

# Program Discontinuance

Sample Procedures  
From

Foothill College  
Glendale College  
Hartnell College  
Modesto Junior College  
Santa Ana College  
Santa Rosa College  
Santiago Canyon College

Assembled by CCCCIO and CCCAOE  
December 2003

In the Chief Instructional Officers Forum at the fall 2003 conference of the California Community College Association of Occupational Education, a group of instructional administrators identified the need to share good practices in program discontinuance. The discussion yielded a number of criteria identified as considerations for program evaluation:

- Number of students pursuing that particular educational goal, based upon actual enrollment "behavior" rather than student declaration
- Labor market information
- Comparison of WSCH to cost
- Currency of course outlines and industry standards
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Outside accreditation issues (Nursing, dental, etc.)
- Core indicators – skill attainment, completers, job placement, nontraditional
- Consultants – industry experts, present analysis to Board of Trustees
- Program viability plan / program improvement plan (First Aid)
- Validation study – objective team members
- Faculty retraining
- Political issues – how to mitigate
- Regionalization – distance education or other regional strategies
- Program Review and Two-Year Review to monitor efficacy of programs
- Services to students trying to complete a program scheduled for discontinuance

Pursuant to this discussion, CCCCIO surveyed its members to identify which colleges had a policy or procedure in place for program discontinuance. Of those who responded, most stated that some kind of system was in place. Several samples are attached.

Another useful resource document is "Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges" published in the spring of 1998. It can be found at the Academic Senate website at [http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers/Program\\_discontinuance.html](http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers/Program_discontinuance.html)

Our first purpose should be to see if a program can be revitalized. Sometimes, that is not possible, while at other times market demand for the program may evaporate. Since the basis for decision making is most constructive when we are not faced with urgent budget restrictions, it is hoped that this information will bring colleges closer to having a sound policy in place.

Edmund H. Buckley  
Santa Rosa Junior College  
President, CCCCIO

Kim Holland, Ph.D.  
Citrus College  
President, CCCAOE

# Foothill College

Excerpts from

## Roundtable Guidelines

*Adopted April 17, 1996, revised June 4, 1997, February 4, 1998, October 7, 1998, September 22, 1999, March 9, 2000, November 1, 2000, May 2, 2001*

**PURPOSE:** To advise and consult with the president on college-wide governance issues and institutional planning from a mission-based perspective.

**OBJECTIVE:** To insure open communication, genuine involvement before and while decisions are made, and inclusive participation.

**METHOD OF OPERATION:** Standard meeting agendas would allow a brief period for open hearings from any member of the college community on appropriate items. Meeting agenda items would be annotated and posted for non-members to be informed and know when to come to participate if so desired.

### **MEMBERSHIP**

1. Appointed members are representative of the respective missions. There will be three members per mission, with the third member being a student.

Transfer (3)

Career Education (3)

Basic skills and ESL (3)

Student Outreach and Recruitment (3)

Student Development and Retention (3 from student equity, counseling, health, psychological, or tutorial services)

Appointed membership is by the College President in consultation with the presidents of the academic and classified senates and the ASFC. Appointees who are faculty will be submitted to the Academic Senate for ratification. Student members will be recruited college-wide by ASFC, or by any other means, each Spring Quarter as Mission-based positions are available. All student candidates will be asked to fulfill the same application process as other Mission-based members which should be reviewed by ASFC (which will compensate student participants) and recommended by ASFC for appointment to the Roundtable.

Appointments will be made in the same manner as for other members.

*Footnote:* Student members will attend any additional mission-based committees, such as the Vocational Education Committee, at their option.

1a. Appointed members are expected to represent their respective mission to the Roundtable and to a larger constituency in the college. This larger constituency will be sought through Open Forums on each of the missions and from which a list of "burning issues" will be developed.

2. Ex officio members are members of the Roundtable by virtue of their respective positions:

President of the ASFC Students

Foothill Student Trustee

President of the Classified Senate

President of the Academic Senate

representative from the FA

representative from the MSA

representative from SEIU (Foothill steward)

representative from CSEA

co-chair from the College Curriculum Committee

Director of Economic Development or Dean of Career Education

Director of Multicultural Relations

Vice President of Educational Resources and Instruction

3. All members are required to participate in an orientation and background readings before participating.

4. Membership term for the appointed members is 3 years, non-renewable. Mission based members' terms will be staggered between members.

5. Additional ad hoc resource members may be added as needed, for example, during an accreditation self study.

### **OPERATIONS**

1. The Roundtable will operate through consensus rather than vote whenever possible and appropriate.

Consensus is used because not all votes may be weighted equally if an issue affects one particular group or area than another.

