

# Academic Program Reduction & Elimination

## College Council Breakout Sessions

### Questions

#### ARE Process Report:

- Are these accurate costs for faculty? They seem high, especially for PTF. If all that's being analyzed are the face-to-face "clock" hours, how do we know that all instructors' support work outside of teaching specifically supports the program in which they are teaching, and not another program in their department, or something else at the College? For example, there are Guided Pathways teams that are contributing to instruction and student support in general at the College, including the work of those programs that are in the green. How do we recognize the faculty work that supports instruction in varied ways?
- When will the new revised, updated document on the financial analysis be released? There are CWE classes that were not calculated accurately. How often will an updated report be released? Administration has indicated that the report isn't precise. Please describe how precise the data will be before a decision is made what will move to the next phase.
- When will we have a complete financial analysis? It was mentioned that some items weren't added, such as materials & supplies, equipment, technology, or other costs. At what point in the process will those be included?
- Why aren't actual costs used instead of averages? How does that inform Administration how much savings will be made by reducing or eliminating a program if the actual costs are not used?
- When and how will the customized training courses be added in? How will that be analyzed and included in the calculations?
- How are classified going to be included in the costs and added value of the programs, and at what stage will that occur?
- Please describe what will happen if there is a vital course that doesn't bring in enough revenue. It is unclear what will happen.
- It is evident that CTE courses are more expensive to run. Is it the goal of Administration to eliminate most CTE programs and focus on LD transfer courses?

#### Evaluation of Criteria:

- How soon will we see a draft of the rubrics? How will they be shared, how will Administration gather feedback, and what will Administration do with that feedback?
- How does a bond identify program support instead of college support?
- What is the minimum # of FTF/PTF/ACE to run a program? The FTF/PTF ratio in the FTF contract doesn't provide a way for us to clearly assess the number of FTF we need in a certain program. How do we get that information?
- Will the number of faculty and/or classified be a part of the evaluation of criteria? If so, how?

- Will faculty portfolios be included in the analysis of a program?
- What are the qualitative aspects that have been referred to? At what part of the review process will these be brought in?
- Which criteria are the same for the items being reviewed for College Services in BAG, and which criteria are different? Will some of the items in College Services be reviewed based on a profit/loss analysis? If not, does that mean all areas of College Services will be reviewed?
- Does Administration plan on assessing the wraparound support systems that are available to students? How will we be able to distinguish between the effectiveness of a program and the effectiveness of the wraparound support systems?
- How will Administration assess programs in which students don't need a certificate of completion in order to start their career?
- If certain courses within a program (e.g., high school courses) will not be included in the financials of the ARE Process, will they be a part of the evaluation criteria, or will those courses be fully excluded from the process? If so, when will they be reviewed?
- Please explain what is meant by slide # 5 on the 11/06 College Council presentation. Administration has indicated that rubrics will be adopted with "some criteria." What exactly does that mean? Which criteria will be included, and which will be excluded?

#### **General ARE Process/Shared Governance:**

- When will Administration more clearly respond to the previous questions that have been asked? Some of questions have not yet been answered, or have been answered by asking a question. How does Administration plan on posing those questions in meaningful way?
- What is the target goal for savings after we complete the ARE Process? \$2M per year? \$400K per year? If we are looking at savings, where will the savings go? Will the savings go to reducing the projected deficit? Will it to go supporting other programs or courses? If so, which ones (the ones already in the green, or ones that are operating at a loss)? Will the savings go to supporting faculty, classified, or administrative positions or increases in salaries?
- When do we get feedback from community stakeholders?
- Are students giving input? What are the communications to students? It can't just be ASG. How are other groups being included?
- If a program or subject area is making a profit, is that program/subject area guaranteed not to have any reductions or eliminations at all to their program? Or can something be "untouched" in the ARE process, and yet still be reduced in other ways, such as in BAG? Will Administration commit to not cutting any aspect of those programs in the green?
- What is the accountability for courses outside these programs/courses that only receive money from the General Fund? If they are not analyzed this year, when will they be analyzed? What is the process for them? Are those programs at risk for being reduced even though they aren't part of this process?
- If a program goes through the ARE Process and isn't reduced or eliminated, how long will it be considered "safe" and remain untouched? If the CCSF is low, or if we seem to be on shaky ground, will you consider cutting a program that was previously approved to run without facing cuts?

- How will the review process for College Services in BAG inform decisions related to the ARE for InSS, and vice versa? How will we monitor how reductions in one part of the college affect another area?
- We haven't heard much about Guided Pathways this year. Is it the intention to remove EFAs or make major changes? What is our commitment to Guided Pathways?
- Considering that one of our EFAs specifically identifies Automotive, but Automotive is one of our major losses (according to the financial analysis report), has Administration already decided if that program will go or stay? What about other programs identified in the EFAs? We have already invested quite a bit of time in these programs, so it is unclear what it means to first invest the time in Guided Pathways, and then spend time deciding which programs to cut from Guided Pathways.
- It has been suggested that this process may be used again. Does Administration plan on doing this process every year? How often will we go through this analysis?
- What is the plan for continuous improvement of the ARE Process?

