Academic Program Reduction / Elimination process

I. <u>Criteria for evaluating whether a program should be eliminated or reduced</u>

Mission: How does the program or curriculum support the mission of Clackamas Community College?

To serve the people of the college district with high-quality education and training opportunities that are accessible to all students, adaptable to changing needs and accountable to the community we serve.

- Will reduction or elimination of the program affect diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives?
- Does this program or curriculum exist to remove barriers for marginalized or otherwise vulnerable students?
  - ~~Is the program accessible to all students?~~
- Is the program adaptable to changing needs?
  - Current and future labor market demand
  - Currently and in the future, linked to a high demand transfer program
  - Addresses a gap that is not adequately filled by other public community colleges?
  - Other future potential impact, e.g. vulnerable to automation in the next five years?
- Is the program accountable to the community we serve?
  - Clear evidence that the community expects us to offer education in this area, such as engagement with advisory boards or interest from school districts (accelerated learning)
  - Bond investment
  - Reputation of program and student / prospective student perceptions
  - Student retention and / or completion rates

Financial Impact: Will the general fund deficit projected through budget forecasts be decreased through elimination or reduction of the program or curriculum?

- What is the current net gain or loss produced by the program?
- What are the enrollment trends for the program for the prior five years? If the program is new, what enrollment is projected? How might this change net gain or loss?
- What would be the cost, timeline and impact, if a teach out were required?
- Can equipment be repurposed or investments in equipment be recouped?
- Will elimination or reduction trigger a need for renovation of the facility? What would be the cost?

- What other financial costs are associated with reducing or eliminating the program or curriculum?

Systemic Impact: What internal or external consequences could result from the elimination or reduction of the program or curriculum?

- ~~Will a reduction in the program affect~~What impact will the reduction or elimination of this program have on regional or discipline-specific accreditation?
- What impact w~~W~~ill the elimination or reduction of the program or curriculum have ~~negative effects~~ on other programs, services, or curricula at the college? On external partnerships, community interests, or external organizations? On strategic priorities?
- Is the program or curriculum associated with a grant or donor? What impact will reduction or elimination have related to grant requirements, future grant eligibility or donor relations?
- ~~Will a reduction or elimination of a program or curriculum create barriers specifically to under-represented or otherwise vulnerable students?~~

Legal concerns: Are there legal or compliance issues that need to be considered in the elimination or reduction of a program or curriculum?

- Legal requirements or direct compliance issues associated with the program or curriculum?
- Indirect compliance issues that would be affected by elimination or reduction of the program?
- Contractual concerns raised by the elimination or reduction of the program?

II. Process steps:
   A. Review process and criteria with Deans and Associate Deans, Executive Team, President's Council, College Council and Faculty Leadership before beginning analysis. Gather feedback from all employees and students.
   B. Shared Financial Analysis developed by Business Services.
   C. Draft a rubric based on criteria and review standard data sets with representatives from employee groups.
   D. Using the financial analysis developed by Business Services, any program that is not revenue neutral (i.e. general fund / operating expenses equal or exceed revenues) will require further review based on the criteria above.
   E. The Vice President of Instruction and Student Services and Instruction and Student Services Deans will review all the programs based on all of the criteria above and determine if a reduction or elimination is feasible. If reduction or elimination is clearly not feasible, the program or curriculum will no longer be under consideration for elimination or reduction. During this process, Instruction and Student Service Deans will consult with departments in order to gather information.
   F. The Vice President of Instruction and Student Services and Instruction and Student Services Deans will use a rubric, in collaboration with faculty and staff, based on the criteria for academic program elimination or reduction to evaluate each program. The rubric will use standard data sets.
   G. The analysis will be shared with the affected departments for further input.
   H. After the analysis is shared with affected departments, a report that includes the criteria, the process steps, the results of each process step, and a draft set of recommendations will be shared with the whole CCC community.
   H.I. There will be significant opportunities for public review and discussion of the report, including through College Council and Presidents' Council.
   I.J. The Vice President of Instruction and Student Services will present the draft set of recommendations for elimination or reduction to the Budget Advisory Group for input and the Executive Team for vetting.
   J.K. Recommendations for program or curriculum elimination will be reviewed through the shared governance process (College Council, Presidents' Council).
   K.L. Recommendations for elimination of programs and curricula must be approved by the Board of Education.

Timeline

Date	Audience	Purpose & Message	Mechanism	Delivered by	Deliverables
Phase I					
11/4	Ex. Team	Review and input to process and criteria	Ex. Team meeting	David	Rev. criteria, process
11/12	Faculty leadership	Input, advice on communicating with faculty		David	
11/13	Open forum	Answer questions and provide context		David	
11/19	Pres. Council	Shared Governance review		David	Input
11/21	Open forum	Answer questions and provide context		David	
11/22	Chairs, directors, Associations	Communication, input	VP meetings	David	Initial prioritizing of draft criteria
11/22	All Staff	Gather input	Survey	David	Input to revise criteria, process
12/3	Associations, students	Review revised criteria, process	Presidents' Council	David	
12/6	All Staff	Review revised criteria, process	College Council	David	Input to revise criteria, processCriteria, process move forward
Dec.	Associations All Staff	Review Financial Analysis Methods	Open forum	Jeff	
1/7	Pres. Council	Final Review, Criteria and Process		David	Criteria, process move forward
1/17	College Council	Final Review, Criteria and PRocess		David	Criteria, process move forward

		Phase II			
January	Associations, Student reps	Collaborate to draft rubric, review data sets	Workgroup	David	Criteria analysis method drafted
January-February	BAG	~~Results of~~Rubric, data sets shared		David, Workgroup Reps.	Feedback on Rubric, data sets
		Phase III			
February	~~All Staff~~ Impacted Departments	Results of draft analysis shared, feedback gathered	~~All staff email~~Meetings with departments	David, Dean of Division	Feedback
February	BAG	Results of draft analysis shared, compared to other budget cutting, efficiency or revenue ideas		David, Deans	Final Review by BAG
March	All Staff	Analysis shared	Email, public forums, College Council, Presidents' Council	David, Deans	
Spring	College Council, Presidents Council	Recommendations for program eliminations, if necessary	Shared governance process	David, Deans	Recommendation moved to Board of Education

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Centered

Formatted Table