**Suggestions for future:**

- Appendix A and the Program Review Committee Executive Summary - should not to be distributed to anyone until it is positive the program will undergo the AP 4021 process, and then all information presented must be documented and signed by the president or designee prior to beginning this process (the Appendix A document was a copy only; it did not include a signature from the president).

- Suggestion that a step be added that allows full time or associate faculty who are connected with the program an opportunity to give their perspective to the committee, but not be an integral part of the committee. Also to allow them some response the data submitted.

- Programs where the only deficiency is a lack of full time faculty should not have to undergo this process (e.g. Addiction Studies). The program review committee should make it very clear in the program and executive summaries that lack of full time faculty is the only reason they are recommending the AP 4021 process. This year it was to assist in the faculty prioritization ranking process.

- Suggestion that input from the AP4021 process is included in the rubric for faculty prioritization. It will strengthen process.

- For program initiation or revitalization, the policy should support and include language clarifying that if CR agrees to initiate or revitalize a program, a corresponding commitment should be made to include a full time faculty member, and to rank this high in the faculty prioritization process.

**Process:**

- The Committees reviewed all data, beginning with Appendix A and why the program is undergoing the process. Appendix A was weighted heavily and all factors need to be included. Several programs should have had additional boxes checked; the task force initially did not see the overall picture.

- Aggregating all labor market data into one score was good.

- Quantitative data: add both section and average section size. The one piece of data not included and was added by the task force was average section size over the last five years. It really showed the health of the program.

- Suspension was not discussed in detail. It was an awkward vote; easier to vote suspension than discontinuance, even though the data might show otherwise. If suspension, the report should show what the suspension will look like and what is needed to make it a viable program.
Initiation of Process:

- There were questions on how the program review committee made the decision to recommend a program for AP 4021. Programs should be evaluated based on a rubric and the process transparent. Communication for this year needs to start with a reminder that a process is in place, is succinct and how it will be done. Reminder: AP 4021 can be initiated by PRC, Faculty, Dean or administrator.

- Final AP should be finalized and in place by May. The process should be implemented in the spring.

- PRC discusses each program during the year. There is not a next step to link this process.

- Suggestion that the final report be treated like a personnel record, or nondisclosure, with a signed agreement up front. Like a hiring committee the report is recommendation only and final decision up to president/administration. For this year’s process, the report went to the task force committee for fact finding only and back to the co-chairs to finalize and submit to the president.

- How and why a program is submitted to the AP 4021 should be more transparent, including who will participate in the process; that the same rubric was used for all programs, and required signatures are included.

Discussed there are two processes for program discontinuance or suspension, AP 4021 and the RIF:

- 17 programs were sent to CRFO for possible discontinuation during the RIF process; were reduced to 10; then faculty and the Senate were notified. Faculty felt the Senate should be advocating for their program(s). It is important the Senate knows how programs for the RIF process.

- There seems to be a disconnected between AP7217 and 4021. If the 4021 process finds a program is good but needs full time faculty, it should be weighted in faculty prioritization.

- Add language to AP 7217 for faculty prioritization based on the 4021 process.

- Suggestion: fine tune and finalize the interim process and implement for Spring 2014 to get on the right cycle. Clarify the ambiguity around program scoring rubric, and communicate.

- Include the senate in the process for determining what program will undergo the AP 4021 process, so they can inform faculty.

- Scheduling decisions should not be linked to the 4021 process.