

Program Viability Committee Summary

Sept. 3, 2026, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – Zoom

Voting Committee Members:					
Lisa Hooper	Committee Chair	X	VACANT	Transfer Discipline Rep./At-Large Member	A
Kelly Cude	Program Review Faculty Chair (and/or MSE Faculty Dept. Chair)	X	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	A	David Vakil	Interim Asst. Superintendent/CIO	A
Jesse Vera	Enrollment Services /Counseling	X	Jason Hinkle proxy for 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 (Part-Time) Representative	X	VACANT	Assist. Superintendent/VP Tech, Inst. Dev. & Tech Computer Support	A
Tricia George	Curriculum Committee Chair/Humanities	X	A= Absent	X = Present	

Guest:							
Erika Torgeson	X	Dianne Avery	X	Jennifer Brezina	X	Monica Shukla-Belmontes	X
Chad Peters	X	Daylene Meuschke	X	Harriet Happel	X	Nadia Cotti	X
Clinton Slaughter	X	Dilek Sanver Wang (COCFA President)	X	Marilyn Jimenez	X	Paul Wickline	X

I. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 10:03 am.
2. Approval of the 5/14/2026 meeting minutes:
3. Approval of the Agenda

II. Discussion

1. Refinements to the Program Viability and AP process, Lisa Hooper
 - i. **Introductions/Announcements:** PV Chair archived the previous PV Shell and created new one. Some material was moved over. Lisa had all committee members do introductions.
 - ii. **Committee Composition Updates:** Erika was serving as counseling and/or student services representative. Jason Burgdorfer will continue as COCFA rep due to Dilek Sanver-Wang teaching schedule not allowing her to attend the meetings.
 - iii. **History of the Program Viability:** Due to accreditation findings the district was asked to create a process for the discontinuation of programs.
 - iv. **Programs Reports:** Currently programs are being asked to report 3 times. PV reports will come through PV in spring 27. It has been the experience that there isn't sufficient time for the faculty champion to report yearly, therefore Garrett allowed for programs to have some space in the form of milestone accomplishments.
 - v. **Programs on Hold:** Many times, programs are on hold as faculty haven't had time or the district hasn't secured the resources to start a program. There is concern with programs not making progress and how to assist programs. How can faculty draft a narrative to help explain the delay in starting a program.

- vi. **BP 7215 (Academic Senate Participation in Collegial Celebration):** At COC, the Senate and faculty have control of curriculum, courses and programs. The development of new programs in the BP does fall under the matter of reaching mutual agreement. A pause had to be made to include representation from administration such as VP of Information Technology, Executive Cabinet and business services. Initiation proposals are just proposals as the committee is not voting for budget approval.
- vii. **Proposed New Processes:** There is an idea of proposing a ranking system like the one the ASC uses. Programs can be ranked and placed in a priority order and at times some programs may not be selected based on the list due to funding availability. The suggestion is to recognize this, and any documentation created in the due process, so it is not implied that programs are randomly given priority. Perhaps less labor intensive or resource-needed programs can be moved up first.
- viii. **New Accreditation Standards for Programs (ACCJC Convening new federal regulation and the earning account):** There is a new accreditation standard and requires that students earn a livable wage in a career focus area.
- ix. **AP 4021 (PV, Initiation, Modification, Discontinuance, and Revitalization) updated in spring 2024:** Area C, states that all newly created programs will be considered pilot programs. There are concerns that if this doesn't work a program would be discontinued. The process of revitalization was created to assist programs who may not be moving in a viable way. Revitalization was proposed by faculty to address the perceived reduction of resources, for example if a program does not have financial support.
- x. **Program Revitalization:** The revitalization has expanded in scope however; it is not clear how the new scope is managed. Under Section 2, sub-section E the process of, "determining the appropriateness of a program initiation, modification, discontinuance, and revitalization" falls on faculty. This process also identifies problematic areas of the program. In this case this would trigger an ad-hoc committee. All must have a faculty champion that supports the proposal. A program requires a faculty sponsor and if a faculty member refuses it is not clear how this would be addressed.
- xi. **Committee Composition & Function:** There is no current student designee with ASG. Need to list the resource representatives that would be contacted. There is concern with listing an AFT part-time faculty union president as this may be limiting to all other adjuncts. Lisa agrees that that this could be pulled out of the AP and added to the operating procedures. The AP cannot be updated at this time as this is BOT approved.
- xii. **Ad-Hoc Committee Function:** It is not clear how a program revitalization process triggers an ad-hoc committee, if the PV committees' role is to adopt the standards and not oversee the implementation of the standards. A program revitalization process can be of concern if there is a single person department and that person is not in agreement with the process. The next step would be to trigger a program discontinuance. Once PV decides revitalization is needed, then an ad hoc committee could be put together to support the actual revitalization of the program and report back to PV. There are supposed to be standards for revitalization, however, those have not been defined. The PV implies that the committee is doing review of all programs. It should be informed via data and program review process.
- xiii. **Program Initiated in the 3-year pilot process could be recommended for revitalization:** This communicates that the committee wasn't fully aware of a program to continue with the revitalization process. In the past there were programs that have been approved with no discipline expert or subject matter expert. The committee was making recommendations based on incomplete information.

- xiv. **Hiring of Non-Faculty Discipline Experts:** Soon the district may be hiring discipline experts who are not faculty and the faculty would serve as the faculty of record. Could curriculum be borrowed from other CCC's to help move curriculum via the local processes. The suggestion is for faculty to work with Curriculum committee as curriculum from other areas is not written the same way as at COC.
- xv. **Development of a Dashboard to Support Planning and Decisions:** Daylene and her research team are happy to support development of a dashboard to support planning and decisions pertaining to today's topic, which can be integrated as part of the program review process. Right now, there is no flag or mechanism built into the existing PR module or data to alert faculty or PV to any areas that need attention. There are open-ended prompts but that is the extent right now. Another step is to have the committee go to the Senate with the needs for ad-hoc committee.
- xvi. **Final Program Reports:** The PV Committee makes a recommendation to the Senate. We need to do a better job of getting the full picture of getting a program to fruition. There is an interest in possible update the AP 4021 and this can be added to the list of policies to update.
- xvii. **Program Initiation Modification Form SP 2021:** It is suggested to update this form and not include both initiation and modification together. It is recommended that committee chairs review the form and provide feedback.
- xviii. **Program Splitting or Merging Proposal:** It is difficult to determine the criteria as to how the splitting or merging of a proposal should be approved. It can be challenging to determine based on national and regional standards or FTES.
- xix. **What is a department?** It is difficult to determine what constitutes a department. The department splits have all increased reassign time. The committee focuses on shared resources and collaboration. It may be beneficial for new departments to be paired with an existing department to provide mentoring. The chairperson is 100% reassigned at time. Currently there are 19 FT faculty on 100% reassigned time. There is concern that when departments get too big could they be split or assign co-chairs. The suggestion is to develop a criterion to inform these decisions. The revitalization process needs more refinement.
- xx. **Potential Department Criteria's:** This may include the number of faculty, dept size, FTES, workload on chair, any overlapping or similar MQs, shared facilities, equipment, lab techs, and if there are any faculty that already teach in multiple disciplines of a proposed dept. There needs to be mediation and formal resolution if there is not mutually agreed upon solution and there is much back and forth.
- xxi. **Next Steps:** Lisa will bring back documents with revisions to begin making some processes changes and have those approved this semester.

III. Adjournment: