STRENGTHS? WHAT DO YOU LIKE?

I like that there is no other college with this kind of program (DMT). There is also a connection with Rad-tech with will be good for college, there is also no major impact on other students. I think this will be a great opportunity for students who have interest in this program, with the 4 year pilot will help promote the college and grow it slowly.

We like that we are attempting a new process.

Liked that labor demand was examined when creating a new program.

Appreciate the 4-year cycle (a containment given).

A process in place is also important to identify potential funding sources to write curriculum for new programs.

AREAS OF CONCERN?

1. Should a Dean be able to propose a new program without faculty support? Curriculum is faculty purview. While it is appropriate for administrators to suggest ideas for programs to faculty, it is ultimately the responsibility of faculty members to put forth a new program proposal. Suggest rephrasing of this step to: "After receiving input from Deans, students, etc., faculty conceives program and initiates process."

comments on # 6. Don't ALL faculty have min quals already? #6a needs further development.

Dani's response to above, because Dani has entirely too much to say about MQ, and also dealt with this with the NDT program creation: When we create a new program, we do not necessarily already have faculty employed at the college who meet MQ in that discipline. The newly-approved NDT program is a great example of such a program. See comments below.

Ok, understood-- perhaps the language should specify MQ "in the proposed discipline" not just in general. Who defines MQ? http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/FlipBooks/2014_MQHandbook/2014_MQHandbook_ADA.pdf

As an example, is there already an NDT MQ established?

Diagnostic Medical Technology (Diagnostic medical sonography, neurodiagnostic technology, polysonographic technology)	Any bachelor's degree and two years of professional experience, or any associate degree and six years of professional experience.		

6. Pilot program development begins
   a. Faculty with Minimum Qualifications begins curriculum development
   b. College engages market research to conduct focus groups to validate student demand
   c. Marketing/outreach plan begins implementation
   d. Space and equipment acquisition
   e. Hiring of personnel
   f. Establishing advisory board

There is a big assumption here that we already have faculty employed on campus that meet MQ in the discipline in which the newly created program falls. If the newly created program is a new degree/certificate within a discipline that already exists on campus, that will totally be the case. If the new program involves the creation of an entirely new discipline that does not already exist on campus, this will not be the case. Keep in mind that curriculum development (e.g., the writing and submission of courses, degrees, certificates to the local curriculum approval process) is faculty purview (i.e., cannot be done by staff or administrations) and must be done by faculty who meet MQ in the discipline in which the curriculum is being created.

With the newly-created NDT program, that discipline has never before existed on this campus or in the district and we had no faculty currently employed who met MQ in the discipline. How do you get funding for a program for which we haven't created any courses … when you have no faculty who can create courses to prove that the program is viable and prove that you need to hire faculty in the discipline … (see where I'm going with this?)
tl;dr - What is the process for justifying/funding a new discipline/program when we don't even have a faculty to write the curriculum? What is the process for tapping discipline experts from outside the college/district to create these new disciplines/programs?

It is unclear from this description how faculty who develop programs (which is an activity outside contract faculty duties) will be compensated for this work. What are funding sources for additional pay/reassigned time?

- During the pilot phase of the program, are courses exempt from reporting SLO assessment results? PLO assessment results? What about Program Review? Wouldn't this data be needed for the 'annual review by Task Force'. Is there any other assessments that a pilot program be doing?
  - Doesn't need to be an additional step, but how will the 'pilot' program be reviewed during the 4 years? How will issues, deficiencies be identified? What will set a pilot program apart from permanent programs in terms of reporting/assessment/program review? It seems that there is a missing step once a program is approved as a pilot program. If we decide to go in this direction, expectations/processes within the pilot program should also be identified.
- If the program will offer DE courses, there should be a step in the process for ensuring that faculty and courses are ready to be taught online or hybrid. A check in with the DE Coordinator, Instructional Technologist and/or DEAC.

- ○ Any courses that will be offered online/in hybrid format must complete a DE supplement which is reviewed/approved by the DE Coordinator during the curriculum review and approval process. Are we suggesting a check outside of this? If so, why would a new program require such a check when we don't require this of our existing courses/programs?
    - ■ In terms of faculty, STOT doesn't exist anymore and we will soon have an in-house online teaching training. New online faculty will need to be trained to teach online *before* courses are taught.
    - ■ [Academic Senate approved the use of the OEI Course Design Rubric in November 2015](), so it is on DEAC's radar to start using this rubric in some form. Still very much in process though.