2. To assure open and fluid communication, each Roundtable agenda will begin with Open Hearings which is an opportunity for anyone within the college to appear before the Roundtable to share an item of interest, an issue, or information.

3. Each action item on the agenda will be preceded by at least one hearing on the item at a previous meeting.

4. Anyone in the college community may submit an item for an agenda.

5. In this new mission-based governance structure, it is important that the Roundtable reinforce the distinction between policy and governance decisions and operational decisions. The chair will decide whether the item will be information only, information and ultimate action, or other resolution. However, if there is any disagreement then the chair will consult with the Roundtable, or Roundtable members may ask for a consultation to take place.

6. Action items approved by the Roundtable will be taken by the chair to the responsible groups or party to implement the action. For example, some policy recommendations may go to Chancellor's Council, others may be referred to the appropriate administrator or college body for implementation.

7. In the interest of streamlining and decentralizing decision-making and eliminating bureaucracy, the above operational guidelines are meant to be only guidelines and not immutable.

## EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Educational Resources Committee is a subcommittee of the College Roundtable and is empowered to formulate recommendations to the Roundtable in the areas of personnel and funding allocations. Normally, Educational Resources Committee members are also Roundtable members joined by a representative of the Institutional Planning Committee.

This working group is chaired by the Vice President of Educational Resources and Instruction and is charged with the development of initial resource allocations as per the Roundtable Guidelines.

## Guidelines and Procedures for Funding New Programs

*Developed by Educational Resources Committee  
Approved by Roundtable March 9, 2000, May 2, 2001*

The following policy linking program review and resource allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

**Policy Linking Program Review and Resource Allocation:** Requests for resource allocation or resource redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study. Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document. Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information. The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on both the Educational Resource Committee and the Budget Task Force. The Educational Resources Committee recommends the following guidelines and procedures for funding new or expanding programs or initiatives:

1. Divisions or program areas identify new programs, significant program expansions, or other initiatives, which would be viable, and meet emerging student needs. This identification could be based on program review, changing demographics or workforce needs, developing technologies, etc.

2. Institutional planning (program review) data or a planning document must accompany funding requests.

3. Funding sources could be one or a combination of the following:

A. Divisions would absorb start-up costs.

B. Project funding would be requested by placing the new program on the Budget Allocations Model for one-time funding.

C. Deans or program leaders could write a rationale for permanent "B" budget funding, to be submitted to the Educational Resources Committee for approval.

4. Actual funding may proceed through A-B-C above, as the program is instituted and evaluated.

5. Funding would follow the normal procedure for ongoing College allocations:

The administration will develop a decision making timeline and will receive the prioritized budget

augmentation requests from Division Deans, Senators, and Roundtable members. The Educational Resources Committee will review and develop a proposed list of budget augmentations. The administration (primarily Vice Presidents) will review the proposed list of budget augmentations.

The administration will report back to the Roundtable (including a first and second reading) with a rationale of how the proposed budget augmentations meet campus goals and "Guiding Principles", and hear final input and suggestions. The College President will make final budget augmentation decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

6. The new program will undergo program review at the earliest reasonable time.

## Guidelines and Procedures for Reducing or Eliminating Funding

*Developed by Educational Resources Committee*

*Approved by Roundtable November 1, 2000*

This procedure is parallel to the one for providing funding. NOTE: This procedure assumes a timeline which would allow the process to unfold. In an emergency, the Cabinet and/or Roundtable could take immediate steps.

1. Faculty, staff, students (where appropriate), and division deans will be requested to submit possible cuts in programs and services for review by the Budget Task Force and Educational Resources Committee.

2. Program review data will be provided when available, and applied if useful and appropriate.

3. The Educational Resources Committee will review the proposed budget reductions and forward recommendations on each to the Cabinet.

4. Summary notes should be included showing the impact of the cut on campus/student needs, campus goals (including *Partnership for Excellence* goals), and consistency with the "Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Ongoing Budget Augmentations".

5. With this information, the President's Cabinet will develop a proposed list of budget cuts.

6. The Cabinet will report back to the College Roundtable, (including a first and second reading) with a rationale for the cuts and a probable impact on students, and proposed listing of fund restorations to be implemented when the funding exigency has passed. The Roundtable will offer final suggestions and recommendations to the President.

7. The College President will make final budget reduction decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

## Guiding Principles for Determining New Full-Time Teaching Faculty Positions

*Developed by Educational Resources Committee*

*Approved by Roundtable November 1995*

The following policy linking program review and faculty position allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

**Policy Linking Program Review and Faculty Position Allocation:** Requests for faculty position allocation or faculty position redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study.

Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document.

Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information.

The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on the Educational Resource Committee.

**Principles that should be used:** Areas of the College do not "own" faculty positions; vacant positions revert to the College for possible reassignment. Departments with a high part-time/full-time faculty ratio should have priority over departments with a low ratio. Departments with increasing enrollments should have priority over departments with decreasing enrollments. Highly "viable" programs should have priority over less viable programs. "Viability" should be determined by program review and should include such issues as assurance of future enrollments, availability of facilities, and provision of proper staff support. Departments needing full-time faculty to address health/safety/legal requirements should have priority over programs having lesser such need. Established departments with no full-time faculty and viable newly proposed departments should have priority over departments with existing full-time faculty.

Departments which do not have available part-time faculty should have priority over departments which do have available part-time faculty. Departments should exhaust the possibility of reassigning other (possibly under loaded) full-time faculty to department before being authorized to proceed with full-time hire. Such reassignments should be consistent with contract provisions.

**Principles (and criteria) that should not be used:** Whether or not the productivity of a department (measured in WSCH/FTE) is high or low. Departmental productivity may properly be used in determining the number of sections of classes offered and whether or not to continue a program, but productivity should play a much lesser role in deciding what portion of classes in a department should be taught by full or part-time faculty. The number of years a department has been making a request for a full-time hire. Recent retirements/resignations/reassignments of full-time faculty in a department.

**Additional principles that should be used if there are more candidate pools than positions available:**

Positions with a truly exceptional candidate should have priority over positions with a less qualified applicant pool. Positions with a candidate able to teach in multiple disciplines should have priority over positions containing applicants able to teach in only a single discipline. Positions whose filling would advance the College's affirmative action goals should have priority over those whose filling would not.

## **Procedures for Allocating New Full-Time Teaching Faculty Positions**

*Developed by Educational Resources Committee  
Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998,  
revised September 22, 1999, June 7, 2000, May 2, 2001*

1. The District office communicates to the campus the number of available positions early in the fall quarter.
2. The College President and Dean of Faculty and Staff estimate additional positions that might become available due to unannounced retirements/resignations.
3. The Vice President for Educational Resources and Instruction asks division deans for prioritized requests for positions (by department).
4. The Vice Presidents, augmented by the faculty Senate President, will develop a proposed list of approved positions using the Division requests and the "Guiding Principles for Determining New Full-time Teaching Faculty Hires."
5. The administration presents the proposed list to the Roundtable with a rationale of how the proposed hires meet the "Guiding Principles" and hears final input and suggestions.
  - 5a. If, later in the academic year, new faculty needs emerge due to an unanticipated vacancy, the Division Dean or Vice President may request a replacement. This request is to be forwarded to the Educational Resources Committee. It will include a rationale for immediate replacement. In making its determination, the Committee will consider the Guiding Principles, extenuating circumstances, and the realistic timeline leading to a successful search.
  - 5b. The Educational Resources Committee will meet to consider these emerging needs in the context of existing unfilled requests, if any, and the Guiding Principles.
  - 5c. The Educational Resources Committee will follow the same procedure in considering this new request as it does for all others, and forward a recommendation to the Roundtable and Cabinet.
6. The College President makes the final decision based on recommendations from the Vice Presidents and the Roundtable.

**Glendale College**  
**Draft: May 30, 2003**  
**Senate Policy on Program Discontinuance**

Glendale Community College is committed to support programs and classes that fulfill the goals of the Mission Statement as these are elaborated in the Educational Master Plan. Only programs with low or declining enrollment, decreasing demand for service or clear obsolescence shall be considered for discontinuance, once the following criteria have been considered.

- ❖ Budget considerations should not be the primary consideration.
  - ❖ Primary consideration in the decision to consider discontinuance should be given to the service the program provides to the college and the community.
1. When a declining trend has been identified on a specific program the Administration shall contact the Division and Department Chairs of the program. A declining trend will be identified using the following key performance indicators alone or in combination:
    - ❖ Statistically significant decline in class enrollment throughout the program in four consecutive semesters
    - ❖ A consistently low enrollment of 50% below maximum seat load capacity over four consecutive semesters
    - ❖ retention at the end of the term is less than 50% for four terms
    - ❖ statistically significant decline in, or consistently low rate of, student success
  2. A Task Force shall be created consisting of the faculty members of discipline, the respective Division Chair, the Dean of Instructional Services or the Associate Dean of Instruction & Workforce Development, a representative of the Research and Planning Office, a representative of the Counseling Division, and a representative of the Academic Senate who is not a member of the division in question. The Task Force, by consensus, may agree:
    - a) to declare the program obsolete and create a plan for discontinuance that respects the needs of students and fulfills contractual obligations to faculty and staff or
    - b) devise a process/plan to revitalize the program and a time table to accomplish this goal shall be established by the discipline's faculty with the help of the other involved parties. Resources shall be allocated by the Administration in order to improve enrollment or retention. Some areas to be considered are: in-depth revision of the program courses, update of facilities, and workshops (to provide re-training, changes in methodology/ approaches to teaching, etc). Other considerations will include Student Support Services which promote student success and retention.

In keeping the spirit of good intentions and future enrollment management and planning, the task force should consider the following factors:

- ❖ Needs of the community

- ❖ Needs of the department as the particular class fits in as part of a program

---

- ❖ Workforce development
- ❖ Currency of Program Review
- ❖ Core indicators from Chancellor's Office
- ❖ Local labor market information through HDD and or employer program advisory committees and surveys
- ❖ Reputation, and skills of program and/or staff
- ❖ FTES generated by program
- ❖ Other funding sources, such as grants or contributions from business and industry
- ❖ Percentage of faculty who have updated skills (staff development, industry extemships, conferences, classes, etc.) documented within past three years
- ❖ Special leadership, integration or cross discipline projects in which the program is involved

3. If there has not been a statistically significant increase in key performance indicators after three semesters of the implementation of the process the Administration will reconvene the Task Force to determine the appropriate course of action from the following:

- ❖ Give the Program an extension of two semesters. At the end of the extension, the committee will reconvene and re-evaluate.
- ❖ Accept the program in its current state, if it serves a community, instructional, or training need.
- ❖ Create a new plan to improve recruitment and enrollment. This plan will then be implemented over the following three semesters.
- ❖ Discontinue the program.

<b>Timetable</b>	
4th Semester	Problem identified
5th Semester	Task Force meets
6th Semester	Discontinuance or Implementation of Task Force Plan
9th Semester	Re-evaluation: discontinuance or extension
10th Semester	Extension
12th Semester	Discontinuance

## Hartnel College Discontinuance Process

### ***Purpose:***

To critically review a program or discipline for possible discontinuance or to recommend remediation that will result in a viable program or discipline. The Discontinuance Process is separate from the Program and Services Review Process. The Program and Services Review process is formative, providing evaluation that leads to continual improvement. The Discontinuance Process provides a summative evaluation of a program or discipline's viability and may lead to the termination of a program or discipline.

### ***Process:***

- 1. Identification:** An at-risk instructional program is identified, on the basis of the criteria listed below, by the Vice President for Instruction, the Vice President for Student Services, the Area Dean, a member of the discipline, or the Academic Senate.
  
- 2. Convening:** The Vice President for Instruction convenes the Discontinuance Committee. This is not a standing committee, but rather is convened as needed with the following membership:
  - Vice President for Instruction
  - 2 Deans (neither of which is dean of the program in question)
  - 2 faculty appointed by the Academic Senate (neither from the program in question)
  - 1 student appointed by the Student Senate
  
- 3. Initial Review:** The Discontinuance Committee conducts an initial review to determine whether full review is warranted. Full review is necessary if:
  - any two of the Primary Criteria are met, *or*
  - any three of the Secondary Criteria plus one of the Primary Criteria are met

Primary Criteria (any 2)	Secondary Criteria (any 3 plus 1 primary)
• Declining market/industry demand	• Declining university transfer trends*
• Advisory Committee recommendation	• Insufficient frequency of course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program
• Decreasing numbers of students enrolled*	• Lack of available resources
• Low or decreasing WSCH/FTEF*	• Poor retention within courses*
• Poor rate for student achievement of program goals (e. g. completion rate, numbers of degrees and certificates,	• Unavailability of the transfer major

job placement)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decline in importance of service to related disciplines (applies only when discipline does not offer degree or certificate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor term-to-term persistence for students in the major*</li> </ul>

\*as compared to statewide norms for the discipline and local data over the last three to five years.

The Discontinuance Committee will issue a brief narrative report recommending to the Superintendent/President whether a full review is warranted or not. The report will include the reasoning for the decision. The report will be submitted to the Superintendent/President, filed with the Office of Instruction and sent to the party initiating the review, the Academic Senate, the Dean responsible for the program, and the Hartnell College Faculty Association.

- 4. Full Review:** If the Discontinuance Committee determines that a full review is warranted, the review is conducted by the committee. Data used should be based on trends over time (typically three to five years) and should relate to program goals as well as the mission of the college. The criteria to be examined include uniform measures that must be applied to all programs, specific measures required for different categories of program, and other measures that may also be considered.

## Measures applied to all programs

Qualitative	Quantitative (3-5 year trend)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balance of college curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Match of program with Hartnell Mission and Vision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention within course (successful course completion)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student satisfaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention within major (semester-to-semester persistence)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous steps taken to strengthen program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of degrees and certificates awarded</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduling/course offering trends</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources available</li> </ul>

## *Measures applied to Occupational Education programs*

Qualitative	Quantitative (3-5 year trend)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duplication/uniqueness of training programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labor demand</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employer satisfaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment placement rate</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisory committee recommendation</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information about "job-outs"</li> </ul>	

## *Measures applied to transfer programs*

Qualitative	Quantitative (3-5 year trend)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transfer program availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of transfers (UC, CSU, private)</li> <li>Number of transfer ready students</li> </ul>

## *Measures applied to lab/ studio/ shop/ clinical-based programs*

Qualitative	Quantitative (3-5 year trend)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constraints that may limit enrollment and productivity measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment as a percent of available seats</li> </ul>

## *Measures that may also be considered*

Qualitative	Quantitative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional needs for the program</li> <li>Impact of program on underrepresented and female students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industry/ market demand (non-vocational programs)</li> </ul>

- 5. Recommendation:** The committee will issue a written recommendation to the Superintendent/President based on the analysis of the data. The recommendation will consist of:
- a) recommendations for strengthening the program, including specific goals developed jointly with discipline faculty *and a schedule is set for periodic review of progress toward the goals, or*
  - b) recommendation for program or discipline discontinuance.  
 With few exceptions, a recommendation for discontinuance would not be made without first recommending actions to strengthen the program. In most cases, a recommendation to discontinue would only follow failed attempts at reviving/improving the program or compelling evidence to indicate that this is not the best use of the college resources.

## **6. Actions:**

If a recommendation is made for discontinuance, and the recommendation is accepted by the Superintendent/ President and the Board, provisions will be made for adequate notification of affected faculty, and retraining or transfer of faculty to another area.

## **7. Impact on students:** If a recommendation is made for discontinuance, and the recommendation is accepted by the Superintendent/President and the Board, opportunities will be provided for students to finish the program or transfer to a related program.

The discontinuance process will be reviewed by the Academic Senate and the administration during the spring semester of odd numbered years in order to keep the process current.

During the first five years after this process is adopted, no program can be recommended for an initial review that has not had the opportunity for review and improvement through the current Program and Services Review Process. The Vice President for Instruction has the authority to schedule a discipline on the Program and Services Review calendar.

# MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

## PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE POLICY

### BACKGROUND AND UNDERLYING CONCEPTS

The policy is based on the guiding principle that: 1) considerations of program discontinuance are distinct from program improvement; 2) if there is mutual agreement between the affected faculty of a program and the administration, and when students will not be adversely affected, the processes of this policy (i.e., two semesters of program review and convening of the Program Discontinuance Review Committee) do not need to go into effect; 3) program discontinuance is both academic and professional for local academic senates, and insofar as the policy impacts employment, it is a matter of collective bargaining in all cases. As a result, this policy will be kept separate from development of Department/Discipline portfolios. In addition, if this policy needs to be invoked, or if a program is to be discontinued on the basis of mutual faculty/administration agreement, the Yosemite Faculty Association will be notified and given the necessary time to resolve the issues of collective bargaining.

Vital academic considerations include the following: effects on students, balancing the college curriculum education and budget planning, and issues of regional coordination for occupational programs. Qualitative as well as quantitative data need to be used as a result. Qualitative data are less statistical and more value-laden. The quality, breadth, and depth of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process should be taken into consideration. Student satisfaction and how the program is perceived by articulating universities or employing business and industry are factors as well. Quantitative data include the following: weak enrollment trend (e.g., lack of demand); insufficient frequency of course section offerings to assure reasonable availability for students; poor retention; poor term-to-term persistence for those in courses in the major; poor rate for student achievement of program goals; lack of demand in the workforce; and unavailability of the transfer major.

### PROCESS

1. A review process will go into effect when the Vice-President for Instruction, in consultation with the discipline faculty and the Division Dean using the factors listed above, has determined that a program is in jeopardy. Department/program/discipline members and the administrator working directly with the program will identify aspects, i.e., qualitative and quantitative data, which apply to the specific program, and then do a preliminary analysis of items related to the mission of the college, enrollment trends, workforce-related issues, completion rates, articulation issues, course availability (both lower and upper division), and outside agency requirements. Then formal notice, including the factors used to make the determination, will be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee, the President of the YFA, and the College President.
2. The department/discipline will then work internally for one semester to review program goals

and attempt to ameliorate the situation. Ongoing documentation will be needed. Notice of progress will again be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee, the President of YFA, the Vice President of Instruction, and the President of the college.

3. After one semester, the Vice President of Instruction and the President of the Academic Senate will convene a Program Discontinuance Review Committee (PDRC). The membership of this committee will include the President-elect or president of the Academic Senate, the affected faculty as determined by the Academic Senate, the Division Dean, the VPI and his designee, and one faculty member chosen by the Academic Senate. The PDRC will supervise a comparative study on the quantitative/qualitative factors identified as pertinent to the program. The charge of the Program Discontinuance Review Committee is to make a recommendation to continue or delete the program. This committee will hold meetings with provision for public comment and will have a first and second reading of action items.
4. If it is determined, by the Program Discontinuance Review Committee, that the program should be discontinued, there will also be a recommendation for a phase-out period to ensure that all students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program and to ensure that the YFA may resolve contractual issues for faculty in the affected program. These recommendations will then be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.
5. If extreme financial hardship is declared by the District, 1 through 4 will be condensed to start no later than October 1 of an academic year and must be completed by February 25 in order to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees in advance of the March 15 statutory requirement for potential for faculty lay-offs.

**Santa Ana College**  
**Program Review and Program Discontinuance Procedures**  
(revised September 2002)

1. The academic deans will identify programs that may be at risk, using a set of data that includes (historical and recent) enrollment data—average class size, cancellation and below 20 data, and scheduling patterns. In addition, data on the identified programs will include productivity (FTES per FTE), enrollment limitations, and full to part-time staffing ratios. Although no threshold criteria are set, the preliminary list of programs will be inclusive of all programs that demonstrate decline vis a vis historical and current experience.
2. The list of programs at risk will also suggest other variables that may be pertinent to the evaluation of individual programs. These variables may include centrality to mission, labor market data, and space and equipment needs, among others.
3. The list will be given to the affected deans and departments for review and response, with direction to validate the data, add and develop any other variables, and develop options and recommendations for the future of the program. Preliminary lists and data should go to the deans and departments prior to the end of the semester, giving them until around the first of October to submit responses.
4. The administration will review the responses and develop a set of specific recommendations on the programs, which the FARSCCD Board will review. This first draft of the recommendations will be distributed to the deans and departments for one more opportunity to respond. Around the end of October, the administration will revise the set of specific recommendations, based on the second responses, and again review the final set of recommendations with FARSCCD leadership. At that point, FARSCCD would become directly involved in any consideration of faculty reassignment, retraining or layoff.
5. Around the first of November, the administration will submit the recommendations to the President. When spring enrollment data are available, the November recommendations will be revisited, with new or amended recommendations forthcoming in February. Final action will occur no later than March 1.

## **Santa Rosa Junior College**

POLICY 3.6  
APPROVING, REVISING OR PHASING  
OUT INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS  
ADOPT: JULY 9, 1996  
REVIEWED: MAY 8, 2001  
ED CODE: 78015-16  
TITLE 5: 51022

---

Santa Rosa Junior College recognizes that the curriculum must be responsive to the needs of the students and community. As those needs change, the content and organization of the educational programs must undergo regular review for appropriateness and efficiency including both qualitative and quantitative measures.

There are regulatory requirements for the review of vocational or occupational programs, as outlined below. In addition, the College's own procedures for adding, revising or phasing out programs, along with the existing curriculum review process, serve an integral role in ensuring a responsive, quality educational programs at Santa Rosa Junior College.

### **SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR VOCATIONAL OR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS**

1. With reference to the establishing of a new vocational or occupational training program, the Board of Trustees shall adhere to the requirements of California Education Code, Section 78015, including the following:

\* Prior to establishing the program, the Board shall conduct a job market study of the labor market area.

\* The study shall use the State-Local Cooperative Labor Market Information Program established in Section 10533 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, or if this program is not available in the labor market area, other available sources of labor market information.

\* The study shall include a California Occupational Information System supply analysis of existing vocational and occupational education or training programs for adults maintained by high schools, community colleges, and private postsecondary schools in the area to ensure that the anticipated employment demand for students in the proposed programs justifies the establishment of the proposed courses of instruction.

\* Copies of each job market study will be made available to the public.

\* Subsequent to completing the study required by this section and prior to establishing the program, the Board shall determine whether or not the study justifies the proposed vocational

education program. If the Board determines that the job market study justifies the initiation of the proposed program, it shall determine, by resolution, whether the program shall be offered through the district's own facilities or through a contract with an approved private post secondary school pursuant to Section 8092 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. Per California Education Code, Section 78015, every vocational or occupational training program shall be reviewed every two years by the Board to ensure that each program, as demonstrated by the California Occupational Information System, including the State-Local Cooperative Labor Market Information Program established in Section 10533 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, or if this program is not available in the labor market area, other available sources of labor market information, does all of the following:

- \* Meets a documented labor market demand.
- \* Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.
- \* Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.

The review process shall include the review and comments by the local Private Industry Council. A written summary of the findings of each review shall be made available to the public.

Any program that does not meet these requirements and the standards promulgated by the governing board shall be terminated within one year.

-----  
PROCEDURE 3.6  
-----

APPROVING NEW INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Most new course-based programs are subject to the guidelines and requirements set out in the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Standards Handbook. There may also be new non-course-based programs which will require a modified version of the process below. A "" indicates those steps pertinent only to occupational programs.

1. Contact your Department Chair/Director with ideas for potential certificate program.
2. Discuss with program coordinators/department faculty.
3. Discuss feasibility with your Assistant Dean including examination of proposed facilities, equipment, and staffing.

Request that the Regional Occupational Dean receive a verbal report of the proposed certificate program.

4. Conduct an informal needs assessment including, but not limited to: potential enrollment, potential transfers/job placements, indications of community and/or campus needs etc.

Convene an ad hoc advisory committee.

Based on ad hoc advisory committee input and support, formalize the assessment for occupational advisory committee review.

5. Develop a program proposal, which should contain the following:

- a. Results of needs assessment;
- b. Program goals and objectives;
- c. Topic outline of courses;
- d. Feasibility - required resources; and,

e. Input from ad hoc advisory committee.

6. Forward proposal to your Dean for Administrative review.

7. Curriculum development following Dean's approval:

- a. Course outlines/objectives;
- b. Prerequisites;
- c. General Education requirements, if applicable;
- d. Course sequence;
- e. Methodology; and,
- f. Field experience, if applicable

8. Forward program proposal to the Curriculum Committee, which should include the following.

- a. Program proposal and curriculum as developed in Steps 7 and 9.
- b. New Courses proposal(s).

- c. Timelines for initial implementation, including dissemination of information to the campus.
- d. Evaluation plan, including evaluation tools.
- e. Completion of college checklist.
- 9. Obtain appropriate approvals
  - a. Articulation;
  - b. President;
  - c. Board of Trustees;
  - d. CPEC;
  - e. Licensing agency;
  - f. Department of Apprenticeship Standards; and,
  - g. Chancellor's Office C.C.C. (for programs of 18 units or more).

-----

## REVISING OR PHASING OUT EXISTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

When the results of a regular or special program review indicate essential weaknesses in enrollment, retention, completion, or employment/transfer rates, the supervising administrator(s) shall notify the Academic Affairs Office and the appropriate department chair(s) and initiate the following steps to determine the need for program revision or phase out. The review process should include components of the annual PP & E reports, adjusted to include a self-assessment based on the information below and recommendations of the department and administration, as well as appropriate review bodies (accreditation groups, certification boards, etc.). Examination of these factors should include trends over the past four semesters and projections of anticipated enrollments and outcomes.

1. **Information Collection and Review:** The Academic Affairs Council in consultation with departments will review relevant information which must include both qualitative and quantitative measures. (The following items are not presented in priority order.)

- \* Community need
- \* Impact on community
- \* Relationship to College mission
- \* Impact to related programs
- \* Retention and completion rates

- \* Employment or transfer rates
- \* Enrollment efficiency rate (enrollment/max) over the past 4 semesters
- \* WSCH/FTES
- \* Cost of program
- \* Cost of support services
- \* Direct facilities costs
- \* Other

2. Development of Recommendation for Action: After review of the above information with the department, the supervising administrator(s) will develop recommendations for action.

- \* Program revision or reduction
- \* Program phase out

3. Fiscal Impact of Program Revision, Reduction or Phase Out

- \* Determine cost of recommended program revisions, reductions, or phase out
- \* Determine cost of associated retraining (if appropriate)
- \* Itemize savings in adjusted salaries & benefits
- \* Itemize revenue from sale of equipment and/or facilities (if appropriate)

4. Identification of Possible Alternative Funding Sources

5. Recommendation for program revision, reduction, or phase out will be presented to appropriate groups for consultation. Possible audiences may include:

- \* Students
- \* Department representatives
- \* Curriculum Committee
- \* Advisory committees
- \* Specific accreditation/certification bodies
- \* Community groups
- \* Cost of support services

6. Preparation of Documentation for Final Report of Recommended Program Revision, Reduction, or Phase Out. Documentation may include:

- \* Reason for reduction or phase out
- \* Effect on students currently enrolled
- \* Impact to related programs and community
- \* Projected use of facilities
- \* Budget impact and timeline
- \* Timeline for implementation including consideration of impact of
- \* Program revision or phase out on students and staff
- \* Relevant legal issues
- \* Alternatives for students
- \* Union contract obligations

- \* Consultation report from legal counsel
- \* Report from advisory committee (if appropriate)

7. Recommendation is submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review and approval/disapproval.

8. Additional Required Approvals

- \* Accreditation groups, as appropriate
- \* President
- \* Board

When the results of a regular or special program review indicate essential weaknesses in enrollment, retention, completion, or employment/transfer rates, the supervising administrator(s) will initiate the following steps to determine the need for program reduction or phase out.

#### PHASING OUT PROGRAMS

When the results of a regular or special program review indicate essential weaknesses in enrollment, retention, completion, or employment/transfer rates, the supervising administrator(s) will initiate the following steps to determine the need for program reduction or phase out.

## **SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE**

### **PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE POLICY BACKGROUND AND UNDERLYING CONCEPTS**

Current regulations and statutes (i.e., Title 5:55130, Approval of Credit Programs; Title 5:51022, Instructional Programs; Education Code: 78016, Review of Program Termination) mandate that the governing board of each community college approve a program discontinuance policy by July 1, 2000. In addition, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has developed a fine position paper for information and guidance. Based on these statutes and the information received from the state, the Curriculum and Instruction Council considered this as an action item (4/26/99 - approval) after receiving input from the Academic Senates of Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College, the administration, and FARSCCD. On this basis, it is presented to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The policy is based on the guiding principle that: 1) considerations of program discontinuance are distinct from program improvement; 2) If there is mutual agreement between the affected faculty of a program, and the administration, and any students will not be adversely affected, the processes of this policy (i.e., two semesters of program review, and convening of the PDRC) do not need to go into effect; 3) program discontinuance is both academic and professional for local academic senates, and insofar as the policy impacts employment, it is a matter of collective bargaining in all cases. This policy will be kept separate from development of Department/Discipline portfolios. In addition, if this policy needs to be invoked or if a program is to be discontinued on the basis of mutual faculty, administrator agreement, FARSCCD will be notified and given the necessary time to resolve the issues of collective bargaining.

Vital academic considerations are: effects on students, balancing the college curriculum, education and budget planning and issues of regional coordination for occupational programs. Qualitative as well as quantitative data need to be used as a result. Qualitative data is less statistical and more value-laden. The quality of the breadth and depth of the curriculum, and the

teaching and learning process should be taken into consideration. Student satisfaction and how the program is perceived by articulating universities or employing business and industry are factors as well. Quantitative data includes: weak enrollment trend (e.g., lack of demand); insufficient frequency of course section offerings to assure reasonable availability for students; poor retention; poor term-to-term persistence for those in courses in the major; poor rate for student achievement of program goals; lack of demand in the workforce; or unavailability of transfer major.

#### PROCESS

1. A review process will go into effect when the department chair, in consultation with the discipline faculty, and/or the administrator working directly with the program in consultation with the faculty and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, using the factors listed above, have determined that a program is in jeopardy. Department/program/discipline members and the administrator working directly with the program will identify aspects, e.g., qualitative and quantitative data, which apply to the specific program and then do a preliminary analysis of items related to the mission of the college, enrollment trends, workforce-related issues, completion rates, articulation issues, course availability (both lower and upper division), and outside agency requirements. Then, formal notice, including the factors used to make the determination, will be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Council, the President of FARSCCD, and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs.

2. The department/discipline will then work internally for two semesters to review program goals and attempt to ameliorate the situation. Ongoing documentation will be needed. Notice of progress will again be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Council, the President of FARSCCD, the Vice-president of Academic Affairs, and the President of the college.

3. After two semesters, a comparative study will be conducted on the quantitative/qualitative factors.