| ECTION #<br>Line #<br>PAGE # | INDIVIDUAL | COMMENT | COMMITTEE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Ben Mudgett | I am concerned that Classified Senate and CSEA do not have a seat on this committee. Classified Staff have a vital role to the success of students and programs, and should participate in the procedure of identifying at risk programs. | Comments received.<br><br>Which committee—Ed Pol or ad hoc?<br><br>Title 5 identifies the role and purpose of the Academic Senate in academic and professional matters. Further, all groups were invited to participate to ensure that the Academic Senate captured those views and concerns of the larger system.<br><br>The Educational Policies Committee does have two *ex-officio* representatives on this committee. |
| Document | C. Hendrickson | Indentation on document should be uniform | Agreeable change. |
| overview | Jim Holbrook | This policy will provide structure where none currently exists. It will be interesting to hear the views and ideas of others where I am unaware.<br><br>The requirements for written comments only is ok by me. | Comments received. |
| 1. Identification | Jim Holbrook | The "program review committee" looks like the ad hoc committee identified in 2 and 3. In each of those items (2 and 3) I suggest listing after the term ad hoc – "Program Review Committee". This will make it | Ad hoc committee is appropriate designation. No change. |

| ECTION #<br>Line #<br>PAGE # | INDIVIDUAL | COMMENT | COMMITTEE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | more clear who this group is and the role they will play in this policy. | |
| Pg 1; 1st paragraph | Kim McCormick | I suggest that Academic Senate recommend to the district that all procedures include the legal authority and one to three paragraphs describing the background that led to developing the procedure or the revision of an existing procedure. | Current process addresses and remedies this concern. No change. |
| Pg 1; 2nd paragraph | Kim McCormick | Process 1. Identification: The Academic Senate will determine by majority vote if a full review is necessary. A program may be considered 'at risk' if, in comparison to other Crafton or Valley programs, a cursory review suggests:<br>*Significant and permanent declining industry-demand<br>*Consistently low or decreasing WSCH/FTEF<br>*Low rate of student success<br>*Low persistence within the program<br>*Low retention within course(s)<br>*Duplication/uniqueness of training programs within the college<br>*Declining university transfer trends. | The assessment criteria are listed in 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d. No change. |
| Pg 1; 3rd paragraph | Kim McCormick | Shouldn't this procedure include Student Services programs also? …The report shall be submitted to the CHC President, *Office of Instruction or the Office of Student Services* | Agreeable change. Title changed to "Instructional Programs." We may want to write another procedure for other programs, such as Student Services. |
| Pg 1; 4th paragraph; 1st bullet | Kim McCormick | 2. Full Review:<br>*Vice President, Instruction or Vice President, Student Services | Moot point b/c of title change to "Instructional Programs." |
| | Jim Holbrook | The assessment and measures consistent in all | Comments received. |

| ECTION #<br>Line #<br>PAGE # | INDIVIDUAL | COMMENT | COMMITTEE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | | programs regardless if the program is academic or career and technical is important for me. | |
| Pg 1; 5th paragraph | Kim McCormick | 3. Assessment: the ad hoc committee shall review the program's program review and program planning documents, survey the program's advisory committee, student, *employers in the respective field*, statewide norms, peer institutions, and program-unique criteria. | Pg 1; 5th paragraph |
| P 1: 6th paragraph | C. Hendrickson | Lower-case letter "a" should be removed after numeral 3 | Committee discussed options and decided that it's clearer with the repetition of the number 3. |
| 3a. criteria | Jim Holbrook | The forth bullet (low or decreasing WSCH / FTES might need a bar established. Is it helpful to list a bar? For example 50% or less. This bar might be helpful in other areas as well. However, the bar can be more harmful if the program is taking steps to correct the identified consistent low numbers as shown in program review materials. | The bar is already defined in the phrase "consistently low or decreasing." No change. |
| 3C | Keith Wurtz | In reviewing the procedure for identifying "At Risk" Programs I noticed that one of the criteria in 3c is to identify the number of transfer ready students. This is something that we can do, but it may take approximately three months. Especially if we need to first define which students are considered to be in the program and then identify which of these are transfer ready. Also, does transfer ready mean that the student has successfully completed 60 or more transferable units with a 2.0 or higher GPA (usually called transfer prepared)? Or does it mean successfully completing transfer level math and | Agreeable change. 3c, fourth bullet now reads "Number of transfer-prepared students." Further, committee has agreed to define *transfer-prepare*d to mean that a student has successfully completed 60 or more transferable units with a 2.0 or higher GPA. |

## Comments on *Procedure for Identifying At Risk Programs* Draft
## Campus Comments
## Due December 10

| ECTION #<br>Line #<br>PAGE # | INDIVIDUAL | COMMENT | COMMITTEE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | English (usually called transfer ready | |
| Pg 2; paragraph just below 3.d | Kim McCormick | If the committee determines. . . in a timely fashion, *or is substantially below expected goals* | Agreeable change. Paragraph rewritten to read as follows: "If the committee determines there is sufficient evidence to suggest a program is substantially below expected goals, the committee shall, with input from the affected faculty, develop an intervention plan to determine causes and recommend strategies for redirection, reorganization, or redevelopment of the program." |
| P2: 2nd, 3rd, 4th paragraphs | C. Hendrickson | Lower-case letters "b, c, d" should be removed after numeral 3 | Committee discussed options and decided that it's clearer with the repetition of the number 3. |
| P3: 3rd, 4th, 5th paragraphs | C. Hendrickson | Lower-case letters "a, b, c" should be removed after numeral 6 | Committee discussed options and decided that it's clearer with the repetition of the number 6. |
| Pg 3; #7; last sentence | Kim McCormick | If we choose to include Student Services in this process, we need to open administrative participation to the VPSS.<br><br>7. Analysis: The Vice President of Instruction *or the Vice President of Students Services* may schedule a program on the Program review calendar outside the program's usual review cycle. | Moot point b/c of title change to "Instructional Programs." |
| 7. | Jim Holbrook | In the last sentence, I would add the planning and program review committee after the Vice President of Instruction as a group that can also schedule a | Ageeable change. |

| ECTION # Line # PAGE # | INDIVIDUAL | COMMENT | COMMITTEE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | program outside the normal calendar. | |