Is there a plan for the college to see the rubric that is coming in the next step of the analysis?

Can someone with strong experience in developing rubrics be added to the Ac Red task force?

By starting with only programs that are not profitable could we be missing reviewing profitable programs that may not be relevant and/or needed by the community?

How is equity being considered when only reviewing the funding data?

Can we use labor market data as an initial screening tool along with program cost?

How does this process support the new guided pathways Educational Focus areas?

1. Will there be any criteria that focus on DEI? How will that be reflected in the decisions about programs considering to be cut?

2. Once the workgroup creates the rubric: feedback, review? And what is the process for that review and feedback?

3. What metrics are you using to assess employability? How will this lens be weighted among and against the others? See concern below.

4. How does the interwoven nature of courses as they help students achieve programs show up in this financial analysis?

5. Will there be a cost analysis for the service departments?

6. How are we gathering community feedback? Community feedback matters.

7. What is the equivalent of workforce for transfer students?

8. How will the rubric assess impact on programs with external accreditation?

9. How will we account for a department that participates in state-wide organizations?

-Timing? What needs to happen when? What is the overall timeline?

Examples: How much time do we have to go through the information? If info needs to be corrected by when do I need to contact Jeff/Sally?

- Rubric: Is there a draft of the rubric? What is the process for reviewing and finalizing the rubric? Who will be involved in the review process?

-Labor market: Will we adjust the review of labor market data because of COVID impacts? How can we anticipate changes in the labor market that may occur because work may change due to COVID?

- Document use etc.: Do people understand how to use the document? Do people understand how to read the costing analysis?

1. The timeline looks long, methodical, careful- but there's concern that something might force unexpected immediate action. What are the specific factors that might necessitate the acceleration of the reduction/elimination process?

2. Sustainability- does CCC want to encourage programs be self-sufficient?

3. When will we be looking at programs that are doing really well, and look at what they're doing well that could be replicated by other programs?

4. How are programs being identified as "community supported"? What's considered "untouchable" regardless of cost?

- Will we keep a program because of investment in its building/facility even if enrollment or funding doesn't seem to support it?
- What are the factors that decides what's supported even if it's costly?
- How are programs being defined as "community supported"? (Most recent bond? Previous bonds?)
- What the rubric used to determine something is "important to the community?"

- Could we look at several data points and not just the financial piece first? Is there a reason why we are looking at the financial piece first?

- How will we go about this process in the future? Will the financial piece always be considered first?

- Are all areas of the rubric considering the same time period (2015-2019) for analysis? For instance, are we looking at five years impact to the community, as well as five years of financial data?

- Have special arrangement courses been weeded out so they don't skew a program's cost data?

Do departments get to meet 1X1? How are those at program level able to communicate to the greater group?

How do we put a \$ amount to the work we do?

- Why aren't we looking at all of the pieces? This could be a good analysis for all programs, not just those that are in the red.
- Once rubrics are developed, who is completing those? Is this just being done at the Dean level or are faculty engaged?
- How are the departments involved in the process?

High school connections – who pays for the instructors? Do those numbers bleed into the college itself and its offerings?

Does it only include programs that were in place prior to 2015/16?

Lab, lecture lab, lecture – and related costs of instructors. How are you figuring in faculty expenses?

## **Concerns**

- We just heard that Administration has no target numbers for cost savings. Why is that? Why are we going through a process when we don't know what the outcome of the process will be? At the very least, there should be scenarios and options for reducing/eliminating based on those scenarios.
- It is possible that the economic outlook will be better later this spring. It is concerning that we seem to be going through a constant cycle of dire predictions, followed by a reality that isn't so bad. It is concerning how fear-based the planning by Administration seems to be. We lack confidence in Administration's ability to plan without creating such fear and distrust among the College's employees. It is exhausting, and it feels abusive.
- There was a whole list of feedback regarding the budget process, which was shared at the Board of Ed meeting on 10/21. It is unclear how Administration is adding a DEI lens to the ARE Process, which is part of the entire Budget Process. How is that being developed?
- We are concerned how Administration is going to find the time to respond to all of these questions, suggestions, and concerns, while at the same time continuing with developing the ARE process. How is all of this feedback going to be integrated into improving the process?

1. Related to employment and workforce: sometimes students earn a degree or certificate that allows them to earn a higher wage; so, they won't be getting a new or different job. . .

2. The analysis suggests that the only cost to running a course or program is faculty; there are so many costs that go into classes. Classified and other support positions are integral to the success of instructors and students. Electricity and so many other things "cost."

-Sequence of process: costing analysis came before mission-related objectives analysis.

-Enrollment: college-wide systemic issues may be causing bottlenecks and some departments may be affected. How can these issues be addressed? What is the college doing to address these systemic issues? Are we responsive to our larger region needs? Issues might be: registration process is difficult, late fees, marketing for programs, lack of ongoing labor analysis.

- no validation of the costing tool

- we are not completely confident in the numbers

- some programs are getting a pass based on the numbers

- shouldn't we look at them all?

- there are courses that are pre-requisites for programs. Those are not part of the financial analysis. For instance, in the Allied Health programs

- low enrollment course sections are affecting the calculations, such as special arrangement sections.

Seems strange to present info this way when it doesn't include things like fees.

Hasn't been widely communicated how to address next steps as far as feedback provided, taking that feedback into account etc.

If we are truly \$53 short per course, how do we come together and solve that problem?

You aren't looking at the support side of things

Marketing lack

Webpage lack

Registration process failure for workshops etc. failure last year

We are supported by industry

You are looking at hours in the classroom without prep, grading, committee and other times. That's a terrible representation because it assumes we can do more in a week....

If the numbers are basically a result of students in classes compared with Instructor costs, we're looking at the wrong things. You're basically asking if the students are paying for their instructor, yet limiting tuition revenue so we fail.

How are you able to compare programs in the first place. Arboriculture requires students to take English and math, but I imagine that revenue is shown going to the English department rather than arboriculture. Lose Arboriculture, reduce that many English students.

In regards to a deficit to the program, why is the deficit for the class attributed to each program multiplying that deficit. It should be a portion per program based on the <sup>P</sup>SEP.

Communications

Core classes have a privilege, but if you get rid of too many feeder programs the core classes then aren't getting students either

## **Suggestions**

- Review the list of criteria to see if it is sufficient. It seems incomplete.
- The following question is insufficient to address DEI: "Will reduction or elimination of the program affect diversity, equity, and inclusion priorities?" The interim DEI framework needs to be better implemented in the ARE Process. Any program can point to the DEI Strategic Priorities because all faculty in all programs will need to address Strategic Priority # 3. This criterion needs to be more clearly identified and articulated to generate meaningful responses.
- Dig deeper on the financials. Get the actual expenses & revenue for customized training and high school courses.
- Connect with students beyond ASG to share information about the ARE Process and gather feedback.
- Norm the rubrics and train administrators how to use them.
- Find out what programs might be cut at other colleges. We don't want to cut a program assuming that students can take it at an area college – and then find out it was canceled.
- If a course is vital for completion of a core program, take it off the table. It shouldn't be eliminated, even if it runs at a loss. It shouldn't be part of the analysis.
- We have been told that this IS about the budget. If the CCSF amount isn't announced until around April 2021, why will Administration make decisions about which programs to cut winter 2021? We suggest you prioritize the programs and subject areas under review, and then make a final decision about what to cut after the funding is announced and we have a better idea what the budget forecast is.
- Tell us what your plan is for AY 2021-22 & AY 2022-23. Jeff gave us a forecast that says we will have a \$2M deficit at the end of AY 2021-22, and a \$4M (total) deficit by the end of AY 2022-23. Administration needs to plan how to make up for those losses. We need to hear about more than what Administration will do this year.

Need to do a cost analysis of non-academic programs too.

1. Set up ways for the rubrics to be reviewed and for people to provide feedback.
2. Set up transparent ways for student involvement

-Align this work with strategic planning work (what do we want to be?)

-Provide a recorded tour of how to use the document/read the information.

- incorporate community need/support, equity, etc. with the first round of review
- review all programs at some level before making cuts
- incorporate Curriculum Committee earlier in the review process. Provide updates to that committee throughout the reduction process and not just at the end for approval.

How do we make sure our values (and mission statement) are related to this plan? This needs to be kept in mind throughout.

Really do need to reflect on each unique financial situation of each program to get overall view (fee funds, X sections/workshops, classified staff cost).

- Calling it reduction and elimination causes trouble for people to see it as a helpful thing for program improvement. Curriculum Sustainability is a better name.
- If we knew this was part of a larger process and included the fact that we had already made reductions and have things frozen that would be helpful. Not seeing the transparency about how other groups are being looked at for reductions.

Keep being transparent.

How did you get the numbers?

Appreciate that David and Jeff have come to department meetings, so keep that up.

## **General Comments**

- Long overdue to assess the programs this way.
- Difference between “what are we” vs. “who are we” - Not just a trade school, we are an academic organization and it is our responsibility to ensure all students are leaving as well rounded, more educated citizens. Employability skills are just as important as technical skills. Creating leaders.