

Initiation	Request by: - College President - Academic Senate - Appropriate Vice President																																																										
Membership on Viability Review Committee (VRC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Supervising Vice President - 2 Deans - 3 Academic Senate representatives (at least 1 chair from similar type of dept. - Vocational Education or Liberal Studies) - The Curriculum Chair - 1 AFT representative - 1 Classified representative (if departments employ classified Instructional Assistants or Laboratory Technicians) - 1 Research and Planning Facilitator 																																																										
Process	<p>Formal Request is brought to Program Review & Viability Committee (PRVC). Approval is granted by PRVC to conduct Viability Review. R&P facilitates Viability Review Committee (VRC) member appointments from constituencies. The VRC and R&P develop a specific plan for study (data gathering, soliciting position papers, interviews, consultations, etc.). A formal chair interview is held and a public forum is held. Within 5 months the VRC produces a Program Viability Report (PVR) including their process, a review of all data consulted, specific recommendations for action with timelines, and an impact assessment.</p>																																																										
Evaluative Data	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; width: 50%;">Liberal Studies Departments</th> <th style="text-align: center; width: 50%;">Workforce Education Departments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Enrollment - current and projected</td> <td>A. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Class retention</td> <td>B. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Term-to-term persistence of students in major (compared to college & state-wide norms for discipline over 3-5yrs)</td> <td>C. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. Program completion / transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts</td> <td>D. Program completion and transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts if the program has a transfer option</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E. Rate for student achievement of program goals (i.e. Completion rate)</td> <td>E. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F. Number of degrees and certificates awarded</td> <td>F. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G. Student learning outcomes</td> <td>G. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>H. Frequency of course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program</td> <td>H. Frequency and balance of day and evening course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I. Relationship to College mission</td> <td>I. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>J. Relation of the program to the Educational Master Plan</td> <td>J. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K. Program Review recommendations</td> <td>K. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L. Importance of service to related programs</td> <td>L. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M. Quality and the breadth of the curriculum, teaching, & learning process; Currency of course outlines</td> <td>M. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N. Percentage of faculty who have participated in professional development activities in their discipline over the last three years</td> <td>N. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>O. FTES generated by the program</td> <td>O. FTES generated by the program (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P. Budget / cost factors (but not primary consideration)</td> <td>P. Budget / cost factors (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (when appropriate)</td> <td>Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R. State and other external regulations and requirements; outside accreditation</td> <td>R. Same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S. Impact / service / needs to the community</td> <td>S. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T. Demand for program</td> <td>T. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>U. Staffing Levels</td> <td>U. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>V. Outside expert opinion</td> <td>V. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>W. Student perceptions (position papers)</td> <td>W. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X. Any additional data requested by the Viability Review Committee</td> <td>X. same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y. N/A</td> <td>Y. Local labor market information (demand for program)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Z. N/A</td> <td>Z. Quality of the program as perceived by employing business and industry</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AA. N/A</td> <td>AA. Other funding sources such as grants or contributions from business and industry</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BB. N/A</td> <td>BB. Nontraditional student enrollment and rates of program completion</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Liberal Studies Departments	Workforce Education Departments	A. Enrollment - current and projected	A. same	B. Class retention	B. same	C. Term-to-term persistence of students in major (compared to college & state-wide norms for discipline over 3-5yrs)	C. same	D. Program completion / transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts	D. Program completion and transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts if the program has a transfer option	E. Rate for student achievement of program goals (i.e. Completion rate)	E. same	F. Number of degrees and certificates awarded	F. same	G. Student learning outcomes	G. same	H. Frequency of course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program	H. Frequency and balance of day and evening course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program	I. Relationship to College mission	I. same	J. Relation of the program to the Educational Master Plan	J. same	K. Program Review recommendations	K. same	L. Importance of service to related programs	L. same	M. Quality and the breadth of the curriculum, teaching, & learning process; Currency of course outlines	M. same	N. Percentage of faculty who have participated in professional development activities in their discipline over the last three years	N. same	O. FTES generated by the program	O. FTES generated by the program (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)	P. Budget / cost factors (but not primary consideration)	P. Budget / cost factors (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)	Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (when appropriate)	Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)	R. State and other external regulations and requirements; outside accreditation	R. Same	S. Impact / service / needs to the community	S. same	T. Demand for program	T. same	U. Staffing Levels	U. same	V. Outside expert opinion	V. same	W. Student perceptions (position papers)	W. same	X. Any additional data requested by the Viability Review Committee	X. same	Y. N/A	Y. Local labor market information (demand for program)	Z. N/A	Z. Quality of the program as perceived by employing business and industry	AA. N/A	AA. Other funding sources such as grants or contributions from business and industry	BB. N/A	BB. Nontraditional student enrollment and rates of program completion
Liberal Studies Departments	Workforce Education Departments																																																										
A. Enrollment - current and projected	A. same																																																										
B. Class retention	B. same																																																										
C. Term-to-term persistence of students in major (compared to college & state-wide norms for discipline over 3-5yrs)	C. same																																																										
D. Program completion / transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts	D. Program completion and transfer readiness / transfer rates / articulation efforts if the program has a transfer option																																																										
E. Rate for student achievement of program goals (i.e. Completion rate)	E. same																																																										
F. Number of degrees and certificates awarded	F. same																																																										
G. Student learning outcomes	G. same																																																										
H. Frequency of course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program	H. Frequency and balance of day and evening course offerings to assure reasonable opportunity for completion of the program																																																										
I. Relationship to College mission	I. same																																																										
J. Relation of the program to the Educational Master Plan	J. same																																																										
K. Program Review recommendations	K. same																																																										
L. Importance of service to related programs	L. same																																																										
M. Quality and the breadth of the curriculum, teaching, & learning process; Currency of course outlines	M. same																																																										
N. Percentage of faculty who have participated in professional development activities in their discipline over the last three years	N. same																																																										
O. FTES generated by the program	O. FTES generated by the program (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)																																																										
P. Budget / cost factors (but not primary consideration)	P. Budget / cost factors (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)																																																										
Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (when appropriate)	Q. Comparison of WSCH to cost (compared to programs with similar enrollment limits due to lab and equipment guidelines and compared to programs governed by similar state regulations and certifying agencies)																																																										
R. State and other external regulations and requirements; outside accreditation	R. Same																																																										
S. Impact / service / needs to the community	S. same																																																										
T. Demand for program	T. same																																																										
U. Staffing Levels	U. same																																																										
V. Outside expert opinion	V. same																																																										
W. Student perceptions (position papers)	W. same																																																										
X. Any additional data requested by the Viability Review Committee	X. same																																																										
Y. N/A	Y. Local labor market information (demand for program)																																																										
Z. N/A	Z. Quality of the program as perceived by employing business and industry																																																										
AA. N/A	AA. Other funding sources such as grants or contributions from business and industry																																																										
BB. N/A	BB. Nontraditional student enrollment and rates of program completion																																																										
Approval	<p>The PVR with recommendations is forwarded to Academic Senate. Academic Senate sends recommendations to the Education Planning Committee for approval. They send recommendations to ESGC for approval. ESGC sends recommendations to the College President for approval. If applicable the College President and the Academic Senate President make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval.</p>																																																										
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Department / Unit Improvement - Department / Unit Discontinuance (generally after attempt to improve program) - Department / Unit Modification - Department / Unit reorganization 																																																										