Program Viability Committee Meeting Summary
September 13th 2018, 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
BONH 330

In attendance: Jerry Buckley, Harriett Happel, Albert Loaiza, Omar Torres, Chris Boltz, Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, Garrett Rieck, Lisa Hopper, Jason Burgdorfer

A. Routine Matters
   1. Call to order started – 9:09 am
   2. Public Comment
   This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Academic Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

   3. Approval of the Agenda
B. Reports
   1. <u>Technical Theatre Pilot Status Report: Year 1</u>
   Equipment ordered has arrived and installed. State has approved the curriculum.
   An example of the requirements that help to demonstrate success and challenges of the pilot program are provided in this report.
C. Discussion
   1. <u>Canvas Shell (a platform for committee's work, including proposal submission)</u>
   Members of the Committees have TA status. Others are students.
   All documents associated with a program should be listed with that program.
   Also have the Pilot status reports in that section. It is okay to have in as many places as possible.

   Discussion about how faculty will have access to Canvas for PV Committee. What is the process for access? Faculty will need to work with Deans and contact PV Committee Chair for access as "student" in PV. Those in the process will get examples of previous proposals as a "student" in Canvas. All the forms and information about the committee will be on a public site.

   2. <u>Pilot Status Reports & Tracking of Pilot Programs</u>
   How do we get accurate reflection of the program growth. There were specific prompts (success; curriculum; resources (equipment, staffing); barriers; next steps) that were suggested to include for example for year 1 pilot status for Technical Theatre.

   The issue with year 1 reports, is that there most likely won't be enrollment. There was an email with prompts sent in May to authors of new programs that can be used as template. We can then evaluate how well that template works after seeing the results of Year 1 pilot.

For programs that have been substantially modified, their year 1 report will look different from new programs, as there may be existing curriculum and courses being offered. There be a prompt related to status at start of year.

How do we get evidence per the AP for year 2 pilot status? PV Committee should support the program in the evaluation. We need templates, but concern about being too specific. For year 2, there should be more data in terms of enrollment.

For CE programs, there is labor market data that can referred to. There could be a table for CE programs for enrollment, certificates, with categories for students in terms of what they define success (skill building, degrees etc.). Why are the students taking these classes? **Should there be an intact survey for the students who initially enroll in these new pilot programs**? This could help with identifying data needed to help the committee to assess resources needed to support the program. For example, if enrollment is low, then is there a need for marketing? We could also do an exit survey.

In considering Transfer programs, there is similarity in terms of evaluating initial enrollment, and success with transfer.

There is an issue for example with quality of data Economic Development Employment (EDE) data. Is there a way to utilize data coaching to help with faculty who are creating these reports? **How does the Student Success Teams interface with the new programs?** Can the relevant data automatically populate in the template? Program Review Data could be used for this. Perhaps the template is "live" all year and a group could contribute to throughout the year.

There could be differences in the templates for CE vs transfer. It should be clear if the question is not relevant, to not answer it.

Year 3 pilot reports should include enrollment and demonstrate sustainability. The question is how to define "sustainability." Resource allocation determinations must be made with help from this committee through the pilot reports. The Year 3 should still include enough information to determine resources versus modification.

What is Defensible Program? Developed by Orange County Workforce Development. This brings the committee to consider Discontinuance procedures and evaluation of existing programs to consider substantial modifications. There is a concern as a system to maintain 'relevance.' How are programs' maintaining relevance?

3. Revisions to Board Policy 4021 and Administrative Procedure 4021 (Program Viability)
   Not discussed.

D. Announcements

Program Viability Committee Meeting Dates for 2018-2019 Academic Year

- October 18, 2018, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330
- November 15, 2018, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330
- February 21, 2019, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330
- March 21, 2019, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330
- April 18, 2019, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330
- May 16, 2019, 9:00 am – 10:00 am, Bonelli 330

Meeting adjourned: 10:05 am

The Program Viability Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. It is responsible for the evaluation of proposals to initiate, modify, or discontinue academic programs. The committee makes recommendations to the Academic Senate. Per the AP 4021, program initiation, modification and discontinuance proposals shall be submitted to the Academic Senate President no later than the eighth week of the fall semester.