

**SWOCC PROCESS FOR  
PRIORITIZATION OF ACADEMIC CREDIT PROGRAMS AND SETS OF COURSES**

1. Definitions:
  - a. Program or set of courses: defined by list of programs/disciplines doing Program Reviews.
  - b. Viability: The level of program sustainability to serve students in their employment or transfer objectives.
  - c. PVRC: Program Viability Review Committee – Academic Affairs
  - d. Prioritization – Quantitative process used to measure the comparative strength and viability of all programs at the college.
  
2. Program Viability Criteria on a 100 point scale (scoring criteria attached):
  - a. Program/Classes Demand (20)
  - b. Program Outcomes Assessment Progress (20)
  - c. Program Size (20)
  - d. Program Productivity (20)
  - e. Program Cost (20)
  
3. Program Viability Review Committee:
  - a. Makeup of committee:
    1. VP of Instruction and Student Services
    2. Academic Affairs Senate Committee (need to have balance of CTE and LDC faculty on committee)
    3. One Dean
    4. One alternate faculty member who would replace regular committee member whose program is part of the viability process listed below in step 4.
  
  - b. Process for PVRC:
    1. Quantitative data will be generated on all programs/sets of courses by the Institutional Research (IR) office or Office of Instruction each fall for all criteria except 2b.
    2. The appropriate Deans will determine the final rating for criteria 2b for each program/set of courses working in conjunction with the program faculty.
    3. New programs would not be included on this list until their third year.
    4. Once all programs/sets of courses are rated on the scale of 1-100, they will be rank ordered.
    5. Programs in the bottom 50% category would be reviewed by the PVRC using the program viability process detailed below in step 4. Qualitative Measures listed in the Criteria Scoring form would be used to further determine whether a program scoring in the bottom 50% of the programs (score of 50 or less) needs to develop a program improvement plan.
    6. All instructional administrators and faculty involved with one of the programs in the bottom 50% will be notified by the PVRC of the process and timeline for review/remedy/final decision on their program (see step 4 below).

DRAFT

4. Program Viability process for programs in the bottom 50% rating category:
  - a. In the fall term of each academic year, the PVRC will meet separately with the program faculty and appropriate dean of each program identified to be in the bottom 50% category. Program Review data for up to the past four years will be reviewed by the PVRC and the program faculty and dean. The data from the Program Viability process will also be reviewed to determine which criteria led to the program being ranked in the bottom 50% category. Qualitative measures will also be used with these programs to further define the need for a program improvement plan.
  - b. In the fall term PVRC meeting with program faculty members and dean, the health of the program will be discussed. The faculty members can provide explanation and rationale for the data and the PVRC can provide the faculty with recommendations and suggestions for improving the results of the data. Specific suggestions may include but are not limited to marketing and recruiting, curriculum changes, seeking of partners for financial assistance to program, program fees, etc. Other options for continuing the program in a different way will also be discussed.
  - c. If the program faculty and dean want to continue working to keep the program going, they will then have until the end of the fall term to produce a short program improvement plan detailing their how they will address the data and other program concerns. The plan should give timelines for achieving results during the remainder of that academic year.
  - d. The PVRC will then meet early in the winter term to respond to the plans submitted by each program. Options will be discussed and then one of the following recommendations will be made to the VPI and SS and Executive Team (ET).
    - i. Recommend continuing the program another year after the current year to give it a chance to improve and grow. Program Review data and Program Viability data would then be reviewed the following fall to look for improvements with another recommendation to the VPI and SS and ET following the review.
    - ii. Recommend some kind of restructuring or combining of the program in some way for the next academic year to strengthen it using suggestions from PVRC, advisory committees, etc.
    - iii. Recommend program closure after required teach-out period is satisfied.
  - e. Exceptions to timeline: at any point, the program faculty may wish to propose voluntary closure and/or the College will begin working with them on any possible retraining under contract guidelines at that point in the process.

DRAFT

**SWOCC Academic Programs**  
**Program Viability Criteria Scoring**

TOTAL possible pts for each program/discipline = **100**

Formulas for Program Prioritization Criteria:

1. **Program/Classes Demand**: based on scale of 1-20 points looking at enrollment trends over past 4 years.

Points obtained for this criteria for each program =  
 Significant enrollment growth (>10%) = 20 pts  
 Strong enrollment growth (5-10%) = 17 pts  
 Maintaining enrollments(0-5%) = 14 pts  
 Small enrollment loss (0 to -5%) = 10 pts  
 Large enrollment loss (< -5%) = 5 pts

2. **Program Assessment**: Academic Deans work with each program faculty member to come up with appropriate score in each category of program assessment using an assessment rubric:

<u>Assessment Category</u>	<u>Initial</u> <u>(1)</u>	<u>Emerging</u> <u>(2)</u>	<u>Developed</u> <u>(3)</u>	<u>Highly</u> <u>Developed (4)</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>SCORE</u>
A. Development of course and program outcomes					
B. Mapping course to program to general student learning outcomes					
C. Multiple Assessment measures documented for each program outcome					
D. Assessment measurement data collected and analyzed					
E. Analysis leads to documented adjustments to outcomes/ curriculum to improve student learning					
<b>TOTAL Points</b>					<b>1-20 total pts</b>

3. **Program Size**: Determine the total student FTE for the previous full academic year based on duplicated enrollments in all program/discipline-specific prefix courses.

Large FTE program enrollments (>50 FTE) = 20 points  
 Moderate FTE program enrollments (30-50 FTE) = 17 point  
 Average FTE program enrollments (20-29 FTE) = 14 points  
 Below Average program enrollments (10-19 FTE) = 10 points  
 Low program enrollments (<10 FTE) = 5 points

DRAFT

4. Program Productivity: Measure the retention rates using the percent of students in all program/discipline classes for past full academic year that earned a C or better in the course compared to the number of students enrolled in the course at the end of the second week.

Large retention (>95%) =	20 points
Moderate retention (80-94%) =	17 point
Average FTE retention (65-79%) =	14 points
Below Average retention (50-64%) =	10 points
Low retention (< 50%) =	5 points

5. Program Cost: Use the general fund budget for each program from the previous academic year. This number is then divided by the total student FTE in the program for the previous academic year (data from the #3 criteria).

Low program cost (<\$1000/FTE) =	20 points
Below Average program cost (\$1000-2000/FTE) =	17 point
Average program cost (\$2001-3000/FTE) =	14 points
Above Average program cost (\$3001-4000/FTE) =	10 points
Large program cost (>\$4000/FTE) =	5 points

Qualitative Measures Used for programs that score less than 50% on quantitative measures:

- Alignment (relationship) with the Academic Master Plan
- Quality of the program as perceived by employing business and industry/articulations of courses at universities
- Articulation agreements with transferring colleges for program/set of courses
- Current or potential funding sources from agencies and/or business and industry
- Impact of eliminating program on other programs/college/community