**Purpose:**

Title 5, Education Code and Board Policy 6.13 identify that instructional program development must occur in consultation with the Academic Senate and result in a proposal that is shared with the college community through participatory governance processes. Local Academic Senates are to approve the processes for new program development, program review, and program discontinuance. This document describes a proposed process for new instructional program development at Cañada College. The process is intended to ensure that program development is clearly linked to institutional planning and institutional support/commitment.

**Process:**

1. Faculty and/or Dean identifies need, conceives program, and initiates process
2. Faculty and Dean develop a new program proposal (justification, criteria A-R below, and implementation plan)
3. Consult as needed with Articulation Officer, Curriculum Chair, Workforce Development Director, PRIE, Marketing/Outreach, Budget Office
4. Identify faculty Minimum Qualifications
5. Identify initial advisory team members to assist in developing proposal
6. Task Force (with IPC, Curriculum, Senate representation) reviews and approves proposal
7. PBC reviews proposal, defines college commitment and makes recommendation to President
8. Commitment must identify resources and terms of pilot
9. Commitment may be contingent upon meeting defined criteria/milestones
10. PBC may recommend incubating courses through CCCE prior to bringing to the college
11. President authorizes program implementation
12. Pilot program development begins
13. Faculty with Minimum Qualifications begins curriculum development
14. College engages market research to conduct focus groups to validate student demand
15. Marketing/outreach plan begins implementation
16. Space and equipment acquisition
17. Hiring of personnel
18. Establishing advisory board
19. Curriculum Committee approves curriculum and program certificates/degrees
20. Curriculum and program approval by BACCC, CCCCO, Accreditors
21. Begin 3 or 4-year pilot program (length determined by PBC) with annual review by Task Force (with IPC and Academic Senate representation)
22. At end of the pilot, Task Force recommends to PBC program institutionalization or discontinuance

Questions for discussion:

* Should there be a “go/no go” check early in the process?
* Composition of the Task Force?
* Are there missing steps? Are there unnecessary steps?
* Should there be a “fast-track” process? If so, what would it be?
* Can this process proceed in split streams/dual track with partial or conditional approval?

Criteria for consideration and components of a new program proposal:

1. Alignment with college mission and master plan
2. Ability of the college to meet external accreditation requirements
3. Impact on equity
4. Potential for articulation with 4-year
5. Potential impact on, or competition with other district/regional programs
6. Labor market and other data
7. Student demand and enrollment projections: impact on FTES, Load
8. Projections of student success, persistence, and completion
9. Identification of which division will house the program
10. Impact on existing academic and student support services
11. Impact on other academic programs including the allocation of FTEF resources
12. Impact on instructional spaces
13. Space requirements for support staff
14. Impact on marketing and outreach
15. Funding for curriculum development
16. Funding for instructional equipment
17. Funding and space for personnel
18. Terms of college subsidy for potentially low-enrolled courses: minimum enrollments identified

An example of how these criteria might be addressed is provided below.

**Case Study: Neurodiagnostic Technology (NDT)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Alignment with college mission and master plan
 | Goal 2: Addresses community/industry partner need – Associates-prepared technicians; increases connection to healthcare industry (UCSF, Stanford, Kaiser) |
| 1. Ability of the college to meet external accreditation requirements
 | Requirements do not appear to present any barriers or roadblocks |
| 1. Impact on equity
 | Provides opportunity that may attract male students; likely 60:40 female to male |
| 1. Potential for articulation with 4-year
 | n/a |
| 1. Potential impact on, or competition with other district/regional programs
 | No other programs exist in the region. Only programs on the west coast are one in Southern California and one in Washington. Our program will serve all of N. Cal.  |
| 1. Labor market and other data
 | Provided by UCSF and Alex Kramer. See data in SWP proposal. |
| 1. Student demand and enrollment projections: impact on FTES, Load
 | Cohorts of students, will have to start small ~12-14 and grow based on job market and clinical placements. Eventual target is 20 students.Load 400 |
| 1. Projections of student success, persistence, and completion
 | Projected to be similar to Rad Tech: >90% success, > 80% persistence and completion |
| 1. Identification of which division will house the program
 | Science Division – NDT program is comparable to Rad Tech; prerequisite courses are within this division |
| 1. Impact on existing academic and student support services
 | NTP program is not likely to exceed 20 students annually and so is not expected to have a major impact on support services |
| 1. Impact on other academic programs including the allocation of FTEF resources
 | Requires ~1 FTEF per semester, will need a full-time faculty to get CAAHEP accreditation. |
| 1. Impact on instructional spaces
 | Could share space with physiology lab initiallyIf program grows and is successful, will need a single classroom/lab dedicated to the program with possible sharing. |
| 1. Space requirements for support staff
 | Share space with Rad Tech support staff |
| 1. Impact on marketing and outreach
 | Opportunities: the NDT program will be the first and only in the region, high-demand well-paying jobCost: need to market to general population as well as targeted to existing hospital workers |
| 1. Funding for curriculum development
 | Will need to pay adjunct faculty with Min. Quals. Model curriculum already exists so only needs modification to semester-based system. |
| 1. Funding for instructional equipment
 | Could be provided by SWP. Estimated $$ |
| 1. Funding and space for personnel
 | Could be provided by SWP. Estimated $$ |
| 1. Terms of college subsidy for potentially low-enrolled courses: minimum enrollments identified
 | Requesting a 4 year pilot; commitment to run courses with at least 10 students during the duration of the pilot |