AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Members of the audience are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Academic Standards and Policies Committee.

3. Discussion Items, Connie Wolfsen

   3.1. Continue Revisions to AP 4021 Program Revitalization, Suspension and/or Discontinuation, (Attachment)

   3.2. Revised Priorities from Senate Executive Committee (Attachment)

   3.3. Review Suggested Revisions to AP 7217 Faculty Prioritization

4. Announcements/Open Forum

5. Adjournment

Public Notice—Nondiscrimination:
College of the Redwoods does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. College of the Redwoods is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats. Please contact Debbie Williams, Academic Senate Support, 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, Eureka, CA 95501, (707) 476-4259, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (except Wednesdays).

Upcoming Meeting Dates:
March 13
March 27
April 10
April 24
May 8
Program Revitalization, Suspension, or Discontinuation Evaluation Process

Step One: Program Analysis Request

Program revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance discussions can be initiated by administration, faculty, Program Review Committee or Academic Senate. The Program Analysis Request (Appendix A) submitted to the appropriate Dean/Director shall be forwarded to the Chief Instruction Officer/Chief Student Services Officer (CIO/CSSO). The Academic Senate Co-Presidents shall be consulted on whether to move the recommendation forward to the President/Superintendent.

Step Two: Appointment of the Task Force

If a Program Analysis Request is approved by the President/Superintendent, a task force will be appointed. The Task Force shall be composed of the following:

- One Dean or Director not connected to the program
- One Academic Senate Co-President or designee
- Two faculty members who are not members of the program or division,
appointed by the Academic Senate (or designee appointed by the President if a faculty member is not available)

- One representative appointed by the President/Superintendent

The Task Force will be co-chaired by the Dean/Director and one faculty member. The Co-chairs’ responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Consult with the Office of Institutional Research and other resources to gather information being used to formulate recommendations
- Prepare a written summary of each meeting
- Produce a Task Force Recommendation Report

The Dean/Director and faculty who are responsible for, or teach in, the program under review will not serve as members of the task force but shall provide information to the task force.

The work of the Task Force is strictly confidential. Information relating to the process may only be discussed with other task force members.

**Step Three: Program Analysis**

Program Analysis involves completion of Appendices B and C. The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for completing the quantitative data within Appendix B. The Task Force is responsible for researching and gathering the qualitative data within Appendix C. When data collection is complete, the Dean/Director and faculty from the program shall be given the opportunity to review and/or supplement the data from Appendices B and C. The Task Force will then commence analysis of all data.

**Step Four: Task Force Program Recommendation Report**

Subsequent to review of all of the relevant information, the Task Force will prepare a report that consists of a summary and analysis of the data used to arrive at the recommendation. Any disagreement among Task Force members on the final recommendation will be documented in the report.

The Dean/Director responsible for and Faculty who teach in the program under review will have the opportunity to review the initial report for findings of fact. The final report shall be submitted to the CIO/CSSO and the President/Superintendent no more than sixty (60) days after formation of the Task Force unless otherwise agreed to between the CIO/CSSO and the task force co-chairs.

The three possible recommendations that may be provided by the Task Force include:

1. Program Revitalization: A program may be recommended to continue with qualifications.
   
   These qualifications may include specific interventions designed to improve the viability of the program, such as training and professional development, curriculum
changes, reallocation of resources, a new full-time faculty position, or restructuring the program.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization shall include:

- Detailed description of recommended interventions,
- Timeline during which these interventions will occur,
- Expected outcomes following program revitalization
- Plan for program re-evaluation that includes a timeline for feedback regarding program viability from the CIO/CSSO to the President/Superintendent and Academic Senate

2. Program Suspension: A program may be recommended for one or more years suspension.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Suspension shall include:

- Detailed plan and recommended timeline for the suspension of the program that minimizes the impact on students, faculty, staff and the community;
- Impact report explaining how phasing out the program for suspension will affect students, faculty, staff, and the community;
- Amount of cost savings achieved by the program’s suspension;
- Recommendations for how currently enrolled students may meet their educational objectives through alternative means while the program is under suspension;
- 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;
- Conditions necessary for program reinstatement (refer to AP 4020)

3. Program Discontinuance: A recommendation to discontinue a program 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.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Discontinuance shall include the following:

- Detailed plan and recommended timeline for phasing out the program that minimizes the impact on students, faculty, staff and the community;
- Impact report explaining how phasing out the program will affect students, faculty, staff, and the community;
- Amount of cost savings achieved of the program’s discontinuance;
- Recommendations for how currently enrolled students may meet their educational objectives through alternative means;
- Requirements of collective bargaining for faculty and staff, including application of policies for reduction in force and opportunities for retraining of faculty and staff.
Step Five: Decision

The President/Superintendent has full responsibility and authority to implement the recommendation as designee of the Board of Trustees. If the President/Superintendent concurs with the Task Force recommendation, the President/Superintendent will direct the appropriate administrators to work with faculty and staff to create a detailed plan for implementation.

If the President/Superintendent decides not to implement the recommendation for revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance, then he or she shall communicate the reasons in writing to the College community.

History:
Interim edition implemented July 1, 2013
Revisions September 2013, February 2014 (Academic Senate and College Council feedback)
2nd Interim edition implemented Spring 2014
Revisions ongoing by ASPC Fall/Spring 2014-2015
Appendix A
PROGRAM ANALYSIS REQUEST FORM

Program Name:____________________________________________________

This Program Analysis Request must be supported by the program review or other appropriate data and shall be submitted to the President/Superintendent. The President/Superintendent will determine if a Task Force shall be convened to evaluate the program for revitalization, suspension or discontinuance.

Please check the indicators that triggered the initiation of the program revitalization, suspension or discontinuance process. Please attach the program’s most recent Program Review to this proposal request.

MULTIPLE INDICATORS (please check multiple indicators below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Multiple Indicators (please check the indicators below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment has declined at least three of the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTES/FTEF is consistently below the district average, or has declined at least three of the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success rates are consistently below the district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention rates are consistently below the district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program completions are consistently below the division’s district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient availability of courses for students to complete the program within its stated duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonaligned with state, the Chancellor’s Office priorities or College mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonaligned with federal and state law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of available program personnel (faculty/staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate equipment and/or facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the local and/or regional job market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in community/student needs or interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in transfer requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diminished outside funding resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program creates financial hardship for the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget concerns and lack of sufficient funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdated curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Requestor</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President/Superintendent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

If the Program Analysis Request is approved by the President/Superintendent, the Director of Institutional Research will complete the Program Analysis Form within a two-week period and submit to the co-chairs of the Task Force. The form will address all applicable criteria below for the most recent 6 terms (compared to the current district average) unless information is unavailable or not applicable.

**PROGRAM REVITALIZATION, SUSPENSION AND/OR DISCONTINUANCE**

**PROGRAM ANALYSIS FORM– QUANTITATIVE DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Average (if applicable)</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of class sections offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fill rates/caps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FTES/FTEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Term-to term persistence of students in the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Success (C or better)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of graduated/certified students from the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expense or annual cost/FTES trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Labor market demand: vocational and avocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of program/area transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

PROGRAM ANALYSIS FORM – QUALITATIVE DATA

This report will address all applicable criteria below unless information is unavailable or not applicable.

| 1. | The impact the action will have on the general education curriculum or the curriculum of other programs. |
| 2. | The ability of students to complete their degree or certificate or to transfer. This includes maintaining the catalog rights of students. |
| 3. | The College’s ability or inability to provide the resources to maintain the program. |
| 4. | Balance of college curriculum (for example, ensuring the non-elimination of all of one type of programs, such as foreign languages) |
| 5. | Replication of programs in the surrounding area and their efficacy. |
| 6. | The potential impact on diversity at the College. |
| 7. | Alignment with Chancellors Office priorities, college mission, accreditation standards, and state and federal law. |
| 8. | Effects on local business and industries—i.e., declining market/industry demand (local, regional). |
| 9. | Availability of the program at other community colleges. |
| 10. | If this is a grant-funded program, what was the agreed institutional commitment for the campus to continue this program? |
| 11. | List specific financial resources required to sustain the program: |
|     | • Faculty compensation FT/PT |
|     | • Support Staff compensation |
|     | • Facilities costs annualized |
|     | • Equipment costs annualized |
|     | • Supplies cost annualized |
| 12. | Potential impact on the community. |
List of ASPC Priorities for 2014-15 (per list of 9/12/15)

1. BP/AP 4020 Program, Curriculum and Course Development
2. BP/AP 4021 Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuation
3. BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites & Corequisites
4. BP/AP 4231 Grade Changes
5. BP/AP 4235 Credit by Examination
6. BP/AP 3900 Speech: Time, Place and Manner

Revised list as of 2/27/15

1. BP/AP 4020 done
2. BP/AP 4021 almost done
3. AP 7217 Faculty Prioritization
4. AP 5075 Credit Course Adds and Drops
5. BP/AP 4231 Grade Changes
6. BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites & Corequisites
7. BP/AP 4235 Credit by Examination
8. BP/AP 3900 Speech: Time, Place and Manner
FACULTY PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Faculty prioritization is a key process aimed at strengthening our college, engaging community needs and fostering student success. Because prioritization cannot be reduced to one rubric, the process will be multifaceted, and decision making will consider qualitative and quantitative data from program review, legal mandates, accreditation, and student education goals to come from large and small groups across transfer, career technical and student development areas. This process relies on collegial consultation between the administration and the academic senate.

Process:

1. Each academic year, as part of Program Review, Associate Deans, Directors of the administration and faculty will have the opportunity to fill out a faculty position request form, providing relevant data and a narrative justifying the need for a fulltime position. All faculty request forms will be forwarded by the Program Review Committee (PRC) to the Academic Senate Copresidents and to the Deans’ Council. This process is done each year. There is no holdover of ranked positions from any previous year.

2. Faculty requests will include both teaching and non-teaching faculty positions. Replacement requests due to tenure track attrition during the four year probationary period for that position are not part of this process and are filled automatically, unless there is mutual agreement to the contrary.

3. Requests shall be campus and site specific. In the case of a failed search, processes outlined in the “Contract Faculty Appointment Procedures” will be followed.

4. Temporary grant-funded positions will not be included in this process. Proposals to convert grant-funded to tenure-track faculty positions will be included in the process.

5. The data required on the Faculty Request forms and the criteria used for ranking on the Prioritization Rubric will be articulated and revised as necessary by joint agreement of the Academic Senate and the Administration.

6. Each year, prior to the evaluation of the faculty requests, members of the Faculty Prioritization Committee (FPC) will be trained (normed) in using the criteria on the rubric. Data will be used as much as possible in evaluating the requests, but as every program is different, qualitative factors must be considered. Not all criteria are hierarchical in nature.

7. The FPC will review the data from the request forms and will evaluate each request on the basis of the specified criteria (See Prioritization Rubric and Directions).
8. The co-chairs of the Faculty Prioritization Committee are voting members.

9. In the event that the Faculty Prioritization Committee needs more information, the Co-Chairs of the committee may ask for a representative from the discipline in question to come forward to answer questions about the position; however, no presentations will be made.

10. All faculty requests will be ranked, regardless of how many positions may be available.

11. The initial ranking will be done by ballot as follows: each member will assign a score to each rubric category for each position request. The total of the average scores in each rubric category will determine the initial ranking. The initial ranking may be revised as described in (13) below.

12. Once the draft list has been completed, any member of the Faculty Prioritization Committee can request an override of a ranking where there is significant statistical discrepancy of 5 total points or more with any of the members initial ranking scores. Overrides are permitted when a majority (7/13 of the committee members are required) votes to re-rank a single position.

13. Faculty positions will be forwarded to the President/Superintendent and Academic Senate by the committee Co-Chairs as a recommendation for action.

14. The President/Superintendent acts on the committee’s recommendations and forwards positions to the District as appropriate (timing may be affected by available funding or information regarding the fulltime faculty obligation [FTO]). Should the President/Superintendent override any of the ranked positions, he or she must present a written explanation of that decision to the FPC Academic Senate and to the Deans’ Council.

15. The timeline shown below is for typical prioritization and faculty hiring cycle. The process will also apply to out-of-cycle faculty requests.

Membership of the Prioritization Committee:

- Academic Senate Co-Presidents or designees (2) (1 of whom is Co-Chair)
- Program Review Committee faculty representatives (2)
- At-large faculty representatives (at least one non-Eureka) selected by the Academic Senate Co-Presidents (3)
- Vice President, Instruction and Student Development (Co-Chair)
- Executive Dean of Academic Affairs
- Associate Deans
- Director of Counseling

Timeline:
Nov  
Associate Deans and Directors Administration and faculty fill out faculty request forms as part of Program review. Faculty Prioritization Committee evaluates and ranks the requests. Ranked list is forwarded to the President/Superintendent, the Budget Planning Committee, the Deans’ Council, and to the Academic Senate.

Dec  
President/Superintendent announces the number of positions to be funded for the next academic year. HR initiates the process for faculty hiring. Faculty Prioritization Committee reconvenes, debriefs, and evaluates the process (in order to improve it).

Jan  
Screening committees review applications.

Feb  
Candidates interviewed; finalists selected.

March/April  
Board of Trustees approves contracts

**Directions for Using the Rubric:**

1. Prior to the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, each Co-Chair will be tasked with determining three interests from the faculty and administrative groups they represent and then meeting to collectively bring forward a single shared interest.

2. During the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, the single shared interest will be scored under the category “Other.”

3. All faculty requests will fall into one of the first three blocks on the rubric: Faculty Replacement Positions (for programs/disciplines that have lost full-time faculty due to retirement or other reasons); Growth Positions (for established programs requesting full-time faculty); New Program/Discipline Position (for programs/disciplines not yet established or newly established with no full-time faculty).

4. Within the appropriate block, each request will be assigned 0-5 points based on the criteria listed.

5. All requests will be evaluated in blocks four, five and, if applicable, six. In each of these blocks, each request will be assigned 0-5 based on the criteria listed. NOTE: Not all criteria within a block are hierarchical in nature. Requests must be evaluated holistically within each block, based on a variety of factors.

6. The positions will then be ranked in order of the total points earned. In the case of ties, the committee will vote to rank the positions; a simple majority is all that is required for this procedure.

Approved: February 7, 2014
Revised: December 10, 2013