New Instructional Program Development Process – Draft 2026

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.

Define program (AA, Certificate, etc.)

Process for Developing a New Program

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)
    a. Consult as needed with Articulation Officer, Curriculum Chair, Workforce Development Director, PRIE, Marketing/Outreach, Budget Office
    b. Identify faculty Minimum Qualifications
    c. Identify initial advisory team members to assist in developing proposal
3. Optional Step: Consult with VPI, VPAS, and relevant Dean on budget
    a. Initial minimum cost estimate to help gauge possible College support
    b. The purpose of this optional step is to help individuals determine if the program is feasible enough to warrant the work below before the College formally decides whether to support the new program
4. Relationship with Industry Advisory Board, if applicable
    a. For relevant academic programs, industry advisory boards play an important role in advising the college on a current or possible academic program.
        i. In providing industry perspective, the role of advisory boards should not be confused with a board of directors that would make final decisions about any aspect of the academic program.

ii. In providing industry perspective, the role of advisory boards is not to serve as an advocate for any aspect of the academic program.

b. Additional faculty and dean review of industry advisory board recommendations. Specific data and other topics that commonly deserve additional careful review:
    i. Review for discrepancies between student need (for example, living wages) and industry need (for example, seeking maximum number of employees at lowest wage possible).
    ii. Review who the audience for the program is. For example, would the program serve a long-term pipeline of students, or would the program only serve a specific short-term group of individuals (such as a particular group of highly trained individuals who already work in the industry)?
    iii. Review for possible misalignment of available labor market data with actual jobs in the regional area.
    iv. Disaggregate types and number of jobs within the industry by wage level to avoid potentially misleading general number of job openings.
    v. Verify any industry board recommendations from an independent source if the recommendation involves a significant financial cost.

5. Formation and Membership of a Work Group
    a. Suggested membership: IPC, Curriculum, Academic Senate, Student [recommended; ideally a student who graduated from the program at another school or a similar program], and PRIE [recommended] representation, industry expert [if applicable].
    b. Appointment process: curriculum committee nominates who it thinks should be on the workgroup? Appointments follow the regular appointment process for each constituent member.
6. Work Group (with IPC, Curriculum, Academic Senate, Student [recommended], and PRIE [recommended] representation) reviews and approves proposal
    a. Program proposal includes specific goals for enrollment, course success, and degree/certification completion and/or industry job attainment.
    b. Program proposal includes a list of tasks that delineates the duties that are integral to the success of the program. For example, community outreach/student recruitment, specific registration and enrollment needs (for instance, bachelor student registration, if applicable).

    c. Program proposal includes SWOT analysis in order to examine possible challenges/failure points.
7. PBC reviews proposal, defines college commitment and makes recommendation to President
    a. Commitment must identify resources and terms of pilot
    b. Commitment may be contingent upon meeting defined criteria/milestones
    c. PBC may recommend incubating courses through not-for-credit program options (such as, SMCCCD's CCCE or BAPA) prior to bringing to the college
8. President authorizes program implementation
9. 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
10. Curriculum Committee approves curriculum and program certificates/degrees
11. Curriculum and program recommendation or approval by all relevant bodies, such as Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), California Community College's Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), and all relevant Accreditors
12. Begin 3 or 4-year pilot program (length determined by PBC) with annual review by Work Group (with IPC and Academic Senate representation)
13. Annual reflection on progress toward goals and possible suggested interventions if preliminary annual milestones are not being met.
14. At end of the pilot, Work Group recommends to PBC program institutionalization or discontinuance

If your potential program would like to request a modification of any of the guidelines in this document, such as the process steps, please bring your request to the Academic Senate for review.

Criteria for consideration and components of a new program proposal:

A. Alignment with college mission and master plan
B. Ability of the college to meet external accreditation requirements
C. Impact on equity
D. Potential for articulation with 4-year
E. Potential impact on, or competition with other district/regional programs
F. Labor market and other data
    a. Review for possible misalignment of available labor market data with actual jobs in the area
    b. Student need vs. industry need (i.e. living wages)
G. Student demand and enrollment projections: impact on FTES, Load
H. Projections of student success, persistence, and completion
I. Identification of which division will house the program
J. Impact on existing academic and student support services
K. College's planned support for FTEF allocation for program
    a. Include impact on other academic programs including the allocation of FTEF resources
    b. Are there existing full-time faculty willing and able to teach in the program?
    c. If no full-time faculty would be connected to the program, what is the plan for support adjunct faculty to perform needed functions for academic discipline?
L. Impact on instructional spaces
M. Space requirements for support staff
N. Impact on marketing and outreach
O. Funding for curriculum development
P. Funding for instructional equipment
Q. Funding and space for personnel
R. 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)

A. 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)
B. Ability of the college to meet external accreditation requirements	Requirements do not appear to present any barriers or roadblocks
C. Impact on equity	Provides opportunity that may attract male students; likely 60:40 female to male
D. Potential for articulation with 4-year	n/a
E. 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.
F. Labor market and other data	Provided by UCSF and Alex Kramer. See data in SWP proposal.
G. 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
H. Projections of student success, persistence, and completion	Projected to be similar to Rad Tech: >90% success, > 80% persistence and completion

I. Identification of which division will house the program	Science Division – NDT program is comparable to Rad Tech; prerequisite courses are within this division
J. 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
K. 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.
L. Impact on instructional spaces	Could share space with physiology lab initially If program grows and is successful, will need a single classroom/lab dedicated to the program with possible sharing.
M. Space requirements for support staff	Share space with Rad Tech support staff
N. Impact on marketing and outreach	Opportunities: the NDT program will be the first and only in the region, high-demand well-paying job Cost: need to market to general population as well as targeted to existing hospital workers
O. 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.
P. Funding for instructional equipment	Could be provided by SWP. Estimated $$

Q. Funding and space for personnel	Could be provided by SWP. Estimated $$
R. 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