PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE:
A FACULTY PERSPECTIVE REVISITED

ADOPTED FALL 2012

Contents

Abstract

The 1998 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges paper Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective presented issues of program discontinuance and addressed principles and key factors for effective faculty participation in the development of fair and equitable program discontinuance processes. In 2009, an Academic Senate resolution called for an update to that paper to provide senates with information that reflects various changes regarding program discontinuance and related issues that have occurred since 1998. This paper responds to that resolution by incorporating changes that have taken place in the last decade and providing further guidance to local senates about faculty roles in the development and implementation of program discontinuance policies and procedures. This paper is intended to replace the earlier paper by building on its foundation.

1. Introduction

The 1998 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges paper Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective (available at http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/ProgDisc.pdf)began with the following:

> Increased attention has been given to program discontinuance. Local senates have looked to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges for direction. The purpose of this paper is to focus on the many issues of program discontinuance faced by local academic senates. This paper addresses the need to identify key factors for developing a fair, equitable, and faculty driven and student-focused program discontinuance process.
>
> This paper, developed by the Academic Senate Educational Policies Committee, reviews current regulation and statute, the role of local academic senates, effects on students, the need to balance the college curriculum, educational and budget planning issues, collective bargaining concerns, and other considerations when developing a local model.
>
> The paper concludes with a set of recommendations to local senates on the key factors for effective participation in the program discontinuance process and recommendations for regulation changes.

Such a beginning is as fitting today as it was in 1998. Furthermore, the principles in the 1998 paper continue to provide a solid foundation for discussions about faculty roles in program discontinuance. Therefore, the current paper builds upon the foundation established by the original paper and is intended to update and replace that document. This updated paper incorporates additional information and changes that have occurred in the last decade and reinforces the important and necessary role faculty play in the development and implementation of program discontinuance policies and procedures, as called for in Resolution 9.02 F09:

Update Paper on Program Discontinuance

> Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the paper P*rogram Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective* in Spring 1998;

Whereas, While the 1998 paper directly addresses issues specific to program discontinuance, it does not address program contraction, suspension, or expansion and does not build a solid case for why the topic of program discontinuance is an academic and professional matter under the purview of Title 5 §53200, and it does not effectively build a case for how program discontinuance can dramatically affect our ability to serve students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds;

Whereas, Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, Accreditation Standards, district practices, and Academic Senate positions have evolved since the 1998 paper was written; and

Whereas, Some colleges have established or are establishing improved program discontinuance processes that address program expansion, suspension, and contraction;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research the various changes regarding program discontinuance and related issues that have occurred since the 1998 paper *Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective* was written and update the paper as necessary.

Ultimately, this paper aims to assist faculty with the challenging and sometimes difficult discussions that occur at their colleges and districts by addressing the principles and key factors for effective faculty participation in the development of fair and equitable program discontinuance policies and processes. Discontinuing a program directly affects curriculum, student success, and budget and planning processes, and in many cases program review processes, all of which fall under the purview of the academic senate. Thus, program discontinuance itself is an academic and professional matter. As such, local governing boards should consult collegially with their academic senates in establishing policies and procedures for program discontinuance and reduction. Local academic senates need to identify key factors for developing a fair, equitable, faculty-driven, and student-focused program discontinuance process. This paper serves as a resource not only to local senates but to all faculty members who participate in local program discontinuance activities and policy development.

2. Background and Scope

Although college districts are required by current statute and regulation to develop a process for program discontinuance and minimum criteria for the discontinuance of occupational programs (Education Code §78016 and Title 5 §51022), two informal surveys conducted by the Academic Senate for California Colleges found that many districts do not have a process for either which has been agreed-upon by the local academic senate and the governing board. Moreover, in some districts, programs have been terminated using inconsistent approaches, which is problematic for students, counselors, and academic senates, each of whom feels significant repercussions when discontinuance is managed inconsistently. Furthermore, failure to implement and follow a process may be an accreditation issue if appropriate arrangements for enrolled students have not been made.

The first informal turn-around survey of local academic senates regarding program discontinuance was conducted at the Fall 1997 Plenary Session (Appendix A) and found that only 7 of 62 colleges responding had a discontinuance policy. A similar, broader informal turn-around survey was distributed in Spring 2011 to all California community college academic senate presidents. The results of this survey showed that fourteen years

later, 37 of the 54 colleges responding had a discontinuance policy (Appendix B). The results of the Spring 2011 survey suggest current activity regarding program discontinuance in the California Community College System. The majority of colleges that responded have an approved program discontinuance policy and procedure in place. However, responses to some of the questions from the 2011 survey yielded concerns that merit further consideration:

‣ Over 60% of those who responded said that program discontinuance decisions were made with no policy in place or without following established policy.

‣ Almost half of those responding said that local senates were not included in program discontinuance despite this issue being an academic matter.

‣ More than 75% of those responding indicated that program discontinuance was a result of an administrator-initiated decision. ww

‣ Over 60% of those responding said that programs were ultimately discontinued through incremental cuts to course offerings over several terms or years thereby circumventing any local process for official program discontinuance.

These results suggest that, even with formal discontinuance policies in place, agreed upon processes may be ignored. Thus, local academic senates, working in consultation with their local administrations and with their collective bargaining agents where appropriate, must not only ensure that the college has developed a formal program discontinuance process but also that the process is comprehensive, fair, and efficient and that it is employed for making all program discontinuance decisions.

A. STATUTE, REGULATION, AND ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Central to the development of any policy or process is knowing which Education Code sections, Title 5 regulations, and accreditation standards are relevant to campus-wide program discontinuance or reduction practices.

Education Code §78016 "Review of program; termination" states the following:

(a) Every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board of the district to assure that each program, as demonstrated by the California Occupational 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:

1. Meets a documented labor market demand.

2. Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.

3. Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.

(b) Any program that does not meet the requirements of subdivision (a) and the standards promulgated by the governing board shall be terminated within one year.

(c) The review process required by this section shall include the review and comments by the local Private Industry Council established pursuant to Division 8 (commencing with Section 15000) of the Unemployment Insurance Code, which review and comments shall occur prior to any decision by the appropriate governing body.

(d) This section shall apply to each program commenced subsequent to July 28, 1983.

Title 5 also addresses the topic of program discontinuation. Title 5 §51022 requires that "Within six months of the formation of a community college district, the governing board shall adopt and carry out its policies for the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses or programs. Such policies shall incorporate statutory responsibilities regarding vocational or occupational training program review as specified in section 78016 of the Education Code." Title 5 §55601 requires local governing boards to appoint advisory committees for career technical education programs. An active and effective advisory committee can be a very valuable asset in launching, growing, reducing or eliminating a program since it provides a direct link to the specific community need each program serves.

Additionally, Title 5 §55130 specifies that program approval "is effective until the program or implementation of the program is discontinued or modified in any substantial way." This section also gives authority to the state Chancellor to evaluate periodically "an educational program, after its approval, on the basis of factors listed in this section. If on the basis of such an evaluation the Chancellor determines that an educational program should no longer be offered, the Chancellor may terminate the approval and determine the effective date of termination." Among the factors that the Chancellor may use to evaluate a program are library and media center resources, availability of faculty, and availability of adequate or proposed financial support. Moreover, "the development, establishment and evaluation of an education program shall include representative faculty involvement."

The 2002 Accreditation Standards (revised June 2012) also contain a discussion of program discontinuance that would seem to prohibit a district from eliminating programs too hastily. In particular, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Standard II.A.6.b states, "When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption." This requirement is broader than the one established in Title 5. By specifically obligating a college to meet the needs of enrolled students, this standard implies that colleges should have policies to address the elimination of or significant structural changes to programs and should ask themselves whether students are advised on how to complete educational requirements when programs are eliminated or modified.

Perhaps the most relevant and most challenging accreditation expectation to meet in a fiscal crisis is the requirement that colleges plan and budget effectively. The introduction to the Accreditation Standards states, "The institution provides the means for students to learn, assesses how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve that learning through ongoing, systematic, and integrated planning" (Standard I). Colleges should include program discontinuance processes and evaluation as part of the regular planning processes for institutional effectiveness, as required in the Accreditation Standards. The effectiveness of planning processes

and the working relationships local senates develop in their colleges before a crisis arrives are the best foundation for a thoughtful approach to the threat of program reduction or discontinuance.

3. Definitions

a. defining a program

An important piece that should be in place before any program discontinuance policy is implemented is the definition of a program. This definition will vary from college to college depending on the culture and structure of the institution. One aspect that is consistent across all colleges is that this definition should be determined through discussion between faculty and administration and approved by the college's or district's academic senate.

To inform this discussion and decision, the question of what constitutes a program is discussed at length in the Academic Senate's 2009 paper *Program Review: Setting a Standard* (pages 12-16). The paper lists the following bullet points as examples of different kinds of programs:

- Title 5 §55000(g) defines an educational program as "an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education"

- Disciplines, such as natural sciences, or, even more broadly, science

- Departments, such as early childhood education, counseling, etc.

- Academic majors or areas of emphasis, such as humanities

- Student pathways such as career technical education, basic skills, and transfer

- Programs specific to certain populations, such as Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS) or Disabled Student Programs & Services (DSPS)

- Planning and goal setting processes (planning units), possibly relating to divisions such as career technical education

- College budget processes (cost centers)

- Student service pathways that end in a specific outcome

- Administrative services defined by administrative reporting structures

- ‣ Governance structures, such as board of trustee processes or divisions underneath a particular dean or administrator

- ‣ General education

The Title 5 definition of a program is clearly focused primarily on curriculum. However, at many colleges such things as athletics, honors, Puente, distance education, and other student support services are considered to be and in many cases view themselves as programs, even though they would not fit the Title 5 definition. *Program Review: Setting a Standard* goes on to note that while the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requires that all colleges assess student learning at the course, program, and degree levels, it does not establish or impose a definition of what constitutes a "program," leaving that question to be answered differently by different colleges seeking to fulfill their mission and serve their communities.

A college's definition of a program is crucial to the program discontinuance process. Many colleges now see that programs are not isolated to either student services or instruction, as goals of programs may overlap both areas, leading to a recognition and definition of hybrid programs. Broader definitions may give the academic senate a stronger voice in discussions and evaluations of all types of college services if those definitions lead the college to apply one process for all varieties of programs. On the other hand, a broader definition may also make developing one consistent process that can apply to all programs covered by the definition more difficult. Therefore, academic senates should take into consideration the variety of programs and services that may exist at their colleges and the ways in which they want their program review and discontinuance processes to serve them as they develop a definition of programs.

B. DEFINING PROGRAM VITALITY AND VIABILITY

i. Standard Definitions of Vitality and Viability

Since the original *Program Discontinuance* paper was first written, several colleges have begun to use the terms "program vitality" and "program viability" to examine programs. The terms "vitality" and "viability" can, in some cases, have similar meanings. Among the definitions of vitality in the *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* is "the capacity to live and develop." The same source defines viability as "capable of growing or developing," "capable of working, functioning, or developing adequately," and "having a reasonable chance of succeeding." These definitions are consistent with the way in which most colleges characterize program vitality and viability: a program is viable if it demonstrates itself to be capable of functioning adequately in terms of serving sufficient numbers of students effectively and vital if it shows the capacity to continue serving students at the same or increased levels of production, effectiveness, and relevance as compared to standards set by the institution. For these reasons, the two terms are often used interchangeably in discussions of program discontinuance.

The specific manner in which programs are evaluated in regard to vitality and viability differs according to local processes and determinations. The vitality and viability of programs may be called into question due to numerous factors, including declining enrollment, changes to industry standards or community need, and others. No universally accepted definition of or criteria for evaluating academic programs exist. While this paper will offer suggestions that might be considered in establishing local criteria, the most important element of such discussions is that the academic senate and the college administration work together collegially to agree on definitions of viability and vitality that can be applied fairly and objectively to all programs at the college.

ii. Maintaining Essential Programs in Times of Economic Crisis

In most cases, questions of program discontinuance or restructuring have been raised based on the vitality of the program in terms of such factors as student enrollment, employment trends, and community needs. In times of fiscal crisis, however, economic factors also enter the discussion, and programs that in more stable budget times might be seen as viable and vital might be endangered due to their cost to the college. While faculty would not wish to consider discontinuing a seemingly healthy program, economic realities may force administrators and faculty to raise exactly such a possibility.

This form of program discontinuance – the elimination of successful programs due to budget exigencies – is quite distinct from individual program viability processes. Just as definitions of program vitality and viability in terms of program health should be based on specific, collegially agree-upon criteria, so should definitions of viability based on economic factors. Any program being scrutinized for such reasons should be judged according to criteria that are determined in advance and can be applied fairly across the college. In the absence of such a definition of vitality involving economic factors, programs might appear to be targeted inappropriately, and discussions of program discontinuance in such circumstances will likely be both more difficult and more contentious. Academic senates should therefore work with their college administrations to define the criteria and data that will be used to define program vitality in challenging economic times.

4. Faculty, Administrative, and Governing Board Roles in Developing and Implementing Program Discontinuance Processes

A. ROLES OF THE LOCAL ACADEMIC SENATE

The involvement of the local academic senate is critical to the successful development and implementation of a program discontinuance policy. Academic senates are specifically charged with responsibilities in curriculum, program review, budget processes, and other pertinent areas of academic and professional matters recognized in statute and regulation that pertain specifically to program development or discontinuance. The participation of the local academic senate offers a greater opportunity to create a collegial, student-centered, faculty driven, and academically relevant process for program vitality and re-vitalization as well as the termination of college programs. A collegial process involving both the local academic senates and college administration can work to eliminate inconsistent criteria and inappropriate objectives associated with program discontinuance. Senates must take a leading role in developing a well-defined, educationally sound program discontinuance policy that can then become one of the most important processes for defining the balance of a college curriculum and the future of students' educational pursuits.

The local academic senate needs to be especially involved and assist faculty in related disciplines when no full-time faculty are present in the affected program. Because part-time faculty are often less likely to be involved in college planning processes even though they may lead programs, their voices and perspectives are likely to be absent or diminished. The role of the academic senate is to represent all faculty and to ensure that all relevant voices are heard and respected. If a program without full-time faculty is under consideration for restructuring

or discontinuance, the senate must make every effort to ensure that the input of the part-time faculty in the program is legitimately included and the needs of the students in the program are taken into account.

B. ROLES OF ADMINISTRATORS

District and college administrators also play various roles in program discontinuance by working with faculty, whether in program vitality or viability reviews or program discontinuance. They will likely have specified roles in a program viability or discontinuance policy that is developed through collegial consultation. Because they may be aware of issues such as environmental changes or workforce data regarding a program, administrators need to ensure that programs are routinely reviewed, plans are developed, and actions are taken to ensure the strength and vitality of programs are sustained. However, if the recommendation resulting from program discontinuance is the termination of the program, administrators facilitate the implementation of program discontinuance processes by providing necessary resources and support and making certain that recommendations resulting from program discontinuance processes are carried out. They are responsible for ensuring that all contractual and legal requirements regarding impacted employees are met, students are accommodated, and the negative impact is mitigated as much as possible. Administrators manage regional issues that may arise from program discontinuance activities, ensure program discontinuance processes are linked with educational and budget planning processes, and usually make the final recommendation for program discontinuance to the board of trustees.

C. ROLE OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

In addition to the Title 5 requirement for the governing board of each community college district to develop, file with the state Chancellor, and carry out its policies for the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses and programs, the decision to discontinue a program ultimately rests with the members of the governing board itself. However, that decision needs to be based on a deliberative process that the board approved and that was developed through collegial consultation. Governing boards should ensure that district planning documents and policies, which are integrally linked to effective program discontinuance processes, are approved and implemented. Examples of such planning documents and policies include the district's mission statement, strategic and other master plans, and policies regarding student access and success. When the board makes the final decision to eliminate a program, the board members are responsible for responding to concerns from the community and upholding the collegial processes used to come to that conclusion.

5. Processes and Criteria

A. DEVELOPING A PROCESS FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

i. Connecting Program Discontinuance to Educational and Budget Planning

Community college educational planning requires that the college examine what it does and how its current situation compares to a forecast of what is needed in the future, all while adhering to the mission of community colleges. As stated in the Academic Senate's 2009 paper *Program Review: Setting a Standard*,

> We see enrollments decreasing in course A and wait lists growing in course B so we offer fewer of A and more of B. But planning asks why these changes are occurring, whether the condition can be changed by the college and the faculty, and what is to be done.

A college's comprehensive educational planning process should connect to the program discontinuance process in order to examine and address such issues. Scarce resources and growing student populations compel us to focus on difficult questions, such as which programs deserve additional staff, equipment, or supply budgets, which programs must be reconstructed to more effectively meet student need, and which programs, as determined through an appropriate process, are no longer needed. If the program discontinuance process is tied to and consistent with the educational planning process, then these questions can be thoughtfully and purposefully addressed through consultation that involves faculty in developing the criteria by which decisions will be made, respects faculty knowledge and expertise, and generates more buy-in to the final outcomes of the process.

If program discontinuance is connected to educational planning, then colleges will be better positioned to consider data such as enrollment trends or transfer information before any decision is made to close or restructure a program. An institution should also examine its mission statement, the local and regional labor market, and community needs in order to develop and maintain an effective program discontinuance process. For CTE programs, local advisory committees can help to clarify program strengths and weaknesses, to update offerings, and to assess employer needs. For transfer and major programs, linkages to both K-12 and to four-year colleges and universities can help strengthen and streamline access to programs. All of this information is a standard aspect of educational planning, and thus by linking educational planning with program discontinuance, the process, albeit still difficult, will be more thoughtful, collaborative, data-informed, and collegial.

The college community is best served when curriculum and educational plans drive the budget development process, and thus program discontinuance, as an aspect of the overall educational planning process, should also be connected to budgetary planning. Both short-term and long-term budget forecasts are an important aspect of all college planning processes, and severe budget decreases can challenge even a college's most well-planned program discontinuance policies. In order to ensure that decisions to support, restructure, or discontinue any program are made based on careful budgetary planning rather than as a reaction to an immediate and perhaps temporary economic situation, program discontinuance must be linked to the budget planning process. If a college decides to continue a program that has weaknesses and is therefore potentially at risk of being eliminated, that program may need additional budgetary support to enable it to modify itself, reorganize, and adapt to changing market conditions. Budget processes will need to consider the degree to which the funds needed for strengthening such at-risk programs are available and should identify and prioritize those funds within the college's annual budget. In this way budgetary decisions are intertwined with program discontinuance processes, and thus the two should be formally connected within the college's planning structure.

ii. Considerations When Developing a Local Model for Program Discontinuance

The development and implementation of a program discontinuance process should be considered within the context of the college mission statement and should be linked with the college's educational master plan and department goals and objectives. Institutional planning processes are one of the ten plus one items on which local academic senates must be collegially consulted as per Title 5 regulations. Faculty involvement in the development of a program discontinuance process ensures that the faculty agrees with and respects the goals of the process.

Because developing a program discontinuance process from scratch can be daunting, colleges may wish to consider and draw upon models and best practices that will help to inform their discussions. Among the factors that might be considered in developing a program discontinuance policy are who should be involved and what their roles are in developing the process, what criteria will be used in developing the process, and how programs will be identified and by whom. Some colleges have well-developed templates for conducting appropriate types of analysis that can be used as models and adapted, if necessary, to the unique circumstances of another college (see Appendix C for examples). Any existing model language may need to be adjusted to address local concerns and preserve a focus on data rather than emotional reaction. Faculty involved in developing a local process may wish to contact faculty leaders at the sample colleges to discuss their experiences with their processes.

Perhaps the most important principle to incorporate in a process that examines the future of a program is that all such decisions be data-informed. Colleges should have sufficient institutional research capability to provide longitudinal data about student enrollments, student success, and, if appropriate, work force needs. Any curricular analysis that could result in a loss of programs—and therefore faculty positions—is likely to generate an emotional resistance and reaction. While upon cursory examination seemingly obvious reasons may exist to doubt whether or not a program continues to serve students and the larger community, a more useful, less incendiary, and potentially more revealing approach would involve questioning and deconstructing what may appear obvious.

Many of the important questions that colleges might raise while considering a program's possible modification or elimination are no different than those normally asked during program review: what the program's enrollment trends, occupational outlook, student demand, and requirement status are, along with other related data. Other issues that need to be considered focus on the relevance of the program, such as whether it continues to be the program that it needs to be and whether or not university or employer expectations have changed. Further, while the data a college uses to conduct these analyses may be largely internal to the institution, the process may also include identifying similar programs at other colleges in the same discipline or department as points of comparison for evaluating the program in question. The inclusion of such data, whether from established internal college processes or from carefully selected and contextualized information from a cohort of institutions that share essential and unique qualities and characteristics, can help to inform discussions of program viability in ways that are concrete and thoughtful rather than reactionary.

In order to ensure a consistent and collaborative process for evaluating program viability, colleges may wish to consider establishing a standing program discontinuance committee. Such a committee, with a membership mutually agreed upon by administration and the academic senate, might oversee various aspects of the program discontinuance process, from ensuring that the process uses appropriate data to considering budgetary and long-term planning implications. An established committee with collegially determined membership can also help to ensure that all appropriate voices at the college are represented and respected in developing recommendations regarding program discontinuance. Senates may consider recommending such a committee exist as a sub-committee of planning and budget groups or institutional effectiveness committees.

An additional aspect of program discontinuance processes should involve provision for supporting at-risk programs that the college chooses to continue or restructure. This process may include a probationary period during which data not normally used in periodic program review can be examined. Data will be useful to evaluate and support a program on probation and may include many of same items considered in any evaluation of a program's viability. However, some data sets may be especially important to include, such as the number of entering students expressing an intent to major or earn a certificate in the program, comparative data from

similar programs at similar institutions, availability of the program elsewhere in the region, and impact of the discontinuance on the local community generally.

Processes established to monitor and support programs on probationary status might involve the development and implementation of a plan that could then be monitored by annual compilations of data and accompanying narrative analysis by program faculty. Such a plan should outline the terms under which the program can be removed from probation and needs to include measurable goals for the program, incorporating specific targets involving quantitative and qualitative measures that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions taken. This analysis may serve as a basis for mid-course corrections to the plan and budget changes. The probationary process should be established through collegial consultation with the academic senate and overseen by an appropriate college body such as a program discontinuance committee or other collegially constituted group. The terms of probation should also allow faculty in the program and others to speak on behalf of the program as soon as discontinuance or probation are contemplated.

Colleges should discuss the positive and negative factors regarding if, how, and when to give notice to students that a program is on probation. Included in the terms of probation may be a college commitment to increase advertising or marketing of the program at risk. Such advertising must be well managed to avoid giving mixed messages to students. The terms of probation should spell out the measures and markers that must be met by the program in order to honor commitments made to students and the community.

As an additional alternative to discontinuing a program in light of severe budget decreases, colleges might consider making provisions within their processes for the temporary suspension of the program for a given period of time. In such circumstances, special attention needs to focus on helping students in the program. Within a multi-college district, only one college might provide the courses and offer the program that meets student need. Colleges might also reduce course offerings to provide a minimum number of classes to meet student need. Another possibility is to collaborate with other local colleges to provide the necessary classes for students to meet their goals. If this alternative of program suspension is chosen, colleges must have a plan regarding how it will occur—including faculty load issues—and a timeline to restore the program. Otherwise, the program might remain in indefinite suspension and eventually suffer reduction to the point of extinction.

The specific plan for any individual program, whether it involves discontinuance, restructuring, probation, or suspension, should be developed jointly by discipline faculty, the academic senate, appropriate administrators, and any relevant college oversight body such as a program discontinuance committee. For career technical education programs, the relevant advisory committee should also be intimately involved in the construction of this plan. The actions listed below might be considered when attempting to respond to identified challenges for the programs:

Low growth/low enrollment:

- Actively recruit targeted populations

- Devise cooperative ventures with local employers, transfer institutions, or other community colleges

- Provide enhanced career and academic counseling services (career/transfer center, job fairs, transfer day, etc.)

‣ Adjust course scheduling: times of day, block scheduling, short courses, frequency and number of sections, open entry/open exit

‣ Analyze demand for the program through use of labor market information which may result in curriculum modifications such as adding options for higher demand specialties

‣ Articulate programs and courses: K-12, Tech Prep, etc., and four year sequences of offerings to ensure student ability to transition to subsequent levels

‣ Combine efforts in multi-college districts or geographic regions where each college has the courses approved and in the catalog, but the courses are offered on a rotating basis among the colleges in the district or area

Low retention/persistence/completion:

‣ Analyze the curriculum to ensure alignment of course outcomes with next-course entry skills in sequences

‣ Provide enhanced student support services: tutoring, financial aid, learning/study skills, child care, etc.

Insufficient program resources:

‣ Ensure adequate faculty, both in numbers of full-time faculty and in their particular expertise. Use of faculty development or sabbatical resources may be appropriate

‣ Analyze and make provision for sufficient physical resources, including facilities, equipment, and supplies

‣ Secure resources to provide appropriate levels of outside support such as classified staff, course offerings, library materials, and work place learning opportunities

iii. Considerations in Developing Processes for Dire Fiscal Emergencies

In a severe budget contraction, students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff will inevitably experience very difficult and painful cuts to educational offerings, programs, and services. Academic senates can most effectively minimize the negative educational consequences of budget-mandated reductions to the college's instructional programs in such situations by preparing for a fiscal crisis well before it happens.

Given the possible impact on the curriculum and the college's educational programs, the local academic senate should take the initiative in developing a plan for considering program reductions in the event of a budget crisis. The senate can begin by initiating discussions within existing committees that may touch on relevant issues, such as the college's curriculum, budget, planning, or enrollment management committees. Because budget reductions of this scope are likely to touch all programs to some degree, the development of a plan for addressing a fiscal crisis should also involve students, the collective bargaining agent, classified staff, and administrators who may have information that is critical in formulating an emergency plan.

One of the goals of planning in advance is to reduce intergroup tensions when the crisis actually occurs by addressing them when the emergency is not pressing. If a college has no process in place to deal with program decisions during a fiscal crisis, the college may be forced to create processes and make decisions in a less deliberative manner when the emergency occurs and runs great risk that the process might be or at least appear to be applied unfairly. Therefore, whether the college creates a separate process for fiscal emergencies or builds consideration of such situations into existing program discontinuance processes, the senate and faculty should work to ensure that a plan for considering program discontinuance for budgetary reasons is fully established through collegial consultation before the need for such a plan actually arises.

iv. Program Review and Its Relationship to Program Discontinuance

The 2009 paper *Program Review: Setting a Standard* encapsulates the longstanding position of the Academic Senate that the process of program discontinuance should be kept distinct from program review. Program discontinuance raises broader institutional issues and questions than those addressed by program review, such as faculty reassignment and retreat rights, and addressing some of these issues may ultimately require the participation of the collective bargaining agent. The position of the Academic Senate is that a process separate from program review is needed because ongoing program improvement is distinct from considerations of discontinuance. Certain types of data, including enrollment trends, student demand, and occupational outlook, may be common to both program review and program discontinuance and thus would be considered in both processes. In spite of this overlap in certain information used for both purposes, the Academic Senate continues to maintain that, in order to ensure the integrity of both processes, program discontinuance and program review should be constructed and implemented separately.

B. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING AT-RISK PROGRAMS AND DETERMINING RESEARCH NEEDS

Given the diverse characteristics of California community colleges, a standardized set of criteria for program discontinuance is not practical. Community colleges are specifically designed to meet the educational needs of the local community. As communities differ significantly across the state, so do their community colleges. As local academic senates work with their administrations to develop program discontinuance processes, they must consider their local mission statements, community needs, college culture, and other relevant aspects of their specific circumstances.

Criteria to identify at-risk programs should do the following:

- State clearly each criterion's goals or measureable outcome

- Contain specifically-defined measures that can be applied fairly to all programs

- Be based on trends over time, typically five or more years

- Consider industry needs

- Relate both to program goals, the mission of the college, and local community needs

‣ Identify a process for determining definite steps to strengthen at-risk programs that the college wishes to save

‣ Consider both the current and long-term economic outlook of the institution

i. Useful data

The following criteria for identifying at-risk programs are suggestions only. Criteria actually included in the district program discontinuance process may be subject to approval by the local governing board consulting collegially with its academic senate, depending on local process. Key factors which may be used in identifying at-risk programs include the following:

‣ Enrollment trends

‣ Term-to-term persistence for those in courses in the major

‣ Demand in the workforce or availability of the transfer major

‣ Service to those in related programs, when the program is being considered for termination

‣ Resources available to support program satisfaction surveys from industry, students, and others in contact with the program

A comprehensive discontinuance process should include both quantitative and qualitative assessments. During the discontinuance process, local senates should encourage that quantitative data be reviewed in context by providing discipline or program faculty an opportunity to provide a narrative explanation.

6. Cautions and Considerations

Most critical college decisions involve many stakeholders and when made cause ripple effects throughout the campus. A decision to discontinue or severely reduce a program will impact discipline faculty, students, counselors, librarians, administrators, the community, and many others with specific jobs at the college. In developing processes for discontinuance, reduction, or growth, academic senates and their partners will want to ensure that they have covered all the possible issues, challenges, and affected parties to the best of their abilities. This section lists some important reminders and considerations as colleges work through the steps to reduce or eliminate, or possibly grow, a program.

A. ORGANIZATIONAL RESTRUCTURE

With fewer employees in many districts currently due to hiring freezes, colleges and districts may find themselves involved in organizational restructuring either for temporary gains or long-term returns on implementing change. Instead of fully discontinuing programs, colleges might consider whether discrete academic or student service departments could be restructured into a better-integrated division that can continue to engage in enrollment management or delivery of quality services. In such a scenario, a discrete program may be discontinued only to

reappear better able to serve students. While not without controversy, campus reorganizations undertaken to improve service to students can be brought about without depriving students of promised academic and student services.

B. CLASS CANCELLATIONS AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

One of the most difficult issues facing a college when a program is discontinued is the balance of course offerings across the curriculum. Class cancellation and the redistribution of full time equivalent faculty (FTEF) workloads have a similar effect on an institution as discontinuing a program. High costs and low enrollment are typical reasons why colleges redistribute FTEF, and those funds typically go to subject areas that show potential for growth or are deemed essential for student completion. Without a comprehensive plan for program discontinuance, some departmental offerings across the curriculum can become unusually deflated to the point that students cannot make reasonable progress toward program completion, hence producing a de facto program discontinuance negatively impacting students and faculty alike.

Academic senates and curriculum committees must review the effects of significant class cancellation and slow program dissolution by including all faculty segments in the discussion. Library and counseling faculty will have unique perspectives to contribute to the discussion of program discontinuance or slow dissolution of programs that other discipline faculty may not consider. From the perspective of these professionals, senates may learn of unintended consequences of course or program reductions, such as students being unable to access the remaining sections due to time conflicts or transfer deadlines or students having reduced access to bibliographic support in the library. In addition, some programs complement other programs that may be negatively affected by reductions or near closure of an associated academic program. For example, if costs of opening more sections of biology courses and laboratories increase and if colleges decide to limit course offerings in these areas, nursing and other allied health fields could be negatively affected and could see their enrollment reduced to a point at which their viability is threatened.

C. REGIONAL ISSUES

Program discontinuance can have implications beyond the immediate community and extend into neighboring geographical regions. When a program is determined to be at risk, the college should initiate an analysis to determine the impact of terminating the program on the surrounding region. Consideration should be given to the following:

- ‣ Need for workers in the region with skills taught in the program

- ‣ Number of transfer slots available at 4-year schools in the region

- ‣ Availability of the program at other community colleges offering the major within the region

- ‣ Collaboration with business and industry in the region to strengthen the program

- ‣ Possibility of joint programs with other community colleges in the region

- ‣ Possibility of encouraging students at neighboring community colleges not offering the program to enroll in the program at the target college

- ‣ Effects on UC/CSU transfer students

- ‣ Effects on local industry

- ‣ Impact on transfer students' ability to complete specific lower division subject areas and general education requirements when eliminating a program

- ‣ Impact on local recruitment efforts by employers seeking to find individuals with entry level occupational skills

An institution's program offerings need to reflect a variety of local community and regional needs, many of which are reflected in the occupational skill needs of the area. Regional cooperation is essential to establishing and maintaining a skilled workforce. The limitation of program offerings to one specific college may not acknowledge the reality of a regionally-based economy or of the scarce resources available to educational institutions. Program discontinuance discussions must include an assessment of the potential impact on the surrounding region. Larger geographical areas often rely on high profile occupational programs (i.e., nursing, dental, business, computer technology) to satisfy the need for workers in the region.

Communication among discipline faculty within a given region is essential prior to the discontinuance of a program. For occupational programs, the issue may be presented to the regional occupational education deans, who also review programs for program approval before they go to the Chancellor's Office. For transfer programs, discipline faculty should consult with colleagues at neighboring community colleges as well as transfer institutions and explore options, including cross enrollment opportunities. Transfer center coordinators should also be involved so that they may provide transfer data and statistics, which will prove valuable to any discussions.

D. EFFECTS ON STUDENTS

An effective program discontinuance policy and process begin with at least a two-year commitment to the students of any entering class such that it is possible for full time students to complete the stated requirements of the program before it is discontinued. Colleges should make available specific counseling services to assist affected students. Regional efforts to support students in certain programs that are subject to reduction might help to address this issue, or the college might encourage students to complete program requirements before completing general education or other college requirements.

As with all student success, colleges and specifically academic senates should be mindful of disproportionate impact for any students in courses or programs. If a college is using low student enrollment as a key reason for identifying at-risk programs and an occupational program identified as at-risk happens to enroll high percentages of minority students, many of whom are underrepresented, the local academic senate should carefully evaluate the causes of low enrollment. If pedagogical or curricular issues are found to be factors in the low enrollment, every effort should be made to encourage the discipline faculty to make appropriate changes. Also, the college

should ensure that the faculty has the necessary instructional support and equipment to keep the program current and vibrant.

When programs or course offerings shrink dramatically or are eliminated, many students may be caught in unfortunate situations. Colleges should be very conscious of monitoring data on student access and success and addressing outcomes that are negatively disproportionate in order to ensure that students are not unfairly impacted by program discontinuance or restructuring.

E. BARGAINING AGENT

While the decision to maintain, redesign, or discontinue a program is primarily an academic and professional matter and thus falls under the purview of the academic senate, such decisions, once made, can impact faculty working conditions or the need for faculty services. Thus, policies regarding program discontinuance should have two phases. The first, the process for determining whether an academic program will be discontinued, is a matter of consultation between the academic senate and the college or district administration. In the second phase, which should deal with implementation of such decisions, local academic senates must work with their union colleagues to ensure that collective bargaining issues related to program discontinuance are clearly addressed. Collective bargaining agreements usually have processes for addressing such issues codified in "Reduction in Force" articles. Effective discontinuance of a program will include addressing the following collective bargaining issues in collaboration with the collective bargaining agents:

- **Adequate Notification to Affected Faculty**

  Section 87740 of the Education Code requires notification to affected faculty of impending termination or reduction in contract by March 15 of the academic year prior to the anticipated termination. In cases of program discontinuance, longer phase out periods may be needed. Many collective bargaining agreements require earlier notice to the union of an impending faculty termination or reduction in contract.

- **Availability of Retraining for Displaced Faculty**

  The district should recognize its investment in well-trained faculty and should offer faculty the opportunity for retraining if transfer is not possible. Some collective bargaining agreements contain provisions for funding such retraining.

- **Construction of Faculty Service Areas**

  Senate and union leaders need to consult to address the needs of faculty when a program will be discontinued, including a review of Faculty Service Areas (FSAs). For more information on FSAs, see http://www.asccc.org/content/it's-not-fsas.

F. STEPS TO AVOID

Planning processes and well-defined steps to follow in discontinuing or severely reducing programs should help eliminate most of the common pitfalls experienced with program discontinuance. However, the state budget or local availability of funding can cause panic, resulting in poor options for students, bad outcomes for faculty and staff, and negative reflections on the board and administration of the college.

Here are some important reactions to avoid:

‣ Taking precipitous action based on a January governor's budget message, the May Revise, or other local financial forecasts. Frequently colleges find out that the drastic measures they engaged or were about to engage were not necessary. Program discontinuance is more difficult to undo than virtually all other options. If cuts are required, a responsible, thoughtful approach is necessary, especially one that preserves the core mission of the college. (For an example, see Appendix D.)

‣ Going through a program discontinuance process as a well-meaning gesture without really intending to follow through or expect change from the program.

‣ Using self-study aspects of program review in the program discontinuance process. While institutional data typically used in periodic program review may be necessary, program self-study aspects of program review should not be used to engage program discontinuance.

‣ Targeting a program solely or primarily on the basis of its size or projected cost savings to yield a certain sought-after amount of money.

‣ Only considering program discontinuance when fiscal emergency looms.

‣ Deciding which programs to reduce or eliminate based on personality.

G. RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOCAL SENATES

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommends that local academic senates pursue the following actions regarding program discontinuance:

1. Work collegially with district or college administration to develop a locally appropriate definition of a program for use in the program discontinuance process.

2. Work collegially with district or college administration to ensure that program discontinuance processes are data-informed, inclusive, and comprehensive and that they are fairly and consistently implemented.

3. Work collegially with district or college administration to connect program discontinuance to college planning and budget structures.

4. Work collegially with district or college administration to develop processes for program modification and discontinuance during fiscal emergencies and have those processes in place before such emergencies occur.

5. Work to ensure that the self-study aspects of program review remain separate from program discontinuance processes.

6. Create a strong role in the program discontinuance process for the advisory committees in occupational programs.

7. Consult with the local bargaining agent to resolve contractual issues for faculty in the programs that are designated for modification or discontinuance.

7. Conclusions and Summary

Since the original *Program Discontinuance* was published in 1998, more colleges have formal program discontinuance and program viability and vitality processes in place. However, many faculty continue to see program elimination occurring in a variety of ways that are often outside of the formal process. Because program discontinuance directly impacts curriculum, student success, budget and planning processes, and in many cases program review processes, all of which fall under the purview of the academic senate, academic senates must remain vigilant in working with their administrations to develop fair and comprehensive processes for program modification and discontinuance and to ensure that these processes are implemented and applied consistently. Such processes should also include the basis on which program discontinuance decisions are made during fiscal emergencies. By developing such processes through collegial consultation before they are called into use, faculty can help to ensure that the processes are data-informed, inclusive, and have buy-in from all relevant constituent groups.

Appendix A: Program Discontinuance Turnaround Survey 1996

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
TURNAROUND SURVEY

Fall 1997 Plenary Session

PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

1.   Has your college discontinued any occupational program in the last three years?

     Yes: 31   No: 33   Don't Know: 12

2.   Does your college/district have a written policy for program discontinuance?

     Yes: 7   No: 31   Don't Know: 25

3.   If programs have been discontinued, please list them:

Electronics (3)	Welding (2)	Court Reporting
Drafting (4)	Apparel Design	Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
Technical Illustration	Mgt. Of Manufacturing	Travel & Tourism (2)
Purchasing	Early Childhood Ed.	Dry Cleaning (2)
Motorcycle Repair	Tech. Theater	Design Technology
Model Building	Environmental Tech (2)	Aviation Maintenance
Horticulture	Court Reporting	Technical Illustration
General Clerical	Watch Repair	Sprinkler Design
Arch. Design (2)	Interior Design (2)	Food Preparation
Petroleum Tech.	Broadcasting	Journalism
Office Management	Photography	

Appendix B: Program Discontinuance Survey Spring 2011

Survey results on Program Discontinuance
Educational Policies Committee

54 Colleges responded

1. Does your college/district have a policy for program discontinuance?

Yes	**37 (68.5%)**
No	17 (31.5%)

2. Does the program discontinuance policy cover non-instructional programs?

Yes	13 (37.1%)
No	**22 (62.9%)**

3. Which of the following non-instructional programs does the program discontinuance policy cover?

Student Services	**11 (91.7%)**
Administrative Units	4 (33.3%)
Other	2 (16.7%)

4. The position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been to maintain a clear distinction between program discontinuance and program review. Does your college/district maintain this distinction?

Yes	**30 (88.2%)**
No	4 (11.8%)

5. Has your college discontinued any programs in the last three years?

Yes	10 (30.3%)
No	**23 (69.7%)**

6. What programs have been discontinued?

   a. Animal Health Technology, Electronics
      Auto technology is in the discontinuance process – recommendation awaiting board action
   b. Drafting was discontinued. Real Estate was discontinued as a separate program (folded into Business). Computer Network Technician was discontinued. Other programs were significantly modified and/or combined with other programs

      c. Animal Health Technology
      d. Environmental Horticulture
      e. Joy of Music
      f. Travel and Tourism
      g. GED
      h. Cosmetology
      i. Fashion Design and Merchandising and Basic English as a Second Language

7. Does your policy for program discontinuance include any provisions for significantly reducing (scaling back) a program?

Yes	15 (42.9%)
No	**20 (57.1%)**

8. Has your college significantly reduced (scaled back) any programs in the last three years?

Yes	**38 (76%)**
No	12 (24%)

9. What aspects of the program(s) has/have been reduced? (Check all that apply.)

Course Offerings	**33 (89.2%)**
Faculty	19 (51.4%)
Staff	8 (21.6%)
Other	6 (16.2%)

<u>Areas reduced</u>:
      a. Support personnel, student workers, aspects of programs, not replaced retirements, not provided faculty for approved programs (usually vocational).
      b. Counseling and counseling courses
      c. Lower enrollment in nursing due to workload cuts
      d. Retained fulltime faculty and staff though reduced some categorical programs
      e. Moved to fee based
      f. Cosmetology (contract ed) suspended; Model United Nations and forensics team discontinued
      g. Facilities
      h. Faculty retired, courses reduced, next step to happen soon will discontinue the rental of space where courses were offered.
      i. The program is the Center for the Arts, which doesn't offer courses. It supports the campus and offers many artistic opportunities. Both staff and offerings have been reduced.
      j. Administration/management

10. Was a policy used to make these significant reductions to programs?

Discontinuance policy (includes provisions for program reduction)   3 (9.4%)
Program reduction policy   2 (6.3%)
No policy was used   **20 (62.5%)**
Other policy   7 (21.9%)

11. In general, was your Academic Senate involved in the process and final recommendation to make reductions to these programs?

Involved in the process   9 (30..0%)
Not involved in the process   **14 (46.7%)**
Involved in final recommendation to reduce   1 (3.5%)
Not involved in final recommendation to reduce   3 (10.0%)
Other   (10.0%)

12. In general, who initiated the policy or process to make reduction to programs?

Faculty initiated reduction   3 (9.7%)
Administrators initiated reduction   **24 (77.4%)**
Other   4 (12.9%)

13. One of the ways that programs are ultimately discontinued through incremental cuts to the offerings over several terms or years. Do you have any programs that have been discontinued in this manner?

Yes   12 (36.4%)
No   **21 (63.6%)**

Appendix C: Example Program Discontinuance Policies & Procedures

American River College's Policy

excerpt from: *American River College Curriculum Handbook 2011 – 2012*

PROGRAM FOCUS REVIEW

Purpose To critically review a program for possible discontinuance or to recommend changes needed to enhance its viability.

Process 1. Using at least one of the Initiating Criteria, a request is made to the Curriculum Committee to initiate a Program Focus Review.

2. The Curriculum Committee (CC) reviews the request, confirms the initiating criteria, and if in agreement, forms the Program Focus Review Committee (PFRC).

3. The PFRC conducts the review using the guidelines. Prior to sending it to the CC, the PFRC notifies the Program's Department Spokesperson and Area Dean of its recommendation.

4. PFRC sends its recommendation to the CC.

5. CC receives PFRC recommendation and schedules a hearing with the program's department. CC then forms its recommendation.

6. Curriculum Committee's faculty co-chair takes CC recommendation to Academic Senate. Vice President of Instruction (VPI) takes CC recommendation to President's Executive Staff (PES).

7. The recommendation is presented to the President at a joint meeting of the Academic Senate's Executive Officers and the President's Executive Staff.

8. President makes decision.

Note: Any request for further information or clarification should be directed to the Curriculum Committee Chair for disposition.

Initiating Criteria One or more of the following:

- Declining Market/Industry Demand (local, regional, etc.)
- Advisory Committee Recommendation

NOTE: College processes may be updated, modified or replaced since publication. Please check with the senate president from the college at which the example process was created for the latest information.

- Lack of Availability of Resources
- Declining Enrollment/Productivity Trends
- Declining 4-year College/University Transfer Trends

Note: Trends must be at least 3 years

- Department Chair in consultation with department members, or when there is no department chair, a majority of the department members.

- Curriculum Committee Chair in consultation with Curriculum Committee members: Vice-President of Instruction in consultation with program's division dean and Associate Vice-President, Instruction 5 faculty and 2 administrators, none of which is directly involved with the program under review.

> *If the program under review is vocational, then the 5 faculty must include:*
> three vocational faculty, one non-vocational faculty, one counselor familiar with vocational programs, and the two administrators must include at least one who works with vocational pro-grams.

> *If the program under review is non-vocational, then the 5 faculty must include:*
> three non-vocational faculty, one vocational faculty, one counselor familiar with non-vocational programs, and the two administrators must include at least one who works with non-vocational programs.

Appendix C: Example Program Discontinuance Policies & Procedures (con't.)

<u>Cuesta College's Program Discontinuance Policy</u>

Administrative Procedure: Program Discontinuance AP 4021
Reference: Education Code 78016; Title 5, 51022, 55130

PROGRAM REVITALIZATION, SUSPENSION, AND/OR DISCONTINUANCE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE [1]

Background
In accordance with title 5, Section 51022, "college districts are required by regulation and statute to develop a process for program discontinuance and minimum criteria for the discontinuance of occupational programs."

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has recommended that local senates in consultation with the collective bargaining agent develop a process for program discontinuance that takes into account the following issues:
- impact on student learning, goals, and needs;
- affect on the balance of the college curriculum;
- impact on educational and budget planning; and
- changes in regional economic and training conditions.

Policy Statement
The Academic Senate of Cuesta College has updated the campus Program Discontinuance Policy in accordance with Title 5, section 51022, and in consideration of the recommendations and guidelines of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). The primary purpose of this policy is to establish criteria and guidelines for decisions regarding the revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance of programs proposed for such action. Following due process and using appropriate data, this policy will ensure that all programs under consideration for suspension or discontinuance must be proposed for such consideration using the policy guidelines as stated herein.

Program Definition
An ***instructional program*** is defined as a discipline and as an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

Policy Summary
When a program's effectiveness is in question due to the content of a Institutional Program Plan and Review (IPPR) Template and has demonstrated to be in need of further review for possible revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance based on a number of factors, this policy provides the process and procedure for such programs to be considered for revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance as defined later in this policy.

There are five stages to the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance

Process:

- **Stage One: Proposal Request (Appendix A)**
  - A Proposal Request for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance must be informed by the content of an Institutional Program Plan and Review (IPPR) Template.
  - Any full-time faculty member in the program, division chair, dean, or the VP of Academic Affairs may prepare a Proposal Request form and present it to the College Council for their approval to initiate the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Process.
  - Multiple indicators must be checked on the Proposal Request form for the proposal to be consider valid by the College Council.

    1 **Approved by the Cuesta College Academic Senate Council on 4-23-10 after incorporating final feedback from the Shared Governance Council on 4-13-10.**

  - Each Proposal Request form must be signed by one of each of the following three personnel: one program faculty member, the division chair of record, and the dean of record or the VP of Academic Affairs.

  - Each signed Proposal Request must be presented as an agenda item to the College Council for consideration.

- **Stage Two: Review of Proposal Request—College Council**
  - If a Proposal Request is approved by the College Council, a Task Force is assigned by the Council to convene work on a recommendation report for the program to either be continued, revitalized, suspended, or discontinued.
  - If a Proposal Request is denied by the College Council, the meeting minutes must reflect the reasons for the denial of the Request.

- **Stage Three: Program Analysis Forms (Appendices B & C)**
  - If the proposal request is approved by the College Council, the program's dean, division chair, lead faculty member or coordinator, and the Office of Institutional Research will complete a Program Analysis Form within two weeks.

  - This Program Analysis Forms are a report on current and past quantitative and qualitative data on the program that must be researched and reported so that the Task Force can make an informed recommendation to the College Council regarding the program's continuance, revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance.

  - The completed Program Analysis Forms will be submitted to the co-chairs of the Task Force, who will then begin work analyzing the data provided.

- **Stage Four: Task Force Program Recommendation Report**
  - The Task Force will evaluate the Program Analysis Forms and present a recommendation report to the College Council for consideration regarding the continuance, revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance of the program.

- **Stage Five: Decision—College Council**
  - The College Council will evaluate the Task Force Program Recommendation Report and make a decision to continue, revitalize, suspend, or discontinue a program

based on the recommendations of the Task Force.

o The President/Superintendent has full responsibility and authority to implement the decision of the College Council.

1. **CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS**

A. <u>Initiation of the Process</u>
    (1) A Proposal Request for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance must be informed by the content of a Institutional Program Plan & Review (IPPR) Template.

    (2) A program may be recommended for program revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance with the Proposal Request Form (Appendix A) by a full-time faculty member or division chair within the program, by the Dean supervising the program, and/or by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

    (3) The Proposal Request Form for program revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance must be proposed to the College Council with multiple indicators, which may include but are not limited to following:
- Weak enrollment trend
- Insufficient frequency of course section offerings to assure reasonable availability for students to complete the program within its stated duration
- Poor retention within courses
- Poor term-to-term persistence for those students in courses in the major
- Changes in the job market, community/student needs or interests, transfer requirements
- Diminished outside funding resources
- Program creates financial hardship for the institution
- Lack of available qualified program personnel
- Outdated curriculum
- Outdated equipment; and/or
- Outdated facilities.

    (4) The Proposal Request Form must be presented on a College Council agenda for approval. If the College Council approves the proposal, a Task Force will be convened to analyze all pertinent information and make a recommendation. In addition, the program's dean, division chair, lead faculty member or coordinator, and the Office of Institutional Research will complete the Program Analysis Forms (Appendices B & C) within two weeks of College Council approval of the Proposal Request Form and submit this to the co-chairs of the program revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance Task Force appointed by the College Council.

B. <u>Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Task Force</u>
    (1) The Task Force shall be composed of the following:
- Dean of the program (Co-Chair, with faculty member as described below)
- Division chair or designee*of the program
- 1 faculty member who teaches in the program
- Academic Senate President or designee
- Chair of the Curriculum Committee or designee

- CCFT President or designee
- 1 representative of the College Council

*If the program has a academic director, the director will also serve.

(2) The Task Force will be co-chaired by a faculty member to be selected from and by the membership of the Task Force. The responsibilities of the co-chairs of the Task Force include, but are not be limited to, the following:
- Consultation with the Office of Institutional Research and other resources to validate information being used in determining recommendations.
- Maintenance of objectivity and integrity during the entire process.
- Meeting minutes recorded for each meeting.
- The production of a Task Force Recommendation Report (Appendix D) within 90 days of the formation of the Task Force that will specify the outcome of its research and deliberations and make specific recommendations for action, complete with timelines.

(3) The Task Force Recommendation Report must include the following:
- A recommendation for the program's continuance, revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance;
- A summary of the reasons for the recommendation;
- A summary of the process used by the Task Force;
- A review of the Program Analysis Forms (Appendices B & C) and all data consulted; and
- A detailed assessment of the recommendations' impact on the college's overall educational program and budget, as well as its impact on all students, faculty, and staff involved.

C. Possible Recommendations provided by the Task Force Recommendation Report (Appendix D)
   (1) Program Continuance – A program may be recommended to continue without any qualifications or recommendations.

   (2) Program Revitalization – A program may be recommended to continue with qualifications.

These may include, but are not limited to, specific interventions designed to improve the viability and responsiveness of the program. Examples of Program Revitalization may include:

- A plan of action to enhance the performance and effectiveness of an existing program, discipline or department, which could include establishing training/ professional development for faculty and or curriculum changes/updates.

- A recommendation to restructure an existing program, discipline or department for greater effectiveness, including restructuring or joining of smaller departments into a larger one, or splitting the program into larger departments.

- A recommendation to develop a new program from the existing program.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization shall include a time-

line during which these interventions will occur and expected outcomes will be outlined. All interventions and timelines will also be communicated in writing to the division chair, Dean of the program and Vice-President of Academic Affairs. After the specified revitalization period is completed, the program will be reviewed again on a regular program review cycle with a completed Comprehensive Program Plan and Review (CPPR).

(3) Program Suspension – A program may be recommended for a one to three year temporary suspension. Any recommendation for program suspension must include the criteria used to arrive at the recommendation. Examples or reasoning for the temporary suspension may include but are not limited to:
- safety issues,
- equipment purchase update,
- unqualified faculty,
- regulatory suspension, and/or
- lack of funding resources.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Suspension shall consider and/or include the following:

- A detailed plan and recommended timeline for the suspension of the program with the least impact on students, faculty, staff and the community.
- An impact report explaining how phasing out the program for suspension will affect students, faculty, staff, and the community based on the Program Analysis data (Appendices B & C).
- The amount of cost savings achieved by virtue of the program's discontinuance.
- Recommendations for how currently enrolled students may continue their program of study or a plan for students to meet their educational objectives through alternative means while the program is under suspension.
- The requirements of collective bargaining for faculty and staff, including application of policies for reduction in force and opportunities for retraining of faculty and staff, if necessary, while the program is under suspension.

(4) Program Discontinuance – A recommendation to discontinue a program, discipline or department will occur when, after a full evaluation study, it is concluded that it is no longer in the best interest of the college, its students, and the larger community for the program to continue. Any recommendation for program discontinuance must include the criteria used to arrive at the recommendation.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Discontinuance shall consider and/or include the following:
- A detailed plan and recommended timeline for phasing out the program for discontinuance with the least impact on students, faculty, staff and the community.
- An impact report explaining how phasing out the program for discontinuance will affect students, faculty, staff, and the community based on the Program Analysis data (Appendices B & C).
- The amount of cost savings achieved by virtue of the program's discontinuance.
- Recommendations for how currently enrolled students may continue their program of study or a plan for students to meet their educational objectives through alternative means.
- The requirements of collective bargaining for faculty and staff, including application of

policies for reduction in force and opportunities for retraining of faculty and staff.

D. Decision-Making Process and Implementation of Task Force Recommendation Report

(1) The Task Force will present the Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization, Suspension and/or Discontinuance to the College Council for comment and approval. If the Recommendation Report is approved by the College Council, the President/ Superintendent has full responsibility and authority to implement this decision as designee of the Board of Trustees.

(2) If the President/Superintendent decides to implement the approved Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization, Suspension and/or Discontinuance, the affected Vice President(s), Dean, Division Chair, and faculty and staff will develop the actual program revitalization, suspension and/or discontinuance timeline, taking into consideration the following:
- Faculty reassignment by FSA or termination
- Staff reassignment or termination
- Alternatives for students to complete program degree(s) and/or certificates
- Redistribution/discontinuance of equipment, supplies, facilities, and budget

(3) If the President/Superintendent decides not to implement the approved Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance, then he or she shall communicate the reasons in writing to the College Council.

(4) The President/Superintendent shall report the final decision regarding the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance to the Board of Trustees with the reasons for the recommendation.

If the final decision is to suspend or discontinue the program, then the Vice President of Academic Affairs or Vice-President of Student Services, Academic Senate, CCFT, CCCUE, appropriate dean(s), division chair(s), academic directors, and/or program instructor(s) will participate in the following steps:

Consult with affected faculty and staff member(s) regarding their employment rights.
Consult with students regarding their options for program completion or transfer.

Approved: July 7, 2010
Effective Date: July 7, 2010

Please refer to Cuesta College Website for Cuesta Forms, Templates and Appendices related to this policy.

Appendix C: Example Program Discontinuance Policies & Procedures (con't.)

Los Angeles Valley College
<u>Viability Review of Educational Programs</u>

Overview
Program Viability Review is a process meant to assure that the College's instructional resources are used in response to the College's Mission, its Educational Master Plan, the needs of its students, and the requirements of the community it serves.

Viability review involves a specific process, one that is a result of the regular Program Review process, or upon special request.

The term *program* as it relates to this review process includes all degree and certificate instructional programs, all instructional disciplines, and all departments or other campus units offering instruction.

Board Rule 6803 requires that each college, in consultation with its Academic Senate, develop procedures for initiating and conducting a viability review of educational programs.

Board Rule 6803.10, Education Code 78016, and Title 5, §51022(a) require that a viability review be conducted prior to program discontinuance (termination).

This policy shall supersede the existing Program Discontinuance Process.

If the recommendation resulting from the viability review is Departmental Reorganization and is accepted at all levels, then the standard Department Modification Process is bypassed.

Outcomes
Viability review committees make recommendations that include but are not limited to the following:
1. *Program Initiation*
   The institution or adoption of a new program, a new discipline, or a new department

2. *Program Modification and Improvement*
   A plan of action to enhance the performance and effectiveness of an existing program, discipline, or department.

3. *Departmental Reorganization*
   The restructuring of an existing program, discipline, or department for greater effectiveness, including the joining of smaller departments into a larger one, or splitting a larger department into smaller ones.

4. *Program Discontinuance*
   The discontinuance (termination) of an existing program, discipline, or department

   In general, program discontinuance should be recommended only after a serious attempt has been made to improve program effectiveness and efficiency, unless it is clear that future efforts at remediation are not warranted.

Pursuant to Board Rule 6803.10, a viability review is required prior to program discontinuance and must consider the following:

1. The effects on students and student success if the program is discontinued;
2. Provisions that can and should be made for students in progress to complete their training;
3. The impact that discontinuance of the program will have on the comprehensiveness and balance of offerings across the college curriculum and within the district;
4. How the program's discontinuance would impact the educational and budget-planning process used at the institution;
5. How the program's discontinuance affects the region;
6. The effects of the program's discontinuance on transfer to four-year colleges and universities;
7. The effects of the program's discontinuance on local businesses and industries;
8. The effects of the program's discontinuance on faculty and staff.

"The College President and College Academic Senate President shall make program discontinuance recommendations to the Board of Trustees for approval. The recommendation shall include a description of the viability review process and the reasons for the recommendation." [Board Rule 6803.10]

Establishing a Special Viability Review Workgroup

The process of Viability Review is carried out by a special review workgroup organized by the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) in all cases of Program Initiation, Program Modification and Improvement, Departmental Reorganization, or Program Discontinuance. The process may be initiated by a request or motion on the part of any of the following with sound rationale: the Discipline/Department; the College President; the Vice President of Academic Affairs; PEPC as the result of Program Review; the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) as the result of Educational Master Planning; the Academic Senate. The Review Committee exists until it files its recommendations.

Membership on the Review Committee should include:
The Academic Senate President or Designee
1 – PEPC member (selected by PEPC)
1 – EPC member (selected by EPC)
1 – Department Chair (selected by the Chairs and Directors)
The Curriculum Committee Chair or designee
1 – AFT representative
The Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee
1 – Academic Dean
At most two additional members from other institutions when either program initiation or program discontinuance are being considered.

Information Data Gathering
Decisions made in the course of the Program Viability Process must be based on a broad and thoroughgoing investigation of factors relating to the benefits of a program for students, for the college, and for the community served by Valley College. They must, therefore, take into consideration information that goes far beyond simple measures of current student demand or weekly student-contact hours.

The following general types of information should be gathered as needed and weighed in the process of formulating the Review Committee's recommendations:
1. Relation of the program to the College Mission
2. Relation of the program to the Educational Master Plan
3. Recent Program Review or accrediting agency recommendations
4. Measures of student demand (enrollment, average class size, degrees/certificates, or surveys)
5. Measures of labor-market demand (CTE only)
6. Current program effectiveness (FTEF/FTES ratio, success and retention) [not required for program initiation]
7. SLO Assessment Data
8. Advisory Committee Recommendations or other reports (CTE only)
9. Interviews [not required for program initiation]
10. Open Forum [not required for program initiation]
11. Projected impact on overall educational program, students, faculty, college budget, community

Process
I. Once a Special Review Committee has been formed, it will meet to elect a chair and establish a specific plan for the study it is about to undertake. *Note: if a Department is initiating a viability review for the purpose of program discontinuance as state on page 1, then, the department only need to address the considerations for program discontinuance and the review committees meets to ensure that the impact to current students is minimal and mitigation strategies are in place in accordance with these considerations.*

II. This plan should include data gathering, solicitation of position papers from faculty, staff, and students involved, interviews with faculty in the affected area and in related instructional areas, interviews with students and administrators, consultations with outside experts and faculty and/or administrators from other institutions, administration of surveys, and/or use of focus groups. At least one well-publicized open forum should be held to allow any concerned member of the campus community or of the College's service area the opportunity to voice opinions and express concerns. In addition, the committee shall consult when necessary with District, regional, and State agencies and institutions overseeing specific types of programs, such as certain vocational programs.

III. Within six months of the committee's formation, it will produce a *Program Viability Report* specifying the outcome of its deliberations and making specific recommendations for action, complete with timelines.

    This Viability Report must include the following:
    1. a summary of the process used by the committee
    2. a review of all data consulted
    3. recommendation for program initiation, program modification, department reorganization, or program discontinuance.
    4. a detailed assessment of the recommendations' impact on the College's overall educational program and budget, as well as its impact on all students, faculty, and staff involved.

IV. **Approvals**
    Viability Review Workgroup recommendations shall be forwarded to PEPC for recommendations /approval.

The review will then be forwarded simultaneously to the Academic Senate and Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) for recommendation/approval. IEC will also receive information from EPC regarding potential FTEF allocation and from the Budget Office regarding fiscal impacts. The Senate's decision shall be taken to the College President through consultation with the Academic Senate President and the AFT Chapter President. [Article 17, §A.2 AFT Faculty Guild Collective Bargaining Agreement] IEC will make a formal recommendation to the College President through the Shared Governance Process.

V. The College President makes the final decision and reports out to the Institutional Effectiveness Council, Council members from Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, Educational Planning Committee, Academic Senate, and the appropriate Vice President will report back to their respective constituencies.

Appendix C – Example Program Discontinuance Policies & Procedures (con't.)

<u>Southwestern College's Program Discontinuance</u> Policy & Procedures

Southwestern Community College District Policy   No. 4021

<div align="right">Academic Affairs</div>

PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

References: *Education Code §78016*
     Title 5 §51022 and §55130

Southwestern Community College District is committed to providing excellent educational programs that prepare students to meet the challenges in their chosen field. Programs that are no longer viable, once identified by the School/Center and supported by the program review process, should be considered for discontinuance. The Program Discontinuance Policy and procedures serves as a mechanism that allows District programs to remain contemporary, dynamic, and pragmatic.

District Policy 2515 and procedures, the 10 + 1 Agreement between the District and the Academic Senate, provides for the District to rely primarily upon the Academic Senate to determine the criteria and process regarding curriculum and program viability. The Academic Program Review Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate, is assigned the task of administering Program Review. The Program Review process takes place on a rotating basis for each discipline. However, review may be initiated at any time, if and when it is determined that a program may be experiencing factors that have a negative impact on academic offerings. This determination will be made by faculty and administrators utilizing the Program Review process.

The following five criteria for program discontinuance are based on the current edition of *Program and Course Approval Handbook* (PCAH), California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

1. The goals and objectives of the Program are no longer appropriate to the Mission of the California Community Colleges nor congruent with the Institutional Strategic Plan of the District.
2. The Program no longer meets industry needs and lacks demand in the current job market and is not considered an emerging industry or career or the program curriculum no longer aligns with university transfer majors or General Education requirements.
3. The Program does not meet curriculum standards as defined by Title 5 §55100.
4. There are insufficient resources to realistically support the program at a sufficient level of quality, **and** the Program has experienced continued low or declining enrollment (55% of class max or more) for a sustained period of time (generally four or more semesters), which is demonstrated by continued low persistence and completion rates in the program supported by reliable, valid and longitudinal data.
5. The Program has been determined to be out of compliance with existing state or federal laws, ie Title 5 §55130(d), or licensing laws in particular occupations.

Southwestern Community College District Procedures　　　　**No. 4021**

PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

References:　　Education Code §78016
*　　　　　　　Title 5 §51022 and §55130*

District Policy and Procedure No. 2515 (the 10 + 1 Agreement between the District and the Academic Senate) provide for the District to rely primarily upon the Academic Senate to determine the criteria and process regarding curriculum and program viability. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, is assigned the task of administering Academic Program Review (APR). The determination for consideration of program discontinuance will be made by faculty and administrators utilizing shared planning and decision-making processes as set out in District Policy & Procedure No. 2510 and the APR process.

Program Review may be initiated at any time, if and when it is determined by the APRC or by discipline faculty that a particular program, including long-standing grant-funded programs, may be experiencing factors that have a negative impact on academic offerings. In regards to program discontinuance for all grant-funded programs, the coordinator or the grant funded program must request funding by the District at least 18 months prior to the end of their grant funding in order to be considered for acceptance by the District.

When an APR report indicates that a Program does not meet one or more of the five criteria that form the basis for program discontinuance as referenced in District Policy No. 4021, it may be determined to be at risk of Program Discontinuance. This determination will be arrived at only after careful consideration by the APRC or the discipline faculty and of valid, reliable and longitudinal statistical data:

Timeline and Procedures:　　　Academic Year 1

Fall Semester – Year 1
The Academic Program Review reports (APRs) are completed by discipline faculty for all programs within the APR cycle.

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) Chair may request an out-of-sequence APR if it is justified by valid statistical data and/or other concerns that affect program viability based on the five criteria for Program Discontinuance.

Spring Semester – Year 1:

By January 15, the APRC Chair forwards APRs for disciplines undergoing Program Review in the APR Cycle to the assigned APR Readers.

By March 1, APRs are read by the APRC readers and reviewed by the APRC.
By April 1, the APRC Chair forwards concerns regarding programs that exhibit one or more program discontinuance criteria to the Academic Senate President (AS President). If the AS President concurs with the concerns, s/he forwards the concern(s) to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and alerts SCEA to the concerns.

By April 15, the APRC Chair forwards the final APR report with data, findings and program concerns to the AS President, the VPAA and the School Dean and, if a transfer program is involved, the SWC Articulation Officer, all of whom will discuss whether the Program Discontinuance process should be initiated.

By April, 30, the AS President calls a meeting with the VPAA, the APRC Chair, the Articulation Officer, the School/Center Dean, the Department Chair, and the affected discipline faculty and an SCEA Representative to report concerns, findings, data, criteria and discuss options and/or recommendations.

By May 1st, notification that Program Discontinuance and other options are being considered for a specific program are announced at a regularly scheduled Academic Senate meeting.

By May 15, the AS President and the VPAA present their recommendations to the School/Center Dean, Dept. Chair, discipline faculty and an SCEA Representative. The VPAA requests that faculty develop a Program Improvement Plan by September 1st of Academic Year 2. Discipline faculty may request additional data for their report at this time, which can also help develop their Program Improvement Plan.

Academic Year 2

Fall Semester – Year 2

By Sept. 1, the Program Improvement Plan written by discipline faculty is submitted to the VPAA, AS President, APRC Chair, and School/Center Dean for their review.

By October 1, The AS President and the VPAA consult with the APRC, the cognizant School/Center Dean, the Department Chair and discipline faculty to discuss the Program Improvement Plan and make a recommendation to:
   a) Approve the Improvement Plan for two years starting in the Spring Semester and conduct a reevaluation of the Program at the end of that period, OR
   b) Continue Program Discontinuance discussions for one year, OR
   c) Discontinue the Program.

By November 15, notification the outcome of the October 1 Program Discontinuance meeting for a specific program are announced at a regularly scheduled Academic Senate meeting.
By December 15, the options above will be implemented respectively as follows:
   a) The Program Improvement Plan is approved for two years starting in Spring of Year 2; the APRC gives priority review to the Plan during the fall semester. APRC offers written suggestions for further improvement of the Plan to the discipline faculty.
   b) Program Discontinuance discussions continue for a year; the Program Improvement Plan will be reviewed in the fall semester of Year 3 as in year 1.
   c) The Program is determined to be discontinued.

Spring Semester – Year 2

Options a & b are implemented as stated above. By February 1, for Program Discontinuance (option c), the VPAA presents the Program Discontinuance Proposals to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for comment and recommendations as well as for inclusion on a future Senate agenda for official Academic Senate consultation and action.

By March 14, the Academic Senate votes on Program Discontinuance for the proposed Pro-

gram. Once voted upon, the AS President forwards the action information to the VPAA in a written memo along with a brief rationale.

By April 1, VPAA submits the Program Discontinuance Proposal to the Superintendent/ President's Office for inclusion on the May Governing Board meeting agenda.

By May 15, the Governing Board reviews the Proposed Program Discontinuance at a public, regularly-scheduled Governing Board meeting, discusses it and takes action to approve, table or disapprove. If approved, written notification regarding the Program Discontinuance is then sent to all affected discipline faculty, staff and students. The SCEA consults with affected faculty members regarding their employment rights and/or options.

By May 16, the cognizant School/Center Dean in collaboration with the VPAA and VPSA (Vice President for Student Affairs) consults with students regarding timely completion of their programs, transfer and/or options on a case by case basis. Such timelines and options will be made public.

Academic Year 3

Fall Semester – Year 3
By Sept. 1, the cognizant School/Center Dean in collaboration with the VPAA and the AS President recommends redistribution of equipment, supplies, staff, facilities and School recommendations are then forwarded to the Shared Consultation Council (SCC) Budget Committee and then finally on to the entire SCC for review and approval in time to be forwarded for timely placement on a Governing Board agenda for final approval before June 30.

A program that remains under discussion from the previous year, start the APR process over again (see Academic Year 1).

By October 1, a program with an approved Program Improvement Plan that was implemented the previous Spring semester submits a progress report to the APRC Chair, who forward the progress report to the entire APRC, the VPAA, the AS President, the School/Center Dean, Department Chair and the SCEA President.

By October 15, The APRC Chair meets with the cognizant School/Center Dean, Department Chair, discipline faculty to review and assess the Program Improvement Plan progress report and to offer assistance and/or suggestions for the following year. The Program will undergo a final review at the end of the Spring semester in Year 4 to either discontinue the program or proceed as a fully supported program.

Appendix D: Napa Valley College–Rubric for Budget-Driven Cuts

Tier	General Education Major Transfer Preparation	Career and Technical (CTE)	Basic Skills College Skills, developmental Math, English, LS	Non Credit
Tier One Cuts Change to fee-based or cut	Courses that are primarily avocational, or personal development. Degree applicable courses that attract mostly these types of students (sometimes particular time slots).	CTE courses that are elective or stand-alone that mostly attract community members, not students training for jobs. Stand-alone courses required for professional development of industry certification leading to career entry or advancement.	Courses that may provide useful content and practice but are not primarily focused on the pathway skills.	Courses that primarily serve an "enrichment" function rather than fulfilling an identified community <u>need</u>.
Tier Two Cuts Maintain enough so that students have elective choices.	Sections that are discipline-required electives within transfer majors where other choices are available to students.	Courses that are discipline-required electives within CTE certificates and majors where other choices are available to students.	Courses that may be useful and supplemental to the primary pathway, but not absolutely critical.	Courses that are supplemental to a noncredit pathway, such as the ESL pathway, but not absolutely critical.
Tier Three Cuts Cut judiciously	Sections that are required for the general education of majors, but multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut.	Sections of courses required for CTE certificate/majors, but multiple sections are offered, some of which can be cut.	Sections of courses in the primary pathway where multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut.	Courses that are part of the ESL or Basic Skills pathway, but multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut.
Tier Four Cuts Preserve these if at all possible	English pathway culminating in college level language skills. ENGL 120, 121. Math pathway culminating in college-level math skills. MATH 90, 94. Critical GE areas such as Speech or Critical Thinking where only a few courses meet the GE area. ENGL 123, 125. Critical GE classes for Health Occupations prerequisites. ENGL 120, CHEM 110, BIOL 105, 103, 218, 219, 220.	Required courses in CTE certificate/majors that are offered on an approved rotation plan or that are critical for students to complete a certificate/major. Courses mandated by regulatory agencies.	Higher level basic skills courses leading directly into degree applicable or occupational courses. ENGL 90. Counseling courses attached to learning communities.	Higher level non-credit basic skills and ESL courses that lead into credit ESL or meet CDCP requirements.