Viability Committee on Co-curricular Activities Report
To the Educational Planning Committee

Rationale

The purpose of this program viability committee was to present our findings on the feasibility of co-curricular programs from a funding perspective. Additionally we were to determine the scope of what expenses go beyond the class such as traveling to competition, printing a newspaper, etc. It is important to note that co-curricular programs that were reviewed were from one of the following categories: all degree and vocational certificate instructional programs, all instructional disciplines, or all departments or other campus units offering instruction.

This program review process adhered to accreditation, state senate guidelines, state law, and the principles of shared governance.

Outcomes

This committee may make, but are not limited to the following recommendations: institution or adoption of a new program/discipline/department, enhance performance, restructuring or discontinuance of a program or discipline or department.

Establishing a Viability Review Committee

Through EPC, the process of Program Viability Review began. This review committee exists until filing its recommendations within 90 days of formation. Membership of the review committee included the following:

1. Richard Lewis – senate appointment
2. Reri Pumphrey - EPC member
3. Tammy Robinson and Barbara Vasquez – (2) Department Chair Council representatives
4. Maria Reisch – Curriculum Chair
5. Joe Meyer – AFT representative
6. James Zetino-Butler – ASO representative
7. Kim Perry – Vice President of Academic Affairs
8. Joyce Moore – Academic Dean

No members on the committee were represented from departments or disciplines that were directly affected by this review process.

Information Gathering

The committee’s solicitation of information was both broad and thorough in consideration of all factors related to the benefits of co-curricular activities for the students and surrounding community. Our findings were based on measures beyond
student demand or WSCH figures. We took into consideration aspects of co-curricular activities such as but not limited to its relation to the college mission, the ed master plan, program effectiveness and its impact on overall educational program, students, faculty, college budget and community.

**Process**

Once this committee was established we formally began the viability process on April 7, 2010. Reri Pumphrey was elected chair at which time a plan of action was developed and implemented. We began by defining co-curricular subjects, activities, and associated students and co-curricular activities. We discovered that LACCD board rule Article IV 9400, 9401, and 9402 on the definition of co-curricular activities was repealed on November 5, 2008.

As a result this committee informally defined a co-curricular activity as the following:
- an activity that is mandatory for all students
- an activity that goes above and beyond the regular classroom activity
- the instructor must be present at all times during the activity
- TBA – courses coded TBA may or may not be co-curricular pending cost for the activity

Based on our findings programs under consideration were Speech (forensics), Journalism (the Collegian), Theater (performances), Music (performances), and Math (math team).

To help us better understand co-curricular activities, research was needed for the definition of extracurricular and curricular. In summary the California Education Code Section 35160.5 states that “…extracurricular activity is not part of the regular school curriculum, is not graded, does not offer credit, and does not take place during classroom time.” Another characteristic of extracurricular is that the program is supervised or financed by the school district. Curricular activity on the other hand occurs in the classroom and credit is given for the class.

The committee moved forward by submitting a questionnaire to the department chair of co-curricular classes that would assist us in determining:
- what expenses were involved, the funding process,
- the number of participants who attended these activities,
- the approximate expense for the activity for the fiscal year,
- did the activity go above and beyond the classroom curriculum,
- was the activity mandatory or optional and
- were there other avenues to fund the activities?

Members of the committee were assigned to interview faculty in the affected areas. After review we concluded that the Math team, which is funded through personal donations of the Math faculty and a small portion from the Foundation, was an extracurricular activity and would not need further review.
The committee also analyzed each program’s course outlines with special attention to the catalog course description, course content and scope, course objectives and SLOs. With this, we wanted to determine the scope of the Title 5 curriculum mandates.

On May 6, 2010 an open forum was held in the Faculty Staff center with faculty, administration and AFT representation. Items for discussion included what EPC would look at in a viability review. There was mention that this was a new level of scrutiny and it was never looked at this way before. It was noted that program can become non-viable if it doesn’t have funding. There was concern that in the past viability review looked at programs --not budget issues related to programs. Of particular concern was that some programs cost more than others. It was added that this viability came about to restructure co-curricular activity (the Collegian, in particular) and its potential move to Student Life. The process was stated again clearly and it entailed a look at the structure of the programs under review. Some of the comments were to make sure we have checks and balances on how money is spend and received and that we are in compliance.

Based on the process as stated above, the committee was able to review all data and thus assess our recommendations impact on the college’s overall program.

The committee’s recommendations are as follows:

1. With the repeal of defining co-curricular activities, the task of having a viability study on co-curricular activities becomes erroneous.
2. That the LACCD board rule reinstate or review the definition of co-curricular activities for the purpose of having institutional framework that can implement how we as a campus and district view co-curricular activities.
3. If an activity is included in the course description of an approved course outline it should be considered as part of the curriculum and is therefore not co-curricular.
4. If an activity is included in the course objectives of an approved course outline it should be considered as part of the curriculum and is therefore not co-curricular.
5. If an activity is included the SLO matrix of an approved course outline it should be considered as part of the curriculum and is therefore not co-curricular. It should be noted that the programs we reviewed had no mention of co-curricular activities in their course outline.
6. All programs reviewed included activities in their course description, objectives, and SLO matrix of their approved outline and should not be considered co-curricular activities.
7. Many educational institutions believe that extracurricular activities are a vital part of skills developed from the curriculum and that we are inadequate in supporting such activities.
8. Activities included in the course objectives and student learning outcomes should be supported with general funds.

The above recommendations will be forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval. The Senate’s final decision will be taken to the College President in consultation.
Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Reri Pumphrey, EPC representative
Viability Committee Chair

______________________________
Richard Lewis
Academic Senate representative

______________________________
Tammy Robinson
Department Chair Council representative

______________________________
Joyce Moore
Academic Dean

______________________________
Barbara Vasquez
Department Chair Council Representative

______________________________
Maria Reisch
Curriculum Chair

______________________________
Joe Meyer
AFT representative

______________________________
James Zetino-Butler
ASO representative

______________________________
Kim Perry
Vice President of Academic Affairs