee | X | Jason Hinkle proxy for Dr. Jim Temple | Assist. Superintendent/VP Tech, Inst. Dev. & Tech Computer Support | X |
| Tricia George | Curriculum Committee Chair/Humanities | X | A= Absent | X = Present | |

| Guest: | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------|---|----------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Clinton Slaughter | X | Jennifer Brezina | X | Paul Wickline | X | Dr. Monica Shukla-Belmontes | X |
| Dr. Daylene Meuschke | X | Marilyn Jimenez | X | Chloe McGinley | X | | |
| Harriet Happle | X | Nadia Cotti | X | Cyndi Trudeau | X | | |

I. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 10:02 a.m.
2. Approval of the 5/8/2025 meeting minutes:
 - a. **Special Thanks:** Lisa gave special thanks to all who have served on this committee. As a reminder the current Academic President or designee is to serve as the Program Viability chair. Lisa also previously chaired the committee.
 - b. **Brown Act Meeting:** Lisa feels the committee should continue to serve as a Brown Act.
 - a. **Proposal to split the Counseling Department:** It was decided that the notion of the department split, and the intent didn't meet the requirement. The group is now meeting to discuss and negotiate the non-instructional area and how this will operate. This item will need to be returned to the Program Viability Committee and the Academic Senate for formal acknowledgement of the proposal withdrawal.
 - b. **Motion** to approve the meeting minutes by Thea Alvarado, seconded by Jesse Vera. Unanimous. Approved
3. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Motion to approve the agenda by Erin Tague, seconded by Ruth Rassol. Unanimous. Approved.

II. Discussion

1. **Introduction**
 - a. Lisa had all committee members introduce themselves and share a bit of their background.
2. **Responsibilities/Goals of the Committee**
 - a. The [Program Viability Committee Training slides for Fall 2025](#) were presented.

- b. **Purpose of the Committee:** The committee reviews the viability of the campus programs. The committee will continue to discuss program initiation but there is concern with the implementation timeline. There may be a need to rank new program proposals like the staffing committee ranks faculty position proposals. There may need to be some discussion of what is realistic for the next two fiscal years as we have no new revenue coming in from the state. The committee will continue with discussions relating to the modification, ratification and discontinuance of programs as well as receiving reports from programs currently going through the Program Viability cycle.
3. **Relationship between PV and Curriculum committee:**
- a. If a program has two new credit courses being proposed and there are no additional resources needed the discussion occurs in Curriculum Committee. If the proposal includes three or more new credit courses, then a proposal must come to the PV committee. If the proposal has four or more new noncredit courses and/or there is substantial human, physical and/or financial resource needed the discussion occurs in Program Viability. Types of proposals include:
 - I. **Substantial Modification**
 - II. **Categorical Modification**
 - III. **Nominal Modification**
 - IV. **Revitalization:** A proforma form is submitted to the PV committee to evaluate and assess the programmatic health and viability of a particular program.
 - V. **Discontinuation of Programs:** This pertains to academic programs but also references “discipline”. It is not clear when “discipline” would be discontinued; this probably requires a revision to the AP.
 - VI. **Focus of the proposal Forms:**
 - 1. **Career Education (CE) programs:** These proposals will include an additional prompt to satisfy CE program requirements regarding labor market data. CLE and LMI reports. A substantial modification can be recoding of a program. The state is moving away from TOP codes and moving to CIP and SOC codes using ONet.
 - 2. **FARE Form:** This was needed to capture the capacity for all physical resources. This is a necessary piece of all initiation proposals and could/should be part of substantial modifications and revitalization proposals.
 - b. **Pilot Program Reports:** Lisa is not in favor of “pilot program status” for programs going through PV other than newly initiated programs, as this may communicate that a program could be going away.
 - c. **Budget Pro Forma & Breakeven Questionnaire:** Faculty need to input their program title. There are questions regarding whether this is a 1- or 2-year program. How many TLU’s per course will be needed? If each course has 3 TLU’s, are there 25 students in the cohort? What are the number of courses per year? Are there 3 courses in the fall or in the spring? How much revenue will the new courses bring in or are we enrolling in existing students? Will this program generate new FTES? What type of degree will students earn?
 - d. **Financial Expenses on the Form:** The second part of the form includes expenses, such as how much FTE reassign time is needed? How many TLU’s are being taught by adjuncts? How many TLU’s are covered by the above faculty? Will there be a need for

an administrative assistant, additional lab techs or coordinators? Are there marketing materials or college assistants needed? Is there a need for equipment?

- e. **Proforma Summary:** All revenue is calculated into the form using the Student-Centered Funding Formula. In addition, annual net gain or loss (which may create a cost and then generate review in the following years).
- f. **Ranking of Program Proposals:** It has been the practice of the committee to take each proposal in order and evaluate the merit. There may be a need for a ranking of prioritization.
- g. **Follow up on the FARE Form Request:** Is there a way to go back and confirm what was predicted such as projected and actual demands? This information may be needed to provide this for guidance to the program. There is a contingency for 10-20% for the scope of the proposal. If it is for an area that has not been done before the contingency will be higher. There is a need to be very conservative in those numbers. There will be many CE programs that won't show a profit but there may be a need to develop guidelines on how much a loss is allowed. The FARE form is a piece which helps in making decisions, it is not a final decision. There is a holistic conversation that needs to happen with the prioritization of resources.
- h. **Human Resource Representation:** Lisa would like Human Resources to attend and explain the difference between a professional expert and a short-term faculty member. How is an expert brought in to help shepherd curriculum.
- i. **Upcoming proposals this semester**
- j. Lisa provided a list of upcoming proposals for the semester and asked Harriet to coordinate with some of the faculty leading the proposal for other CE programs.

III. **Adjournment:** 11:30 am.